

His Excellency the Governor, said to me, "You are aware, I suppose, that we intend to give back the piece of the coast that includes Parihaka." I said, "No, I was not aware of it: in fact, that I had been led to understand by Mr. Sheehan that the whole of it would not be given back." Sir George Grey repeated, "Yes; we had fully decided it, and I thought you were aware of it."

1048. How long was that after the surveyors had been turned off?—It was in June, at the time Sir George Grey was in New Plymouth with the Governor.

1049. Who were the principal chiefs among whom you considered the payments for *mana* on the Waimate Plains should be divided?—I would place Manaia first, and then Titokowaru, Rukukato, Pumipi, Tauake, Ngahina, and various minor chiefs. I could name some chiefs of greater influence than some of the above, who would not take *takoha*, and therefore I leave them out.

1050. In the return now in your hand, the name "Kohi Rangatira" means Titokowaru, does it not?—Yes. His Maori name was Kohi Rangatira. Then he was christened Hohepa, and in the war he took the name of Titokowaru.

1051. He appears to have received about £900?—Yes.

1052. All for his *mana*?—Yes.

1053. Manaia's name does not appear on the return. Did he receive any money for his *mana*?—No.

1054. Neither for tribal nor for chieftain claims?—No. He asked me one day if I would pay him any money. I told him, "Yes," and that he could have £100 at once, if he liked. I then took him over to the bank at Hawera, and placed the vouchers before him for signature, with the money in notes. This was in the presence of the banker. He declined to take the money, saying that he was satisfied with having seen it. Some months afterwards he asked me if that money was still available, and I said it was. He then asked if it could be increased. I said, "Yes, you can have £1,000 if you like; will you take it?" He declined. He said he was satisfied with knowing that he could have it.

1055. You have no doubt in your mind, have you, that he understands he is to receive a considerable sum?—No.

1056. And so far as you are concerned, do you think that what has passed between you and him amounts to an engagement?—It amounts to an understanding.

1057. Ngahina, of Matengarara, received £375, did he not?—Yes.

1058. The following sums appear in the return as part of the *takoha* paid:—Te Hirana, £50; Heke Pakeke, £200; Tauake, £50; Tito Hanataua, £50; Rangipokau, £100; Tuanine, £100; Toko, £100; Ratoia, £100; Kerepu, £100; Wairi te Heke, £150; Mawiti, £100; Karere, £100; Raukura, £100; Tamanui, £200; Te Rarangi, £200; Piki Kohiku, £100; Ruakere, £200; Hone Pihama, £200. Are these sums all for tribal or chieftain *takoha* on the Waimate Plains?—No; of these the following sums were not paid for Waimate Plains *takoha*, but ought to be charged to the expenses of the Waitara meeting: namely, Rangipokau, £100; Tuanine, £100; Kerepu, £100; Mawiti, £100; Raukura, £100; Tamanui, £200; Ngahina, £200. I dare say there are some other names which ought to be added to the list of the Waitara expenses.

1059. There is an item which appears in the return as follows: "1878. July 20: Teira and others, on account, £1,000." Is that a payment to Teira on account of any proprietorship in the Waimate Plains?—No; it was for food and other expenses incurred at the Waitara meeting, and was described by me as "compensation west of Waingongoro."

1060. Why did you describe it as *takoha* at all, if it was money spent on account of the Waitara meeting?—Mr. Sheehan considered that it was one of those items of expenditure which could be properly charged against *takoha*; against the expenditure on this coast, and in settlement of the question. He considered that it would have a beneficial influence; and so it had, for the time, until the Natives found out, after a few months, that it had ended in nothing.

1061. Then that sum ought, in fact, to be taken off the cost of acquiring the Waimate Plains, and added to the amounts which already appear in the Parliamentary Papers as making up the cost of the Waitara meeting?—Yes.

1062. Part of the money appears to have been paid for erecting sheds for the Waitara meeting. When the meeting was over, what became of the sheds?—It was part of the agreement with the contractor, that the material should revert to him when the meeting was over.

1063. There is a payment to Pikirapu of £100, and one to Hohepa of £200. Were those not, in fact, payments to Titokowaru?—Yes.

1064. Why are they distinguished by those names?—Because when the voucher for the first payment I made on Titokowaru's authority was signed in his own name, it was objected to, and several months afterwards was returned to me with the intimation that no expenditure of public money to that individual could be passed; and I was requested to pay the sum immediately into the Public Account. There was a note by the Under-Secretary attached, stating that I had better get the voucher signed in some other name, which I did, and Pikirapu was one of the names which appeared. Ever since, Titokowaru has signed as "Hohepa" and "Kohi Rangatira," either jointly or separately.

1065. In the same return of payments, from Waingongoro to Patea, it appears that £7,413 has been paid for *takoha*. Is any part of that applicable to claims on the Waimate Plains?—No.

1066. At the same time that you have paid Titokowaru and other chiefs considerable sums as *takoha* on account of their *mana*, have you made tribal payments also?—No.

1067. No tribal payments have been made yet?—No; no tribal payments have been made in connection with the Waimate Plains.

1068. What we want to ascertain is, what do you consider you have got, practically, for the Government by the payment of these sums to the chiefs on account of their *mana*. Where are you; are you any better than you were before you paid them?—I am no better on the Waimate Plains; but I was between Patea and Waingongoro.

1069. But as regards the Waimate Plains, are you any better?—No; and that is the reason why I have recommended in my report that *takoha* should cease.

1070. Is it not the case that, since that money has been received by these chiefs, they have been guilty of acts of violence in removing the surveyors and otherwise, and may not some of them