

7. That lists of persons required to contribute to the schools under this Act shall be made out for each of the districts of Avarua, Arorangi, and Takitumu, and such collectors appointed and such regulations made by the Government as it may find necessary.

Dated at Avarua, this day of September, 1895.

Government of Rarotonga.

Resolved, That the following be appointed to collect the school rate under "The Public Schools Act, 1895": In Avarua, ; in Arorangi, ; in Matavera, ; in Ngatangiia and Muri, ; in Tikika-veka,

1. That the duty of the collectors be to draw up as soon as possible lists of the ratepayers in their district with the amount payable by each, and send copies of the same to the Clerk of the Government, Avarua.

2. That the remuneration of each of the collectors shall be 10 per cent. of the amounts collected by him, which he shall deduct on making payment of such collection to the Clerk of the Government.

3. That the first payment of half the tax shall be made on Friday, the 4th January, and that if any be not paid by the 14th an addition of one-fourth shall be made thereto.

4. Chili money shall only be received at the rate of 2s. for each dollar.

The second payment shall be made on the 4th April, and the addition of one-fourth be added on all arrears not paid before the 14th.

5. Every collector shall pay to the Clerk of the Government his weekly collection, and shall make such payment within three days of the end of each week, or the Clerk shall complain of him to the Judge of the Arikis' Court in his district. The fine to be imposed for neglect will be \$1 to \$20, as the Judge may think advisable.

6. The Clerk to Government shall be paid five pounds a year for his work in connection with the collection of this tax, and keeping the accounts in connection therewith.

TUESDAY, 28TH DECEMBER, 9 A.M.

The Petition of the Parliament. (The Arikis' case comes in after the Federal Court Bill.)

The Federal Court Bill.

Vaikai Moate: I do not follow. I want to be asked questions about the written statement—about the Federal Court Bill.

Sir J. Prendergast: If you had been given more time by the British Resident, would the Parliament have passed the Bill?—Yes, if we understood it. If the matter had been properly explained, I think the measure would have been passed by Parliament. I think, if the mode of appointment was by the head of the Government and the British Resident, and, if those do not agree, the Governor of New Zealand should decide who was to be appointed, the Parliament would pass the Bill.

The next important matter that has to be in the Bill would have to be a description of the kind of cases that the Court would have to have exclusive jurisdiction over. The British Government has suggested that the jurisdiction should be over all cases of murders and murderous assaults, and all other serious cases—civil and criminal—in which a European is one of the parties: Do you think that some provision of that sort would be passed by Parliament?—They would pass it if they were clear as to the effect of the working of the Bill on themselves.

It has occurred to me that another matter might be provided for in the Bill—that there should be an appeal in some of the more important minor cases in the Native Courts where a European is a party. I will give an illustration: Where a European had got drunk, that would be a case for the Native Court, and it might not be thought necessary to give an appeal in a case of that sort. There might, however, be a case against a European for some breach of the law within the jurisdiction of the Native Court, which might more seriously involve his character. In such a case as that, it might be thought well to give a right of appeal to the Federal Court. Do you think that would meet with approval? I ask you your own opinion?—I understand what you have been saying, and I think if the Parliament understood it they would approve.

Then, am I right in thinking that the refusal to pass or delay in passing and discussing the Court Bill was a misunderstanding between the Parliament and Mr. Moss?—Yes.

I see that you say in your statement that Parliament sent an answer to Mr. Moss, giving reasons for not passing the Bill?—Yes.

Do you recollect what those reasons were?—I refer to our letter signed by Mr. Salmon, as Chairman, dated 6th August, 1897.

Is there anything else you would like to say about the Federal Court Bill?—We were in the dark, and not understanding the ways of white men. We are not accustomed to them. Through that we were afraid and doubtful after seeing the reading of the Bill. This is what we thought: that it was taking all our power and giving it to the British Resident. That is the reason we did not pass it. That is why we wrote the letter presented to you now.

Do you really think, with the explanation I have given you, that Parliament would still object to Mr. Moss being the first President of the new Court till the expense of a special Judge could be borne?—We will not agree to it.

Will you give the reasons which would keep Parliament from agreeing to that? I am anxious to meet the very point, and hope you will be quite open. I want you to give your own reasons, and not European reasons, unless they are the same?—This is what I think: Why should there be two offices to Mr. Moss—British Resident and President? The question of expense of another man is one reason?—That is true.

Mr. Moss has had a great experience. He was for a good many years in the local Parliament in Otago, and afterwards in the General Parliament of New Zealand; and while he was in the local Parliament he was the head of the Government, called Provincial Secretary. I think you must have seen that his knowledge and skill point him out as a very fit person. If he does appear to you to have the knowledge and skill, is there some reason why you should not put confidence in him as President?—This is the cause of the difference: We asked Mr. Moss to give us time; he insisted that they should pass the Bill: he would not wait for a time to well consider, and to be enlightened and clear on the subject. It is a new thing, and Mr. Moss was hurrying them on to pass the Bill. They asked him to wait.

I have met with a great many persons, and it is likely when one is asked to do a thing and does not wish to offend the person that asks it the answer is not a refusal, but to say by-and-by; but the person to whom that is said understands the by-and-by as a refusal. I understand you now to say that when Parliament said by-and-by it did not mean a refusal?—We did not mean a refusal.

I also gather from what you have said that you admit the skill and knowledge of Mr. Moss?—Yes.

And, so far as you know, if Parliament had more time to discuss the matter, and there had been more explanation, you think it likely that Parliament, instead of incurring the additional expense of a special President, might have agreed to Mr. Moss being first President till the revenue would bear the expense of the salary of a special President?—This is what I think, had he given them time; and this trouble would never have happened, and it is through that hurrying the deadlock came.

The Interpreter for the natives said that they wished to go slowly.

Te Pou-o-te-Rangi examined: You have heard the questions and answers of Vaikai—would you like to make a statement? I will speak what the Arikis have said on the Bill. I wish to say a few words before I go into the question of the Bill. They did not object to the Bill; they only asked for time. This is what I know from their own lips. This trouble arose from some words of Mr. Moss; it was through Mr. Moss saying that it (the work) will not rest with you, but the British Government. That caused the trouble. It was the publication of this that led to the meeting.