

The Court said it understood that Mr. McDonald appeared for the persons formerly represented by Messrs. Stevens and Stafford.

Mr. McDonald said it was so, but he had only been instructed this morning.

Colonel McDonnell intimated that he appeared for the persons whose names he handed into Court when it first opened.

Mr. Stevens said the position was that he withdrew from the case, and Mr. McDonald was to act for his clients.

Mr. McDonald said at present he represented Wirihana and Warena Hunia, Iritana Hanita, and Himiona Kowhai.

The Court stated that a schedule of the owners had been made out. All must be represented before the case proceeded.

Mr. Knocks handed in his retainer.

Henare te Apatari said it had been arranged that he should withdraw from the case, and that Hamuera Karaitiana should act for his clients.

The Court read out the list of names of the registered owners of the Horowhenua Block, and the forty-eight persons whose status had been established by "The Horowhenua Block Act, 1896," and ascertained that all were either present or represented excepting (61) Karena Taiawhio, (62) Ruahoata, (63) Hakehake te Wunu, (81) Aperahama Rangiwetea, (82) Te Miha-o-te-Rangi, (83) Te Whatahoro, (85) Hoani Meihana, (90) Mihi te Rina Kawana, (48) Rangipo Hoani, (104) Turuki, (112) Rawinia Matao, (114) Ema te Whango, (115) Roreta Tawai, (116) Mata te Whango, (120) Mere Karena-te-mana-o-tawhaka, (125) Rora Tohu, (126) Mere Hira Waipapa, (127) Ria te Raekokiritia, (131) Harerota, (133) Herariki Kawana Hunia, (137) Ngahua Tirai, (139) Matina Tamaiwhakakitea, (140) Wi Waaka, (141) Ani Marakaia, (142) Miriama Piripi, (143) Harata te Koete, (31) Rawea Taraua.

Hamuera Karaitiana stated, with regard to Marakaia Tawaroa, Karaitiana Korou, and other members of Hamua Hapu, that these people did not claim any additional area in excess of what had already been allotted to them, as they were of opinion that the land belonged to Muaupoko Tuturu.

Emeri Ngawhakawa informed the Court that she and her son Taitoko ki te Uruotu did not intend to prefer any claim to Sections 11 and 12. (This statement was afterwards personally confirmed by Taitoko te Uruotu, who stated that he was satisfied with his share in Subdivision 6, and stated he did not intend to prefer any claim to lands outside of that.)

Henare te Apatari stated that he had been instructed to appear for the successors to Peeti te Aweawe, Anikanara, Tihoi's successors, and Meretine Whakaewa.

The Court announced that a telegram had been received from Tamati Tautuhi, saying that he had been instructed to appear for Rakerā Hunia. (A letter was subsequently received from Tamati Tautuhi, stating that he did not consider it necessary to appear at present, as the interest of her late father, Kawana Hunia, was sufficiently represented by the conductor employed by Wirihana Hunia. If, when successors to Kawana Hunia were appointed, her brothers denied his client's rights to succeed with them equally to their father's interest, he would ask the Court to give him an opportunity of appearing on her behalf.)

Inquiry *re* accounts resumed.

Sir W. Buller did not intend to call any more evidence. Mr. Stevens had admitted that the amounts received by Kemp were correctly stated in the statement of accounts put in by him (*Sir W. Buller*).

Objectors' Case.

Mr. McDonald said there were several sums mentioned in the statement as having been paid direct to Muaupoko. He had nothing to say about these, as Muaupoko had not made any objection. They had been paid to Muaupoko, and not to Kemp. As to the item £300, given towards cost of meeting-house at Wanganui, he thought there should be some evidence as to the assent of the tribe to the gift being made. The item of £50 paid to McDonald for sheep for Aue Puihi was not a proper charge against the tribe. The sum of £125 paid for sheep for Raniera te Whata was in the same position. The amount of £50 paid to Kiritotara was on the same footing. The amounts paid to Warena Hunia and Wirihana Hunia were not a proper charge. The £1,000 sent to Makere was properly distributed. The sums of £100 each to Rangimairehau and Hapeta Taueki are subject to the same objection as the gift of £300 and others. The £800, he understood, was standing to credit of Sir Walter Buller as a trust account. He contended that this sum should be paid into Court, and remain in the hands of the Court until it was distributed.

The Court said it was satisfied the money was perfectly safe where it was. It would consider what should be done.

Mr. McDonald questioned the item of £250 for expenses of Muaupoko at Court of 1873 at Foxton; also the sum of £20 paid to Renata Kawepo. With regard to the item of £300 for expenses of Muaupoko attending Court of 1890, he did not think it should all be charged to Muaupoko, but he would let it go. He objected to the £200 for expenses of seven persons in Wellington. The £30 and £150 for food and attending rehearing Court he questioned. The next items—of £300, £150, £100, £100, and £25—he objected to. The item of £200 for Kemp's personal expenses from 1873 to 1886 he objected to. He objected to £100 Kemp's expenses on journeys to Wellington. The £200 for Kemp's personal expenses he could not admit. The £30 paid to Dr. Buller, £5 to McDonald, and £130 paid to Ru Reweti for clerical assistance he objected to. As to the items of £115 and £400 paid to Cash, he would call evidence to show that Kawana Hunia paid £400 of it. He objected to the payments to Mr. Baker, and all the following items except the £100 deposited by Warena Hunia. He called Wirihana Hunia.

Sir W. Buller asked upon what principle Mr. McDonald objected to the law charges.

Mr. McDonald said the expenses were unnecessary.