

987. Would it not have been proper, before you declined to give him the information, to ask in whose interest he was asking the question?—No doubt he was not.

988. No; but there is nothing here to show that. He appears to have asked by wire; but there is no record of the Court showing that?—11th October, 1880; it is in the papers.

989. I refer to it there, although it is not so. It is not filed because there is no importance attached to it. However, the usual rule applied to him, I suppose. Would it not have been better, before declining to give him the information, to ask in whose authority he asked the question?—Yes.

990. It was not done?—It ought to have been done.

991. Will you say that this telegram of Buller's, of the 26th July, 1880, the latter part of it, is untrue?—Yes.

992. You have said, I think, that the Court was adjourned some time in July, 1880, because you were unable to overtake the work, being here, in Wellington, at the sitting of the session?—Not to overtake the work; I could not get away.

993. That means to get to the work, I suppose?—Yes. I may mention that, while you are on that subject, I do not think I clearly stated before that the letter which the Attorney-General comments upon on page 10—Dr. Buller's letter, in which he is asking me to adjourn the Court—the Attorney-General assumes that I did it in consequence of that letter. I may say I never saw it until I came to Auckland. The letter is not in existence, and there is only a *précis* of it. It bears on the face of it evidence that I could not have seen it, because it was sent to Auckland, and I was at Wellington.

994. On page 9 of the memorandum it is stated that "Dr. Buller, who acted for Renata Kawepo, applied to the Chief Judge, Native Land Court, for an adjournment of the sitting, stating that notice of the sitting had been received late." You say then, that, nobody applied to you to adjourn the Court?—Not that I know of.

995. If Dr. Buller says he did, would you contradict him?—I could not say that. All that I know is that I never saw this letter. I have seen the paper here, but it went to Auckland, and I was in Wellington.

996. And you do not know whether it arrived in Auckland?—No.

997. I want you to say that you did not receive it?—I did not if I did not see it.

998. When you got to Auckland?—I do not think I ever saw it at all.

999. Do you mean to say, then, that you did not inform Dr. Buller that you had adjourned the Court?—No; I do not say that. No doubt I did inform him.

1000. Do you say that you had no conversation with him in Wellington about adjourning the Court?—I say I do not recollect any.

1001. You are aware that you must have had some talk with somebody in Wellington about this case. You wired to the Chief Clerk, Mr. Dickey, saying that some people had told you that the rehearing had already taken place: it is so, is it not?—Yes.

1002. So that you must have had conversation with some people in Wellington about the matter?—Some people told me apparently that the case had been reheard.

1003. And you were aware also that on the 21st June you sent to Auckland for an epitome of what had been done in reference to the Owhaoko?—Yes.

1004. Though on the 10th June you had advertised that the Court was postponed?—On the 10th June I issued a notice that the Court was postponed.

1005. Why did you want an epitome of the case in Wellington?—Dr. Buller had asked me for it.

1006. And then you must have had a talk with him about it?—I had one or two with him. I had a room near to Mr. Rolleston's, and I remember him coming in to my room to see me.

1007. Then, my suggestion that you heard from him that the case had been reheard would be correct?—Quite possible.

1008. Nothing happens then; but Mr. Studholme asks you apparently to get him the names of the people that applied for the rehearing, and that was supplied to him?—Yes.

1009. Then, the next thing we have is this: on page 10 of the memorandum we have a notice that the Court was to sit at Napier on the 20th October?—I must have met Mr. Studholme somewhere.

1010. The next thing, at all events, was that a sitting of the Court was to take place on the 20th October?—Yes.

1011. Can you remember why you did not go to Napier to hold a sitting of the Court on the 20th October?—You mean on that day.

1012. To arrive there in time: you did not arrive there till November?—I see. I did not go because there was a Friday, and then came Saturday; and generally nothing is done on the first or second day.

1013. But you see you did not arrive there till November: you were a fortnight late nearly?—That surely is a mistake; I think it was the 29th October.

1014. I will point out this to you, that the notice in Maori is one date, and the notice in English is another date, in the papers: which is right I do not know. [Copy of *Gazette*, showing notice in Maori to be dated the 29th, and the notice in English on the 20th, was here produced.]?—The 29th is the date. Clearly that is a mistake in the English copy.

1015. Was it your impression that the rehearing must have been held within the three years limited by the Order in Council?—Yes.

1016. Do you think, then, considering that that only gave two days in the month for the sitting of the Court—the 29th or the 30th—that that was sufficient time to investigate a block like this?—We used to consider that, if we began it within the period mentioned, it was sufficient. Whether right or wrong, that is a question of law that would have to be considered.