

- (g.) In the month of June, 1907, after the order of the Court had been perfected and the survey of the block completed, the Government purchased the interests of the Ngatipare and the Ngatitahinga Tribes in the 13,000 acres at the price of £2 per acre, and the said purchase was arranged by the Native Land Purchase officers with the Native owners personally without any interference by Mr. Kaihau, and the purchase-moneys were paid by the Crown to each individual Native owner direct and not through Mr. Kaihau.
- (h.) No influence was exerted by Mr. Kaihau either on the Government or on the Native Land Purchase Department to induce the Government to purchase the said 13,000 acres, or as to the price or other terms of purchase.
- (i.) After the purchase-money had been paid by the Crown to the Native vendors Mr. Kaihau received from the members of the Ngatitahinga Tribe the sum of about £2,000, being the sum which Para Haimona, the leading man of the Ngatitahinga Tribe, with the consent of the tribe, fixed pursuant to clause 3 of the agreement as a reasonable remuneration for Mr. Kaihau's services. This sum included the payment referred to in paragraph (e).
- (j.) That the negotiations for the purchase from the Ngatipare and Ngatitahinga Tribes of the said 13,000 acres were properly and regularly conducted by the Native Land Purchase officers.

## FINDING.

4. The Committee finds that Mr. Kaihau did not, in or about the year 1906, while a member of Parliament, conduct the sale to the Government of any portion of the Te Akau Block, but, on the contrary, the Committee finds that the said sale was negotiated and conducted by the officers of the Native Land Purchase Department directly with the Native owners. The Committee further finds that nothing done by Mr. Kaihau in the course of the transaction amounted to a breach of any rule of law or of any established parliamentary practice.

## SECOND CHARGE.

5. The second charge against Mr. Henare Kaihau is as follows:—

That Henare Kaihau, in the years 1900, 1902, 1904, 1905, and 1907 while a member of Parliament, charged and received from the persons named in the annexed particulars, on whose behalf he prepared or presented, or undertook to present, petitions to Parliament, payments or sums of money for his services relating thereto or in connection therewith."

*"Particulars.*

- "(a.) A payment by Horomona Watarauhi in the year 1905 in respect of a petition which was to have been, but which was not in fact, presented to Parliament.
- "(b.) A payment by a member or members of the Ngatireko Tribe in 1905 in connection with a petition to Parliament.
- "(c.) A payment by Kaahu Huatare in the year 1900 in connection with a petition presented to Parliament.
- "(d.) A payment by or on behalf of Mohi te Wara in the year 1904 in connection with a petition to Parliament.
- "(e.) A payment by Rewatu te Hiriako in the year 1907 for alleged services in connection with a petition presented to Parliament.
- "(f.) A payment by Hakiha Tawhaio in or about the year 1902 for alleged services in connection with a petition presented to Parliament."

6. The same counsel appeared as in the first charge.

7. The evidence taken at length shows:—

- (1.) That Mr. Kaihau received the following payments either in respect of services rendered as Native Agent prior to the preparation of the petitions or for promoting the petition before the Native Affairs Committee—namely,
  - (a.) In the month of March, 1905, the sum of £15 from Te Awa Horomona in respect of the petition in reference to Waipa No. 66, presented to Parliament in the year 1904.
  - (b.) In the year 1900 the sum of £10 from Kaahu Huatare in connection with the petition presented to Parliament in the year 1900.
  - (c.) The sums of £15 and £5 respectively in respect of a petition to Parliament presented in the year 1904 on behalf of Mohi te Wara.
  - (d.) The sum of £25 received from Rewatu te Hiriako in respect of a petition presented to Parliament in the session of 1907.
- (2.) That the charge (b) mentioned in the particulars was not established, and charge (f) in such particulars was withdrawn.

## FINDING.

8. The Committee is of opinion that the receipt by Mr. Kaihau of the aforesaid payments in connection with his duties as a member of Parliament was improper