614. I presume the dates of sittings of Court were known in the Chief Judge's office at Auckland?—The notices were issued from Auckland.

615. And the Chief Judge, or whoever was attending to the executive business, would know of the days and places of Courts sitting?—Yes.

616. Then, if there was in the minute-book a statement with regard to the sitting of a Court that was not legal, that would be known to him at once?—If he saw the minute-book, yes.

617. Suppose a rehearing was asked for, and the Chief Judge was asked to advise upon it, would he necessarily go to the minute-book to find out what took place?—His practice was to go to the presiding Judge at the first hearing of the case.

618. Suppose the presiding Judge knew nothing about it?—I could not imagine such a case.

619. Was it easy for the presiding Judge to obtain evidence as to whether notices had been served or not upon Natives before he heard the case?—No, it was not. The presumption was that the notices had had the widest possible circulation without his interference or inquiry.

620. Then he never inquired as to whether notices had been served or not, nor did he inquire whether the notices had been gazetted or not?—He had the *Gazette* before him.

621. How long beforehand was it the practice to give notice before the sitting of the Court?—One month before the sitting of the Court. I have known notices of Courts sitting to have very much longer circulation than that, but that was the practice—one month.

622. Should I be right in assuming that one month was the least notice you know of having been given? Do you know of any less notice than one month being given?—I think it is possible that less than one month's notice has been given, but it was not by any means the practice.

623. Then they were sure to have a month's notice?—That was deemed the ordinary practice of the Court, and it was always endeavoured to be kept up.

624. Have you known rehearings being applied for on the ground that the Natives have not had notice?—Yes, I have known cases where that statement has been made a ground for rehearing.

625. Was a rehearing granted if that were proved to be true?—I cannot recall any case. I know it was never recognized as a very strong feature in their case.

626. Then, whether people had notice of the Court or not, that was not considered of importance?—Well, better grounds than that were always looked for.

627. Then, suppose people were living on the land, and it were proved that these people living on the land had not notice of the Court sitting, that would not be sufficient ground for the rehearing?—If they could bring proof I should think it would be sufficient for them.

628. I want to know the practice. Was that considered a sufficient ground?—I would not like to take upon myself to give an opinion.

629. I only ask the practice?—The practice was to look for stronger grounds than inefficient notice or no notice. The notices were distributed so very well through the country by means of the Resident Magistrates and local officers in the neighbourhood or locality of the land, that it was deemed to be impossible for any one to be in the district without getting notice.

630. We have learnt that one notice was gazetted on the 7th September, and the hearing was held on the 16th. Was that usual—to give such a short time as that?—That was a very unusual case.

631. Who were the officers that used to serve the notices—the Native District Officers?—Yes. Resident Magistrates were supplied with bundles of the *Panui*, and requested to circulate them.

632. Mr. Locke was the Native Magistrate at Hawke's Bay?—Or he was the district officer.

633. Then he would be the person to give the notices?—He would be one of them.

634. Now, do you know any case in which the minutes were entered up of the proceedings of the Court more than a day or two after the sitting of the Court?—No, I do not.

635. That was not the practice?—No; to my knowledge it was not.

636. You say corrections were made when it was compared with the notes of the Judge?—Yes.

637. Not afterwards?—No.

638. They might be made on comparison with the Judge's notes?—Yes.

639. *Mr. Stewart.*] Who in the Court was supposed to take minutes or a note of what was going on? Was it the Judge or the Clerk? Under the Act a record was required to be kept of the proceedings? Whose duty was it to keep that record? Was it the Judge or any other official, or the Clerk?—The Clerk, by ordinary practice, kept his minute-book, and the Judge kept his notes.

640. Was taking notes by the Clerk necessary? I mean under the Act. Would it have been sufficient for the Judge to take notes by himself, or for the Clerk to take minutes without the Judge's notes?—Well, the Clerk's notes were accessible to the office, but the Judge's were not.

641. You say the practice was for both parties to take them. Whose duty was it, under the Act, to take a record of what was going on?—That was the minute-book, kept by the Clerk.

642. Now, you were in the head office of the department?—Yes; I was in Auckland.

643. Communications relating to a block of land—what you would call the executive side of the record—would communications on that block of land be put together?—Yes: all the papers relating to a block of land were recorded in the register and filed one upon another.

644. That is irrespective of the question as to whether these documents related to what took place in Court, or were replies to communications sent out from the head office?—Yes.

645. Supposing a person applied to search, under the Native Land Act, papers relating to a certain block of land, would he have access to all those documents?—No: the rule was that he should simply have access to such documents as related to the claim.

646. Suppose I went to the office and said, "I want to search the record of papers in connection with this block," would you place the whole of the papers before me to examine?—My practice