

95. Did not Ngatikauwhata get paid a sum of money by the Government in addition to the land?—Yes; they had a good deal of money from the Government at various times through the instrumentality of Mr. McDonald.

96. Did not the three hapus who are represented by petitioner, receive money from the Government also?—None whatever. Two Natives, however, got a share of the purchase-money.

97. Can you explain how it was that the Government gave money to one section and none to the other?—No; unless it was through the persistency of Mr. Alexander McDonald.

98. Did not, then, Mr. McDonald advocate the claims of the hapus represented by petitioner?—He had nothing to do with them. He always admitted their claims, but was not the agent of these people.

99. In what year was it that these hapus' rents were first held by Dr. Featherston?—In 1863 the impounding first took place.

100. What was the reason of this money being withheld?—Because of the dispute as to who should receive the money.

101. Did Dr. Featherston absolutely agree to pay 10 per cent.?—Yes, he did.

102. Do you not know that in answer to a question put by Colonel Trimble it was stated the Government intended to disallow the money?—Yes; on behalf of the Natives I made certain proposals as to waiving our right to the money.

103. Did you not understand in reply to Colonel Trimble that if the land was given back the claim to these moneys would be withdrawn?—I made such a proposal to Dr. Pollen.

104. Did you first consult the tribe, and get their authority to make that proposal, or did you make it on your own account?—I had given up all hope of getting anything like justice at the hands of the Government, and so made the proposal in the interest of the Maoris.

105. Did the people for whom you were acting agree to your making that proposal?—Before I met the people the matter had come before Parliament, and had been embodied in a Bill; but the Council had the proviso struck out. The tribe said they had never given up their claim, because the money belonged to them, and they instructed me to prepare another petition to bring before Parliament.

106. Did not the Committee report in favour of these rents being paid to your clients?—Yes, in a report drawn up by Mr. Richmond.

107. So the Government held back the rent-money in the hope of impoverishing the Natives, and making them sell the land?—That was the effect of it.

108. *The Chairman.*] Did you recommend that course?—No. Before I was consulted Dr. Featherston had determined on this course, and I may add that there was scarcely any other course left for him at that time.

109. *Mr. Te Ao.*] And then the Government confiscated it?—Yes. Through not completing the survey within the prescribed time, the judgment of the Court lapsed, and the Government confiscated the land.

110. Do you not think that the result of Dr. Featherston holding that money back impoverished the Natives?—I think it had that effect.

111. If it was right for the land to be restored to the Maoris, would it not be right for the rents also to be restored?—Yes, certainly.

112. Do you think you were justified under the circumstances in making that proposal to Dr. Pollen, to forego the back rents, without consulting the tribes?—I think so. I thought that I could have justified myself to the people for whom I was acting. There was no harm done, and the proposal was not entertained.

113. Are you sure that the money they were entitled to was £500?—I believe so. The money actually paid was £400, because of some arrangement between Dr. Featherston and Captain Robinson.

114. Do you know how many years back the rent was impounded?—I cannot say. I think the rent was £100 a year; but I am only speaking from memory.

115. That would be five years' rent?—Yes. About that, which was due at that time, with 10 per cent. added now.

116. Are you sure the Council did not forego the claim?—Quite sure. They struck out the clause, on the motion, I believe, of Mr. Mantell.

117. *The Chairman.*] Was it a clause, or part of one?—The clause, I believe. The portion of the Bill having reference to the abandonment of the back rents was struck out. It think it was clause 17.

118. *Colonel Trimble.*] Were you present at the Committee of the Council?—No.

119. Then you are not speaking of your own knowledge?—No; but the records will tell.

120. *Mr. Te Ao.*] What was the total acreage of the Himatangi Block?—It was 11,700 acres.

121. What is the total amount now?—11,000.

122. What was done with the surplus 700?—The Government sold it.

123. *Colonel Trimble.*] Are you acquainted with the Himatangi Crown Grants Act as passed?—Yes.

124. Do you not know that the 16th clause, as passed in that Act, is the same as the 17th clause of the Bill you have just been referring to?—I cannot say, without the papers being before me.

125. I understand you to say that you were not present at the Committee of the Council when this Bill was passed?—I do not think so, but I am not sure.

126. Then, not having been present, you cannot state from your own knowledge the reasons which led to the striking-out of the last three lines?—No.

127. You know nothing yourself?—No; only second-hand.

128. I refer you to clause 16, which answers clause 17 of the original Bill. Have you read this clause, 16: "The passing of this Act shall be deemed and taken to be a full and complete satisfaction