

AGAINST SALANOA.

Charge.—That he fined members of a committee appointed by District Council to inspect schools for their non-attendance on the inspection. (Page 204.)

Answer.—The District Council imposed the fines and the money was paid to it. (Page 293.)

Charge.—That he banished Galo and Tito. (Page 250.)

Answer.—That these troubles were settled by Mr. Griffin, the then Secretary of Native Affairs, and not by the Faipule. (Page 294.)

AGAINST AMA.

Charge.—That he reported breach of "fine mats" regulation. (Page 212.)

Answer.—It was Seinafo who reported the case, not Ama. (Perfectly proper in any event.) (Page 321.)

AGAINST SAGAPOLUTELE.

Charge.—That he promised work on roads, but it was not given. (Page 212.)

Answer.—That Public Works Engineer would not consent to the village *pulenu'u* being foreman of the road gang. Villagers would not work except with their own foreman, and therefore did not get the work. (Page 292.)

APPENDIX IV.

Apia, Samoa, 23rd October, 1927.

The Chairman, Royal Commission, Apia.

SIR,—

I am instructed by High Chief Tuimaleali'ifano to ask for leave to approach you again with a view to his being heard. I do this not as counsel engaged by the Mau, but as solicitor for my client. I could well wish that there were another solicitor in Apia who could represent my client, but unfortunately he had practically no choice.

My client is not a member of the Mau and has had no association with the movement. He is one of the two Fautuas who occupy the highest position in this territory, subject only to the Administrator. These Fautuas are of princely rank, and are the personal advisers of His Excellency the Administrator.

My client would have appeared had he been called by either the Malo or the Mau. The Malo has not called him. The Mau cannot, as their case, saving arranged exceptions, is closed.

May I draw your attention to the advertisement over the name of Mr. Mason appearing in the *Samoa Times* of 16th September, 1927. May I also draw your attention to the printed and circulated directions of His Excellency. From these publications it would appear that any person has a right to bring forward a complaint.

You, sir, will remember that at Falealili you directed (at my request) that at the resumption of sittings at Apia at 8.15 a.m. on Saturday last no person need attend unless (a) he desired so to do, (b) he had any matter to bring forward.

My client asks respectfully that he may be given the opportunity offered and advertised. He further instructs me to mention this matter on Monday morning.

Yours obediently,

THOS. B. SLIPPER.

Royal Commission of Inquiry into Samoan Affairs, Apia, 25th October, 1927.

Thos. B. Slipper, Esq., Solicitor, Apia.

DEAR SIR,—

I am in receipt of your letter dated the 23rd October, 1927, received at 11 o'clock on Sunday morning.

Tuimaleali'ifano, long after the case for the petitioners had closed and while the case for the Administration was in its closing stage, intimated to the Commission for the first time that he desired to give evidence. The Commission has been informed that all the Native evidence on both sides has been heard by the Commission. We have considered that evidence carefully. Tuimaleali'ifano was neither an actor nor concerned in any single incident or subject of evidence brought before us. It therefore appears clear to us that he can give no admissible evidence on any matter before the Commission. Neither party thinks that his evidence can be of use to the Commission, and our opinion coincides with theirs. At present we see no reason for altering the decision given by the Commission. If we were to do so we could hardly refuse other applications, and so an already unduly lengthened inquiry would be further protracted.