on the 3rd without any notice except a short notice in the *Poverty Bay Herald* the same morning, and in English only.

The Commission adjourned at fifteen minutes to 1 p.m.

MONDAY, 6TH NOVEMBER, 1876.

[Mr. Wilson's evidence resumed.]

The case of Motu is only one instance of errors in the names of owners. I could multiply instances. The same statement applies to the short notices of the sittings of the Court. The statement made in my last memorandum, as to the manner in which lands have been gazetted [read] is correct. The two blocks there mentioned, Tauwhareparae and Huiarua, were first applied for 18th October, 1875. The applications were sent by the Natives and were franked in my office. The entries are in my letter-book. [Entries shown.] Those applications were returned to the Natives by the Chief Judge. The reason was that the boundaries were not described in the application, but the plan was cited: that used to be very commonly done. Fresh applications were then sent with the boundaries fully given. No delay on my part took place in getting it done. I had to send the application to be signed by the Natives: all this took a good deal of time. They were posted to Potae for signature on 17th May, and sent from my office to Auckland on 1st June. Those applications have never been gazetted at all. The applications that were gazetted in the *Kahiti* of 18th May were sent by telegram. Mr. Woon came to my office to get the boundaries, and told me he was going to telegraph the applications. I simply referred him to the map. I think it improper for the Court to send applications by telegram. It gives applicants an undue advantage over those who send their applications by post direct to the chief office. In this case 113,000 acres of land were concerned, and private purchasers were opposing the Government. I hold agreements for the purchase of them, and have paid over £2,000 in advances. When Mr. Woon came to ask me for the boundaries, and told me he was going to telegraph the application, I referred him to the map. I thought he only meant to supply the defect of the first applications. I did not ask for explanations.

In January, 1873, I bought Waimata West, over 10,000 acres; it was surveyed by April. An application was sent about that time by the Natives, signed by them in my presence. It was returned to have the signatures attached in a different place. It was again forwarded 22nd September, 1875. That was returned because the names were all in one handwriting. It was sent again on the 18th October. No attention was paid to that; no fault could be found with the form in which it was sent. It was sent again on the 20th May, 1876. On 1st July its receipt was acknowledged in the *Kahiti*. It is not yet gazetted. I have restrained the principal chief concerned from going to Wellington to complain. I have drawn Mr. Locke's attention to this. I once asked Judge Rogan if I should send my applications through his office, and he would not undertake to say that I should. That was in last March.

I produce a letter, undated, from Hemi te Awahaku, complaining that he could not get the Court to appoint him guardian of his child. I took him to Mr. Woon some time before March last to ask what course should be pursued. Mr. Woon said it would be unnecessary to refer to Auckland, the Court here would require a short notice, which was given, but the Native has never been able to get himself made the guardian of the child. Appendix, No. 41.

The statements in my last memorandum about a promise made to Henare Potae and Ropata Wahawaha is correct. I refer to the *Poverty Bay Standard*, 2nd September, 1876. The meeting of the Court there reported was on the 30th August, 1876. That report shows how the promise to these Natives was broken. I also consider it broken by the advertisement in the *Poverty Bay Herald*, 22nd September. The words "for which no title can be proved," applied to the blocks Tauwhareparae and Huiarua, as well as others, are a proof that causes not yet heard were prejudged. The great majority of cases mentioned in that advertisement were not yet adjudicated upon. I do not think more than eleven had been decided out of all the number. [The advertisement is admitted as Judge Rogan's.] The advertisement comprises probably a quarter of a million acres that have not passed the Court, over 100,000 acres of which have never been surveyed, and only a limited portion gazetted for hearing. They are owned by many tribes and many *hapus*, and affected by many variations of Native tenure. Some of the Natives were in the Bay of Plenty. This letter of Judge Rogan's, which he inserted in the newspaper, contains attacks upon me. I complain that he sent it to the newspaper instead of to the Native Minister, not that I think the latter would have been right. Appendix, No. 42. Appendix, No. 75.

This concluded Mr. Wilson's evidence in chief, and Mr. W. W. Wilson not being then prepared to begin a cross-examination, the inquiry was adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, the 8th.

WEDNESDAY, 8TH NOVEMBER, 1876.

The Commission resumed at 10 a.m.

[Mr. W. W. Wilson, on behalf of Mr. Rogan, cross-examined Mr. Wilson.]

The £50 mentioned by me as paid on 7th October, 1874, was paid to Petatoto. Tauwhareparae includes 7,000 or 8,000 acres of Waingaromia No. 2. I have paid £1,622 on 74,000 acres, Tauwhareparae. I have advanced £30 for Parahika in two payments. The land belonged to one man—Perenaha te Waharoa. The land has not gone through the Court. I ascertained the ownership by inquiry. A portion of it is included in Waingaromia No. 2. It has not been surveyed, Mr. Baker having marked it off on the map, by consent of the Natives, to save expense. It was considered 1,000 acres, but has turned out to be more. It is part of what is shown as Waingaromia No. 2, and, as such, has been before the Court. It has been gazetted for hearing at Wai-o-Matatini, on 10th March last, as a separate block. The