

7. Which was heard first?—I cannot say for certain—all I can say definitely is that they were heard by the same Court; but my impression is that Paraeroa was heard first. I think the judgments were given at the same time.

8. Did you not observe that Ropata contested the hearing of Paraeroa? You yourself were one that took part?—Yes. You had a case, and Ropata and I had a case.

9. Was it because the owners of Waipiro had no knowledge of the position that it was left for you and Ropata to be the witnesses in this case?—Ropata was sent for because he was the owner of the lands immediately adjoining Waipiro Block. He did not come of his own volition.

10. Do you not know that I am an owner in the Akuaku and Ahiateatua No. 2 Blocks, which immediately adjoin this Waipiro Block?—I put you into part of the Akuaku Block by *aro*ha.

11. Do you not know that I am in Oroua and Rangikohua Blocks, also adjoining this block?—Yes, you obtained inclusion under the rights of Ropata's ancestors.

12. Who was Ropata? Was he not a member of Te Aitanga-a-Mate Hapu, the owners of these lands?—Yes; he did belong to Te Aitanga-a-Mate, and he gave the main evidence in support of the Iritekura claim and against your claim.

13. At the first hearing of this case before Judge Mackay and Tunuiarangi, in whose whare did Judge Mackay and Tunuiarangi stay?—He stayed at the hotel. The hotel was mine.

14. Were you present at the second hearing of this land?—No, I was shut out. I was the assessor then dealing with the Ngati Maniapoto Rohe Potae (King-country) lands.

15. Do you not remember that two old people named Hirini Kahotea and Henare Muratahi admitted that the boundary of Iritekura's gift land was at Waikawa Stream?—I know that they were members of that hapu, but I have no knowledge of their having given evidence in the Court. In the third Court I was present, and you did not call them as witnesses in support of your case then.

16. Now, from the year 1847 until 1869—when the trouble first began about this land—did you ever hear of the Whanau-a-Iritekura coming to turn any one off this land?—You have made all these statements before, and they, together with our replies, are contained in the minutes of evidence given before the Courts.

17. Did you ever hear of any person being man enough to continually fight about land that he had no right to?—Our denial of your statement is this: that, no matter how you may allege that the Whanau-a-Iritekura were attempted to be driven off, they never left the land; they did not go. You certainly did make those statements to the Courts.

18. You have stated that Pakanui, after making this gift to Iritekura, left this district and came down to Turanga. Can you point out any single piece of land in Turanga belonging to Pakanui?—Te Turanga is the name of a kainga he had at Turanga. When trouble subsequently arose they went down and claimed land and kaingas at Waiapu, and abandoned Turanga. All this has been stated in the Courts.

19. What I want to show is that Pakanui's descendants have no lands left in Turanga?—They abandoned them, having obtained conquest lands subsequent to that time at Waiapu. Those lands have been awarded under those rights.

20. *Hon. Mr. Carroll.*] Just the same, I suppose, as in the case of Iritekura when she came and settled at Waipiro?—Yes.

21. *Tuta Nihoniho.*] Now, as to Himiona Hapai, you know that he was a son-in-law of Rapata Wahawaha?—Yes, he was a son of Hikarukutai, the principal chief of Te Aitanga-a-Mate. He lived on Waipiro Block, and paid rent to the Whanau-a-Iritekura prior to the hearings of this land.

22. Do you not remember that this man Himiona Hapai was guilty of a very reprehensible action, that he was paid £25 to go over to the other side?—He merely gave evidence before the Court in the year 1890. He lived on Waipiro Block from 1878 to 1882, and he kept a store and a hotel and paid rent to the Whanau-a-Iritekura. If he had had rights of his own he would not have paid rent. It is not within my knowledge that he was paid to give any particular kind of evidence.

23. You know that Horomona te Hui is a son of the elder brother of that man?—Yes. His father signed a lease as witness—a lease between Whanau-a-Iritekura on the one hand and Ropata and Tamati Tautuhi on the other.

24. You have stated that it was because there was trouble between the owners of Waipiro and Kereopa that he wrote this letter supporting my petition: did you not hear him state here that he wrote his letter on the 20th October, and that the trouble you allude to took place on the 12th November?—I cannot speak as to dates, but there was trouble between the Whanau-a-Iritekura and Kereopa. There was none prior to that.

25. But that letter was written on the 20th October, before the trouble arose in November?—There is nothing much in that. He could antedate his letter to any date that he chose.

26. *Hon. Mr. Carroll.*] You do not suggest that he did that, do you?—I am just saying that it would be possible for him to do so.

27. *Tuta Nihoniho.*] Does that letter of Kereopa's mean that he desires that I should be put in through *aro*ha, or is it that he recognizes my ancestral rights?—I heard Kereopa state to the Committee yesterday that he simply desired you should be put in through *aro*ha. He did not claim that you had any ancestral rights.

28. You will notice that that is not what his letter says?—Yes, but what he said yesterday practically contradicts what his letter says.

29. Did you ever say at certain important meetings which were held when there was trouble about some moneys which were not paid by Te Whanau-a-Iritekura to you that it was through you that I, your *tamaiti* Tuta, had lost this land Waipiro?—I have no recollection of any *hui* at which I said that. I have no knowledge of any reason as to why I should say that.