making orders, not for approvers, so we stopped those present calling "Aye." We judged by the "Ayes" that there was unanimous approval. There were several objectors during the course of the proceedings. I judged by the demeanour of those present that they took a keen interest in what was going on. There was nothing unusual in Kemp appearing in a fiduciary capacity. It was the proper course. No one else could Act. [Buckle's explanation read.] Buckle had no right to alter my orders. If the Registrar thought there was anything wrong he should have referred them to me. As I said before, Buckle looked upon the proceedings of the second Court as confirmatory, whereas they were *de novo*. It was in consequence of the dispute about the boundaries of No. 9 in the morning that I made out such a careful description of them in the afternoon. The alteration was made by Kemp. They wanted to come right up to the Hokio Stream, but Kemp would not consent to it. He said that there must be two chains between their boundary and the stream, because he wanted the fish in the stream. Kemp proposed the first boundaries of No. 9. He also agreed to the alterations. I think the land for descendants of Whatanui was brought back into our Court on the 1st December, 1886. The first boundaries for No. 9 were not wrong, but they were not acceptable to Whatanui people, and Kemp proposed that they should be altered. I do not think Lewis had anything to do with the alteration of boundaries.

*Mr. Baldwin* would like to ask Judge Wilson two questions.

*Witness* (to Mr. Baldwin): My impression is that Lewis did not take out of Court any defined piece of land; it was merely the claim. It was either taken out of Court during the first Court or during the interregnum. [Horowhenua Commission, page 131, questions 35 and 36, read.] That all points to Lewis having acted in both Courts, and to the land having been defined in the records of the Court, but not necessarily on the plan. If it was defined it was No. 3, now No. 9, not No. 14. The boundaries were certainly not defined before the 1st December, 1886. Lewis did not remove the claim on the 1st December, 1886; it came back to us there.

To *Mr. Stafford:* It is quite possible that an order may have been verbally made for 1,200 acres on the 25th November, 1886, but it was not finally made, and Lewis then removed it from the Court. He could not have done so if the order had been valid. He could only have done so subject to the order, which would have been an absurdity. As a matter of fact, no such order had ever been made. The order made on the 25th November, 1886, did not relate to No. 14. It must have related to No. 9, but I will not swear to it. It was the only land that came before us for the descendants of Whatanui. I will not swear that the order did apply to No. 9.

To *Mr. Beddard:* I am strongly of opinion that the boundaries taken down on the 1st December, 1886, were the boundaries of No. 9.

To *Court:* I cannot remember the process followed in cancelling the original certificate of Horowhenua Block to Kemp. I do not remember whether I made an order cancelling the certificate. I do not think it was a necessary precedent proceeding to the partition being made. I was proceeding under the Acts of 1880 and 1882. I see that I have signed the note "cancelled" on the certificate. I signed it after the Court had adjourned. I signed it at Waitara—I think, on the 14th December, 1886. W.D. 508 was the plan before our Court. Our subdivisions were shown on the plan by an authorised surveyor. This plan became an integral part of our order. When the divisions were laid out on the ground some of them had to be extended west of the railway. I ultimately approved the extension of No. 14 west of the railway. The plan of Horowhenua was not exhibited under sections 26 to 32 of the Act of 1880. I do not think it was necessary that the plan should be exhibited. The alteration, although large, was a necessary alteration. The persons directly interested signified their assent to the alteration—I mean the owners of No. 11. I did not value their consent much. I looked upon the alteration as a necessary part of our administration. I apprehend that sections 26 to 32 are meant for interlocutory orders—where rough surveys are made and require alteration. If the plan had been exhibited I do not see who could have objected. At any rate, I did not take any action under the sections referred to.

*Judge Wilson* asked if he was relieved from attendance.

After asking counsel, the Court informed Judge Wilson that he was relieved from attendance.

*The Court* notified that after hearing Judge Wilson's replies it proposed to go on with the case to its completion, as there would probably be other questions to refer to the Supreme Court.

*Sir W. Buller* stated that he would be prepared to call his next witness to-morrow.

*Mr. Morison* appeared, and asked the Court to take the Ngatiraukawa claims next.

*Sir W. Buller* supported Mr. Morison's application.

*The Court* saw no objection, and intimated that Mr. Morison would be informed of the date not later than one day before the Ngatiraukawa claims were taken.

The Court adjourned till the 4th instant.

---

THURSDAY, 4TH MARCH, 1897.

The Court opened at 10 a.m.

Present: The same.

No. 1, Horowhenua No. 14, resumed.

*Sir W. Buller:* I will first call Te Rangimairehau.

TE RANGIMAIREHAU sworn and examined.

*Witness:* I belong to Muaupoko Tribe. I am one of the registered owners of Horowhenua Block. Major Kemp was the only certificated owner. There were 143 registered owners. I live at the pa, Horowhenua. I was born there. After I was grown up I went to Arapaoa for a time, and returned to Horowhenua. At the time of the Court of 1886 I was living at Horowhenua. I remember the Partition Court at Palmerston in 1886. I attended the Court, myself and the whole tribe. Some of the tribe were at Parihaka. With the exception of those at Parihaka, all the tribe