previously claimed the land are in Court, and they say, in effect, "This rehearing must have been made on our behalf as much as on that of others who lately made it, because we are claimants too; and we desire you (the Court) to go on with the hearing of the application which has been formally withdrawn by A, B, C. Would you accede to the request, and go on with the rehearing?—I should, most certainly.

1187. *Mr. Stewart.*] But in the case put by the Hon. Mr. Bryce you will observe that the applicants for the rehearing are not in Court?—Yes; they are not in Court.

1188. Would you proceed in their absence to hear the case?—I think I should be disposed to send for those people in the first instance, before I proceeded with it.

1189. Yes. But you say that, assuming all parties to be present, you would pronounce a decision as in an original hearing?—Yes.

1190. That is to say, you would allow any parties who were not parties to the application or original hearing to come in?—Yes. It has been frequently done on the East Coast.

1191. Now, with regard to these minutes of yours, or notes, or the clerk's: did you say they were complete minutes, or merely notes—jottings?—No, they are not complete minutes; because I made a statement the other day in which I perfectly cleared that up.

1192. These two persons who came forward when you challenged objectors—you say they made a statement to you in the Court?—You mean Hapuku and Meihana.

1193. The two who stepped forward?—Yes. That is, Hapuku and Meihana—who came forward and, to the best of my recollection, said in effect that "there is no one here to object to the claims set forth by Renata Kawepo."

1194. Do you say you attached importance to the statements made by these two men?—It was most important to me. If I had left them out in the minutes, I should have considered it would have been serious to me, because I should not have completed the ordinary business of the Court, by not giving every one an opportunity to come forward in the Court to claim or substantiate their claim to the land. May I be allowed to say, with regard to one of the clerks that I referred to the other day—Mr. Woon—I wish not to associate him with the mistake that was made by the junior clerk. Although in attempting to explain what was done he did not absolutely do according to my satisfaction, yet it enabled me to trace the mistake that was made; and he certainly was very careful in not drawing out the order according to the minute made by the other clerk, and he drew out the memorials of ownership properly. Perhaps I blamed him unintentionally the other day in the evidence in the case.

1195. *The Chairman.*] There is only one question I wish to ask: With regard to the statements made in Court by the chief of the hapu, were you in the habit of taking a chief as speaking for the people, although they were not present?—Yes.

1196. In the same way with a written communication, was it usual or not for the chief to sign his own name and the names of his people?—It was.

1197. You expected that, as if it had been their own signatures?—Almost invariably. It may not be the practice now; but eleven years ago the state of society of the Natives was somewhat different to what it is now. There were chiefs in those days, but there are very few of them left.

1198. *Mr. Stewart.*] You treated the chief as the general agent of the tribe?—Yes.

1199. *The Chairman.*] These old chiefs—such men as Hapuku and Meihana—they had very despotic authority over their tribes?—Yes. I might say, in reply to that, that suppose Renata—who was an important chief at that time—that it is probable, if he had come forward and said, "I wish that my name alone should be in this grant"—the probability is that, with the consent of those people, I should have put in his name alone, because of his chieftainship.

Statement of Airini Tonore.

Airini Tonore states: I remember when the Native Land Court sat to investigate Owhaoko. The school reserve was investigated, but the remainder of the reserve was to be investigated at a future date. It was arranged that a certificate of title should issue in favour of Renata Kawepo, Ihakara te Raro, Karaitiana te Rango, Noa Huke, and Mr. Locke. I knew nothing of Hira te Oki being included. He was then a member of the School Committee at Omahu. Before the blocks were set down for hearing, Renata Kawepo had suggested to my mother and aunt that his name and Noa Huke's should be put into the grant, as Ane Kanara and my mother, Haromi Te Ata, would be easily persuaded to sell their shares; and he objected to Arapera going into the land. He said that they, being women, would be easily persuaded by Europeans to sell; that he would manage the land affairs, and, when money was paid, he would divide it between us. Renata at that time was strongly opposed to the sale of Native lands, and had taken an active part in endeavouring to put an end to sales. It was Renata's request that we should not urge our claims at the investigation. He admitted our claims. When the land was leased, Renata recognized our claim by paying us money—viz., £200 to Ane Kanara, £200 to Teira Tiakitai, £200 to Haromi, and £200 to myself. These sums were out of the first year's rent. Subsequently I married, contrary to the wishes of Renata Kawepo. He quarrelled with myself, my mother, and others who adhered to me, and he refused to give us any share of the money, nor did he appear to recognize our claim to the block. In consequence of this I took steps, in conjunction with my husband, to have the rents paid to the Public Trustee, as I was in hopes of having a rehearing of the case, and took these steps to protect the interests of myself and my relatives; or, in the event of that failing, I might bring pressure on Renata to give up a portion of the money. Subsequently Renata and I arranged matters peaceably. He