

1898.
NEW ZEALAND.

THE HOROWHENUA BLOCK:

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE IN THE NATIVE APPELLATE COURT UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF "THE HOROWHENUA BLOCK ACT, 1896."

[In continuation of G.-2, Sess. II., 1897.]

Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly by Command of His Excellency.

LEVIN, FRIDAY, 9TH APRIL, 1897.

The Court opened at 10 a.m.

Present: A. Mackay, Esq., Judge (presiding); W. J. Butler, Esq., Judge; Atanatiu te Kairangi, Assessor; A. H. Mackay, Clerk.

The Court announced that the business before it was the application of Ngatiraukawa to set apart certain reserves in Horowhenua No. 11 for the four hapus named in the Horowhenua Block Act.

Mr. Morison appeared for Ngatihikitanga, Ngatipareraukawa, and Ngatiparekohatu.

The Court read out the several applications, and asked Wirihana Hunia and Raraku Hunia to explain the object of their applications Nos. 10 and 13, and suggested that as many as possible of the Ngatiraukawa should amalgamate their cases.

Mr. Morison said the general grounds of claim were the same. There would, he thought, be no difficulty until the question of relative interests were gone into. He hoped *Mr. Ransfield's* application would not be allowed to lapse on account of his absence.

The Court informed him that *Mr. Ransfield's* application would not be allowed to lapse.

Sir W. Buller wished to know when the Court proposed to go on with the accounts.

The Court said it intended to go into the question of accounts as soon as the Ngatiraukawa claims had been disposed of.

Sir W. Buller asked the Court to take the question of accounts with Horowhenua No. 11. *Mr. J. M. Fraser* had to leave for Auckland, and he could not go on without him.

The Court said Horowhenua Nos. 11 and 12 could not come on until after the Easter holidays, as it would be necessary to send notice to all the persons interested. There would be no objection to the question of accounts being taken with No. 11 immediately after Easter.

Mr. J. M. Fraser regretted he was obliged to leave on business, but he would return in time to go on with the accounts when the Court resumed after the vacation.

The Court called on parties to proceed with Ngatiraukawa claims for reserves in No. 11.

Sir W. Buller appeared for Kemp, to oppose Ngatiraukawa claim.

Mr. McDonald appeared for Himiona Kowhai, and, on behalf of *Mr. Stevens*, for Wirihana and Warena Hunia, to oppose the claim.

Mr. J. M. Fraser appeared for Rangimairehau and the others who had signed his retainer. He opposed the claim.

Mr. Knocks did not wish to set up a separate claim for his clients. He would not ask to do so if, when lists of names were put in, their names were included.

Hamuera Karaitiana and *Henare te Apatari* agreed to place their cases under *Mr. McDonald*, as they all had the same object—i.e., to keep out the Ngatiraukawa.

Mr. McDonald asked the Court to decide the order of cross-examination.

The Court said it would suit the convenience of parties if *Sir Walter Buller* cross-examined first, *Mr. J. M. Fraser* next, and then *Mr. McDonald*. *Mr. Morison*, being the assailant, would commence.

Henare te Apatari asked the Court to give counsel and conductors a short time to consult together, with a view to the amalgamation of cases.

The Court would like Wirihana and Raraku to explain their applications before *Mr. Morison* commenced his case.

Mr. McDonald stated that Wirihana did not draw the application, and explained that it did not refer to the reserves applied for by Ngatiraukawa, but to certain inalienable reserves he intended to ask the Court to make in No. 11. Te Raraku's application had the same object.