

he replied that he believed it was Maori land. I asked him if he knew who the Natives were, and he said they were Mr. Gittos's people. I then wrote Mr. Gittos that letter. I had no information whatever at the time that the land was inside the Pakiri Block; nor do I believe that the settlers themselves or Mr. Gittos had. I believe it was subsequently—when, at the instance, perhaps, of other people, Mr. Gittos was desirous of dealing with the land—that it was found to be inside the Pakiri Block. I wrote to Mr. Gittos. I knew that for many years he had taken a strong personal interest in the protection of the affairs of these people at Oruawharo, in relation to their lands and other affairs. That is the substance of what I have to say, and I am now at your service.

762. *The Chairman.*] There is one question I should like to ask before you leave that part of the subject. Do you say that the land was surveyed and passed through the Court in 1869?—About 1869.

763. Have you reason to believe that these Native petitioners knew of the survey at that time, and that the land was then going through the Court?—Yes; Adam Clark was there.

764. I mean the land in the disputed boundary?—That I cannot say; but I think it would be very likely, because there were a number of other blocks to be put through in the same vicinity.

765. Have you reason to believe that they had other means of knowing that the land was at that time to go through the Court?—I know of no reason to the contrary. The rule is to send Proclamations round the various Native settlements to a number of people of each tribe; but still, it is possible that they might have been there and yet not have been aware of the encroachment.

766. You do not know anything of your own knowledge?—No; but reference to the *Gazette* of 1869, and the Proclamation of the cases to come before the Court, would very likely settle the fact whether they had any claim before the Court or not.

767. I want you to be quite clear about what you said in reference to the money lodged to the trust account. You stated, I think, that you had no doubt that the deposit document produced from the bank is the one that was used on the occasion of the lodgment of the money?—Yes.

768. And that is for £300?—Yes.

769. Did I understand that you stated that on the same day Adam Clark came to your office with Brissenden and Nelson and signed a cheque in your presence for £200?—Yes.

770. I presume that is the cheque which I have seen. Is that the cheque?—Those are the two papers that I refer to, and that is Adam Clark's signature.

771. And did I understand you to say that at the time that cheque was signed it was clearly understood between you that it was for the purpose of paying for the maintenance of Wi Apo's children?—Partly. I said I was not quite sure that that money was paid to him for the survey on that day; but a portion of it was clearly meant as a fund from which he could pay for clothing and matters of that kind from time to time. I do not think I said so absolutely.

772. *Mr. Bowen.*] Then it was to give Adam Clark that £200?—You see, he lived eighty miles from Auckland, in a country which at that time was inaccessible, as there were hardly any roads, and people travelled by cutters. The boy lived at his own settlement, under Mr. Gittos's care. I knew Adam Clark was a member of Mr. Gittos's church, and therefore I had no hesitation in allowing him to receive the moneys.

773. *The Chairman.*] But I think you stated quite distinctly that you had yourself received none of that money?—Yes.

774. That you had handled none of it?—Yes.

775. None of it, in fact, was paid to you?—Yes. Of course that does not refer to the £20 cheque in respect of which I have given my evidence.

776. I am speaking of the £200 cheque?—I did not handle a single penny of it. I did not take the trouble to deduct moneys due to the estate—moneys paid out of pocket. At the hearing of the case in 1869, Mr. Gittos was there. I distinctly remember his holding Divine service.

777. I notice that in your evidence given before the Public Accounts Committee the statement you made then differs from what you stated to-day, and I should like to call your attention to it?—I am speaking from memory of a transaction which took place six years ago.

778. You say there that "before 1 o'clock in the day, Clark and Nelson came up to my office in the Provincial Secretary's room, and produced a cheque, which was signed by Adam Clark, for £200. I asked what the money was for. Adam Clark's £150 was to recoup expenses of survey." I ask what the £50 was for?—That would not be any money for my own benefit. That might have been money for Jones.

779. But you said to-day that you did not even handle the money?—I would not even say now that I did not handle the money for Jones. It might have been handled by Nelson or Brissenden. I am speaking of a matter which took place in 1874.

780. But, as I understood you to-day, you stated you never handled the money at all?—It might have been so. None of it had been given me for myself; but it might have been passed to me to pay Mr. Jones. In that case I should have handled the money, no doubt. I think £100 was paid to Mr. Jones—£50 of that amount, and £50 of Te More's amount. I have no doubt Mr. Nelson would be able to give the exact details of the disbursement. I should like, if the Committee have no objection, before completing my examination, and answering questions that may be put to me, to have reference to the bank account which was sent for. Speaking from memory, one might make a mistake.

781. The telegram states there were only two cheques drawn, the £200 and the £20. The account, when it comes, I have no doubt will be the same as that. I may state that I got a corrected copy of the telegram.—In that case there ought to be a balance in the account now of £80.

782. There is one other matter I should like to ask you, Mr. Sheehan. Do you remember paying any money to Jones on this account?—I cannot say. I know that Mr. Jones came to me two or three times about it in the office, when he heard that these people were down for the purpose of selling. In fact, I think he came to me for a letter recommending his proposal to dispose of his lien to the Government. I saw him frequently about the matter, when he was negotiating for his own lease. It is quite possible I may have paid Jones; but I should be simply a mere machine for transferring money from one to the other.

Mr. J. Sheehan,
M.H.E.
Aug. 9, 1880.