The Court said Mr. Baldwin had better bring the matter up again after McDonald's evidence was taken.

Witness (to Mr. Beddard): I gave you an explanation yesterday as to the words in the minute-book, "The agreement," &c. My explanation was not an afterthought. I don't remember having said previously that I did not know what I meant by those words. I may have. If it is in the notes of the Court that I did, then I did. Tracing No. 3 made by Palmerson was for use of Court. The subdivisions would be transferred to it from No. 2 tracing if there was no objection, and similarly from No. 1 to No. 2. I cannot say from memory that every division went through that process. All those where there had been any difficulty did. It is most unaccountable to me why the tracing was not filed with the Court papers. I could not say when first I heard of the dispute as to who were the descendants of Whatanui. My first recollection of it is when I attended the Native Land Court at Otaki and found a case going on about No. 9. Mr. Morison called me as a witness. I think it was in 1895, and was to ascertain who were the owners of No. 9. My view is that No. 9 and No. 14 were made alternative sections at my own suggestion. It would in my view become Kemp's duty to restore the remaining section to Muaupoko after it had been decided which section the descendants of Whatanui were to have—that is to say, to those members of the tribe that were entitled to it. This was his moral duty after the descendants of Whatanui had finally chosen. I have said that I gave evidence before the Appellate Court at Otaki in 1895. [Horowhenua Commission, page 80, answer 437, read out.] I have no doubt that I said that to Sir Walter Buller. It was true I did not know that the Ngatiraukawa might not still object to it. [Question 440 and answer read.] The minute is there, and I will not attempt to correct it. It is in a measure correct. I don't know now that the Ngatiraukawa have selected No. 9, or that the matter is finally settled. It was impossible for me to urge anything on Kemp after 1890; we had quarrelled. [Horowhenua Commission, page 80, questions 440 to 443, and answers, read out.] If the descendants of Whatanui made the application to the Court for definition of their interests in No. 9 it would be sufficient evidence to me that they had selected it. Both sides were represented by counsel, and were each claiming the whole or a large portion of the Block No. 9. This would not be inconsistent with what I say—that they may not have selected it. All I know is that they were disputing as to the relative interests in No. 9. I also know that they were only to have one subdivision. I repeat that my answer to Horowhenua Commission, question 437, is correctly reported. [Horowhenua Commission, page 80, questions 452 to 456, read out.] My general answer is that up to 1896 I did not know that the descendants of Whatanui had selected No. 9. My answers to questions 440, 441, 442 are true in the sense that I meant. People not knowing the circumstances might conclude from my replies that I did not know what had taken place before the Appellate Court at Otaki in 1895. As I intended them, they are absolutely true; but on looking at them now I will say that they are not well expressed. My best answer would have been that my relations with Kemp precluded my making any suggestion at all to him. I entirely deny having intentionally given any untrue colour to anything. I knew in 1895 that No. 9 was the case before the Court at Otaki. I was told so after I went into Court. If I had said, in reply to 440, that I was called as a witness in the case at Otaki it would not have conflicted with my answer to 437, although people not knowing much of Maori matters might think it did. I did not know what Sir Walter Buller's purpose was in putting to me the questions you have read. So far as I know, up to the present time the Ngatiraukawa have not deliberately selected No. 9. [Minute of Appellate Court at Otaki, 1895, page 47, McDonald's evidence, read: "Muaupoko at once agreed," &c.] I admit that those are my words. If I said Papaitonga it would not be quite correct, because the section did not extend to Papaitonga in 1886. I would consider, if both parties to the agreement agreed to any particular section, that the matter was settled. Nothing further, in my opinion, would be necessary for the selection of No. 9. I said before Royal Commssion that in 1886 the Ngatiraukawa strongly objected to both sections. I am wrong. It was in my letter to the *Farmer* that I said the Ngatiraukawa then present in Palmerston North obstinately refused to make selection. [Appellate Court minutes, 1895, page 47, "Lewis afterwards endeavoured to persuade Nicholson," &c.] I gave that evidence. The locality of the land was altered on account of the objection of the Ngatiraukawa present to the section proposed for them at Ohau. I will not say that I meant that the locality of the 1,200 acres which the Ngatiraukawa had been promised was altered in accordance with their wishes to Raumatangi. I intended the Court to understand that in consequence of certain objections being made by the Ngatiraukawa present in Palmerston it was deemed expedient to allot a different section for the purpose of fulfilling, by the cession of one of them, the agreement of 1874. It was not done in consequence of the wishes of the Ngatiraukawa. I admit that some of the Ngatiraukawa wanted the land at Raumatangi. They were not unanimous. Some wanted it in one place, some in another. By using the word "they" in my evidence before the Appellate Court at Otaki I did not necessarily mean all of the Ngatiraukawa present. The only Ngatiraukawa I distinctly remember at Palmerston was Nicholson. I know nothing about any negotiations between Hare Pomare, Heni Kipa, and Kemp. They were all present at Palmerston. I was acting under the instructions of the Maoris at Palmerston, but most of the instructions were given at my suggestion. I was there to assist the Natives to carry out their wishes, but I had other business of my own. I say that an order was made on the 3rd December, 1886, confirming an order made on the 25th November for 1,200 acres at Ohau. I presume the words used by Judge Wilson in making the order on the 3rd December are correctly given in the minute-book. The application for confirmation was made by myself, and, I believe, on my responsibility, so far as I know, without reference to Kemp. The idea that the order should be a confirmatory one came from me, I believe, and I understood Judge Wilson made it as a confirmatory order. He made no objection whatever, so far as I can remember. This does not appear to me to be a "cock and bull" story. It is true. If Judge Wilson has said that, after consultation with the Chief Judge, he decided not to make confirmatory