

AGAINST SEINAFO.

Charge.—That he approved of “fine mats” regulation. (Page 107.)

Answer.—It was proved that he remitted protest to Fono of Faipules. (Page 107.)

Charge.—Gambling. (Page 199.)

Answer.—Admitted playing cards with other chiefs for matches. (Page 324.)

Charge.—That he dismissed *pulenu’us*. (Page 199.)

Answer.—Power of dismissal rested with Administration. Admitted reporting one *pulenu’u* to Secretary of Native Affairs for abandoning his wife and large family and taking up with another woman. (Page 324.)

AGAINST TOELUPE.

Charge.—Taking away titles of two persons. (Page 105.)

Answer.—Denial. Titles still in use by the holders who were alleged to have been deprived of them. (Page 286.)

Charge.—Failed to banish a chief named Tupai. (Page 252.)

Answer.—District Council settled the dispute between Tupai and others. No complaint by the parties themselves. (Page 283.)

Charge.—That he used for his own purposes cement belonging to village.

Answer.—Cement belonged to the Administration. Toelupe bought four barrels and was properly charged for them. (Page 283.)

AGAINST SEIULI.

Charge.—Imposing punishments. (Page 211.)

Answer.—Denial, and statement that he knew a Faipule had no power to inflict punishment. Admitted, however, that he consulted the Fa’amasino as to whether a general refusal by people of a village to take treatment for hookworm could not be punished. No punishment was inflicted. (Page 293.)

AGAINST TAPUSOA.

Charge.—That he sat on an inquiry, as the result of which the witness (Tu’u Fautupua) was banished. (Page 101.)

Answer.—That he was appointed to sit by the Resident Commissioner of Savai’i. (Page 303.)

AGAINST ASI-MAMA.

Charge.—That he disregarded the regulations as to funerals. No details given. (Page 136.)

Answer.—Denial. (Page 271.)

AGAINST MALUPO.

Charge.—That he was not a titled man but a *taulealea*. That Malupo was not a chiefly title. (Page 164.)

Answer.—It was admitted that Malupo was an Alo Ali’i (one of the great chiefs of Samoa). (Page 201.)

Charge.—That he inspected plantations himself. (Page 201.)

Answer.—Admitted. (A perfectly proper thing for him to do.) (Page 300.)

Charge.—That he held an inquiry, instead of the Fa’amasino.

Answer.—That he merely endeavoured to reconcile the disputing parties. It was not a trial. (Page 300.)

AGAINST LEILUA SIAVI’I.

Charge.—That he recommended friends or relatives for official positions. (Page 192.)

Answer.—Denied assertion that chiefs of high standing have been getting the appointments. (Page 295.)

Charge.—Intimidation in telling Pasia he had better keep his mouth shut. (Page 192.)

Answer.—Admitted a remark to that effect. Explained he had obtained a remission of the Government order that Pasia should not speak at village meetings, and Pasia then used his influence to persuade people to join the Mau. (Page 295.)

AGAINST SU’AMUI.

Charge.—That he did not forward remits to Fono of Faipules. (Page 201.)

Answer.—Complainant himself admitted that the remits had been brought up before the Fono. (Page 210.)

AGAINST SU’A LATU.

Charge.—That he was given presents to get Matamua’s title back. (Page 202.)

Answer.—Denied. The people themselves wished it. A Faipule has nothing to do with titles. The family controls titles. (Page 304.)

Charge.—That he was deaf. (Page 202.)

Answer.—Denied (physically disproved). (Page 304.)