

177. Supposing the investigation of a case lasted for ten days, and one side was represented by counsel, and the other by Native agents: after the expiration of the case, from which would the Maori suffer most, in the way of fees, and that sort of thing?—I can hardly answer that question; each matter would depend upon the bargain made. I have no knowledge of the subject, but I fancy Native agents do not charge so much as lawyers.

178. Did you ever hear of a block of land that was investigated on the West Coast, called Rangatira?—Only to this extent, that I refused an application for a rehearing of it.

179. Previous to the application coming to you for a rehearing, did you not hear that such a block was investigated by the Court, and that lawyers acted in the case?—I never heard of the block at all in any way. I have no knowledge of it, nor anything in relation to it. The investigation took place before I was Chief Judge.

180. Since your appointment to the office of Chief Judge of the Native Land Court, have you never yet availed yourself of an opportunity of looking through the Land Court papers referring to past investigations?—No; certainly not. That would be the work of a life-time. When a matter arrives at a termination, then the papers are marked "file," and are put away until something in relation to it arises again.

181. You stated that you were present at three different sittings of the Court. Was it only during those three sittings that you received proof that lawyers in Court conducted the cases better than the Natives themselves?—In each case I should say so. In addition to that, I have my experience from the bar. I ought to qualify my remarks as to the Cambridge Court by saying that their usefulness there was very much lessened by circumstances to which I have already referred.

182. How is it that the Waotu case took such a long time?—Entirely owing to the mass of evidence brought to support the respective cases. I forget the time it did take, but that would be the reason.

183. I think you stated to the Committee that the principal evidence that was adduced at the Court at Cambridge was as to the occupation of the land from the year 1863, the time of the Waikato war?—I think you misunderstood me. It was called to my attention that Piripi alleged, in his evidence, very stoutly that he had been in occupation of the land; and one of the Committee, Mr. Hobbs, I think, seemed to have it on his mind that, if the land had been in occupation, Piripi must have a title; and then it was I explained that possibly he might have been in occupation since the time they were driven back by the European troops, because it was quite common for the Natives so driven back to squat on other people's land. But I have found out since, having seen Judge Puckey, and had access to the books and papers, that the fact of occupation, as alleged by him, never existed at all except to this limited extent: that he did in 1881 have a slight occupation just inside the boundary. That is how the evidence stands.

184. Was there no evidence taken before you to show the dispersion of Ngatiraukawa by Ngatimaru, some of the fugitives going to Rotorua, Kapiti, and other places?—That was generally dealt with. It has been held, I believe, throughout all the decisions, that those Natives who fled to Kapiti, or anywhere else, forfeited the title they undoubtedly had up to that time, and those Natives who stopped behind maintained their title by reason of continued occupation. That is the theory, I believe, on which numerous judgments have gone.

185. Did you never hear it said that the only hapu who continued to occupy this land (Waotu) from the time before the Treaty of Waitangi was Ngatingarongo?—I really cannot answer the question.

186. Do you know that those of Ngatiraukawa who came to Kapiti went back again in 1862, long after the Treaty of Waitangi?—Yes; I remember it being in evidence that they began to straggle back. I do not know that any of the people belonged to this particular case or not.

187. I might assist you by mentioning the name of one of the chiefs who went back. Te Rei went back about the time the Waikato war broke out, and settled upon Ngawehenga?—I do not remember the circumstance.

188. Do you know whether your judgment in the Waotu case is in favour of any of those who went to Kapiti?—I could not say.

189. You did not hear before the Court that some of the owners put into the block were Kapiti men?—I have no recollection of it; but it might be that some were admitted by favour by the other people.

190. *Hon. Mr. Bryce.*] I suppose the records of the Court will show the names?—The records of the Courts will show every word that was said.

181. *Harawera* (one of the petitioners).] Did you say in your evidence that those Natives who did not apply for lawyers were those who knew a great deal?—I do not remember saying that; but I think I said the negative of it. Sometimes I have told Natives who were trying to conduct their own cases, and who were perfectly incapable of doing it, that they ought to get some one to assist them.

192. Are you aware of any application to you from Patuaia and Ngatingarongo applying for a rehearing?—It turns out that both you and I were wrong in our statements. You said there had been an application which had been refused, and afterwards you said there was no application or refusal. I said there had been no application that I knew of. I am informed by Judge Puckey that at some period in Court the counsel or agent did bring an application to him (Judge Puckey), professing to be signed by Piripi; but he pointed out that Piripi happened to be a long way off at the time, and therefore the application was no good. All that took place in Maori, and I had no knowledge of it until Judge Puckey told me. Judge Puckey has just mentioned to me that afterwards an application was sent in,