

207 Do you not think the Natives resisted on that occasion simply to bring out a more thorough and satisfactory settlement of the question?—They had no right to do that after the Supreme Court had given orders they were to go off. They were setting themselves up as a superior authority to the Supreme Court.

208. If the judgment of the Supreme Court in every respect had been fair, why has the question been brought up now? Why has it assumed this shape?—The Court said the land was mine, and I ought to have had it five years ago; and some one will probably have to pay me for having five years' use of that land.

209. Did you give the grantees £3,000 in money for that land?—I think it was £2,500 I gave them, and that I sold the leased part of it for £3,000 about six months afterwards.

210. How much did you give the grantees in cash for that land?—I gave them £2,500 in cash. Not all was in cash, but the bulk was in cash. There was some store account.

211. Was not the bulk of that amount in spirits?—Certainly not. They did not drink more spirits than you did when you were doing business with me. They always paid for whatever they got, and they never obtained much. I think there was £70 or £80 worth.

212. Did you give any cash to Rewi?—Yes.

213. How much?—I cannot say now. I gave what was due to him. There was never any question about payment in cash.

214. Did Rewi allege, in the Supreme Court, he had never received anything in cash at all for that land?—I do not know.

215. Did not Rewi state in Court he only owed you £100, and beyond that he owed you nothing?—He never owed me anything at all. He paid his debt, and never owed me a penny since.

216. Did you think I excelled the others in drinking spirits at that time?—No; I do not say that. They were all very moderate. I do not think at all you consumed the quantity of spirits some people do.

217 Did not you think Paora strongly addicted to drink?—No; I did not think so. I think Waka at one time was. He was about the only one who went to excess at that time. He did not obtain his supply from me. I do not think the Natives drink as much spirits as the pakehas do, as far as my experience goes.

TUESDAY, 16TH AUGUST, 1881.

Mr. SUTTON, M.H.R., further examined.

218. *Captain Russell.*] You stated yesterday, when the writ of ejectment was first to be served by the Sheriff, that the Sheriff, his officer, and the Inspector of Police, went in a cab to the ground, and did not get out of the cab?—Yes.

219. That, of course, is only from hearsay?—It is from the officers themselves.

220. Then, did these officers lead you to understand they did not attempt to carry out their duty?—I did not understand until some time afterwards how things had been brought about.

221. When you became aware they did not get out of the cab, did they lead you to suppose they had intentionally abstained from duty?—I have seen a letter from the Government to the Sheriff directing him not to take any steps until the arrival of Mr. Ormond, who would instruct him. I have seen Mr. Ormond's memorandum since.

222. Who signed the memorandum?—Mr. Ormond, I believe.

223. I mean from the Minister to the Sheriff?—I am not certain whether it was a letter or a telegram. My impression is it was a telegram from Sir Donald McLean.

224. You have said, I think, the instructions were to the Sheriff to achieve a failure?—To take no active steps to carry out the order of the Court: if there was any resistance, or any show or talk of resistance, they were not to attempt it. They interpreted their instructions, as I am informed, in this way. They were met by a few Natives; and an honorable member of this Committee was present, who addressed the officers, and said they must not take possession, or something of that kind; and no attempt was made.

225. Was any reason assigned for such a course in the instructions from Sir Donald McLean?—No. That memorandum or telegram, whatever it was, was simply directing the Sheriff that he was not to execute the orders of the Court until he had consulted Mr. Ormond.

226. What was Mr. Ormond's position at the time in the matter?—I think Mr. Ormond was Minister for Public Works at the time. I am not quite certain, but I think so.

227 Then, it would have been Mr. Ormond in his official capacity either as Minister or General Government Agent?—I do not think it was in any official capacity as Minister at all. It was, in my opinion, an extremely improper assumption and interference of a Minister. I do not hold at all that it came within the scope of any Minister's authority.

228. But would it not have been as a question of public policy they thought it inexpedient to give effect to the writ?—It was no more a question of public policy than the case of an ordinary writ to a European.

229. What year was this in?—I can hardly say without reference. Probably it was the end of 1874 or in 1875.

230. There was a very strong impression, was there not, in the district at the time that resistance would have been offered?—No. I do not think there was. I had every reason to believe that such resistance as was offered was got up; it was not spontaneous.

231. There was a second occasion of serving the writ—a second attempt to take possession, was there not?—Only the one unsuccessful one and the successful one.

232. The impression your evidence leaves on my mind is that you imagine it was not a question of public policy, but something personal to yourself, which led to that action?—Quite so. That is my impression, that it was not so much a question of public policy as for other reasons. Public policy was the blind.