had sent to them the minute-book as a true record; but the Judge's note-book, that you consider a "truer" record, was never shown to them?—The minute-books were always received with the other documents from the Court.

582. But the Judge's notes were not sent?—They were deemed to be his own private property, I think.

583. The administrators who were in Auckland—we have heard that the head office was in Auckland—did not get the Judge's notes; they only got the minute-books as to what had taken place in the Court?—Yes.

584. You have mentioned several cases in which the Act of 1873 has not been complied with?—Yes.

585. To whom did you look as the head of your office?—The Chief Judge.

586. Did he know that this Act had not been complied with?—Yes, I think so.

587. To your knowledge was it ever reported to the Government that the Act was not being complied with?—Yes, I think so.

588. You know that of your own knowledge?—I have it quite distinctly on my own memory that the Chief Judge had several conversations with the then Native Minister as to the working of the Act, and they had come to some understanding on the subject.

589. You were not present?—No; I only know it from hearsay.

590. Now we come to the question of voluntary arrangement. Were you ever in Court when a voluntary arrangement was made?—I was.

591. Were the people who made it present in Court?—Yes.

592. Do you know of any case in which a voluntary arrangement was made without some of the persons interested being in Court?—I think so.

593. How would it be a voluntary arrangement if the Judge had not the Natives before him?—The parties would make a statement that it was a voluntary arrangement, and would produce authority on behalf of those who were absent, and their names would have to be entered or omitted according to the statement.

594. But, if no authority was produced, what then?—I do not think the Court would recognize the omission of names on that ground. I do not remember a single case where the Court would recognize the omission of any without a distinct authority in writing.

595. Suppose the voluntary arrangement was to be that the land was to be inalienable, would the Judge be justified in ignoring that, and omitting others from the grant or certificate? I want to know if you know any instance of this kind: Suppose Natives come into Court and say, "We have made a voluntary arrangement with Natives not here. We produce no authority from them; but they know all right that this block of land is to be rendered inalienable." Would the Judge be justified—or do you know any case in which he has acted so—that he gave it to these people, and did not make it a reserve?—No, I cannot recall any single instance.

596. Was it the practice of the Court to make blocks inalienable after 1873?—Under the Act of 1873 there was a clause which made all lands under the memorial of ownership inalienable except with the consent of the owners entered upon the memorial.

597. Was no land declared inalienable after 1873 at all?—Yes; but I think it was only after the Court was specially empowered to make the land inalienable.

598. By what Act do you mean?—I think by a later Act that is the case.

599. Then, suppose the Natives came and said a certain piece of land was to be reserved, did the Court make it a reserve?—I think so. That was after the Act of 1873.

600. I am asking, after the Act of 1873. Suppose the Natives came to the Court and said, "We have made arrangements that this shall be voluntarily reserved," would the Court join with the arrangement?—After special power was given to the Court; but I do not think much attention was given to the inalienability until then.

601. I am leaving that alone; I am going to reserves?—I do not think so.

602. Do you know any case where reserves were made to the Natives except upon their own recommendation?—I do not. After 1873 I do not remember a case.

603. Then do I understand you that you do not remember a case of a reserve being made under the Act of 1873? You do not remember a case of land being inalienable after 1873?—Yes, I am certain there were several cases in which land was made inalienable.

604. Then, would the Judge, if the evidence of the Natives was in favour of making the land inalienable, ignore them? Was it the practice?—It was not the practice.

605. Now, in cases where it was found out that the minute did not agree with the Judge's notes, was that matter brought before the Chief Judge?—I have not known it.

606. Who ordered the alteration in the minute-book to be made that you referred to?—I think the Clerk himself brought the attention of the Judge to it—the presiding Judge—who had it altered accordingly.

607. Was any Clerk in the habit of altering the minute-book without the sanction of the Chief Judge or Judge?—I am not aware of it.

608. That was not the practice?—I should not think so. I did not know of it.

609. Now, did you ever know minutes entered of sittings of Court that never sat, in all your twenty-one years' experience?—Of course not.

610. Do you know any single case in which a Clerk entered in a minute-book minutes stating that the Court sat at a certain place on a certain day, when the Court never sat?—No.

611. That was not the practice?—No.

612. Did the Chief Judge look over the minute-books—was that a part of his duty—or the Chief Clerk?—I do not think the Chief Clerk did. I am sure that he did not.

613. Did the Chief Judge?—I know that the Chief Judge perused my minutes more than once, but I do not know that he did those of any one else.