

No. 307 of 1881.—Petition of WAATA PIKA and 19 Others.

PETITIONERS state that the Land Court wrongfully divided Whakatabataha, and declined to place names in the certificate of title that ought to have been included. They say that the case was before the Court both in 1878 and in 1879. They ask for another hearing, that certain names may be included with their own.

I am directed to report as follows:—

That there was an informal application for a rehearing, but it was not so understood at the office in Auckland, and thus the time for granting a rehearing had lapsed. The Committee would recommend the case to the consideration of the Government.

12th September, 1881.

[TRANSLATION.]

No. 307 of 1881.—Pukapuka-inoi a WAATA PIKA me etahi atu 19.

E KI ana nga kai-pitihana i he te wehenga a te Kooti Whenua Maori i Whakatabataha, a, kaore hoki i whakaae ki etahi ingoa tika kia uru ki roto ki te Tiwhikete Whaitaketanga. E ki ana ratou i te aroaro o te Kooti taua whenua i te tau 1878 me te tau 1879. E tono ana ratou kia whakawakia tuaruatia taua whenua kia ahei te whakauru etahi atu ano ingoa ki roto.

Kua whakahaua ahau kia ki penei:—

I te tononga kia whakawakia tuaruatia taua whenua kaore i tika te tono; engari kaore te Tari i Akarana i mohio he tono whakawa tuarua taua tono, na reira kua pahure i naiane te takiwa tika hei tono nga whakawa tuarua. E mea ana te Komiti ma te Kawanatanga e whiriwhiri te tikanga o taua whenua.

12 Hepetema, 1881.

No. 60 of 1881.—Petition of HORI ROPHA and 5 Others.

PETITIONERS claim Rakaiatai and Te Ohu as theirs, and complain that timber is being taken therefrom. They ask that the land and timber may be given back to them.

I am directed to report as follows:—

That the land referred to belonged to ten grantees, the interests of six of whom have been purchased by Government. The Government having stopped the plunder of timber that had been going on, and placed a policeman at Rakaiatai to prevent a recurrence of the trespass, the Committee has no recommendation to make.

13th September, 1881.

[TRANSLATION.]

No. 60 of 1881.—Pukapuka-inoi a HORI ROPHA me etahi atu e 25.

E KI ana nga kai-pitihana na ratou a Rakaiatai me Te Ohu, e ki ana hoki kei te tangohia nga rakau o taua wahi.

Kua whakahaua ahau kia ki penei:—

Kotahi te kau nga tangata i uru ki te karaati mo taua whenua, a kua hokona e te Kawanatanga nga paanga o etahi o aua tangata toko-ono. Kua whakamutua e te Kawanatanga taua mahi tahae i nga rakau, a kua whakaturia hoki he pirihihana ki Rakaiatai hei arai i te haere pokanoa ki reira, kua kore he kupu ma te Komiti.

13 Hepetema, 1881.

No. 304 of 1881.—Petition of H. K. TAIAROA (No. 2). (Report No. 2.)

ON this petition I am directed to report as follows:—

That the application made in the report upon the petition of Mr. Taiaroa, laid before the House on the 23rd August, for the report and evidence of the Middle Island Commission, be renewed, and that this resolution be reported by the Chairman to the House this day

17th September, 1881.

[TRANSLATION.]

No. 304 of 1881.—Pukapuka-inoi a H. K. TAIAROA (Nama 2).

KUA whakahaua ahau kia ki penei mo runga i tenei pitihana:—

Me tuku hou atu ano te tono mo runga i te pitihana a Taiaroa i tukua ki te Whare i te 23 o Akuhata kia tukua te Ripoata me nga korero a nga kai-whaaki ki te Komihana mo te Waipounamu; a ma te Tiamana hoki e whakaatu tenei whakataunga ki te Whare i tenei ra.

17 Hepetema, 1881.

No. 61 of 1881.—Petition of PAORA KAIWHATA and 6 Others.

PETITIONERS say that they had been living on the land at Ngatahira for several years; that Mr. Bryce and Mr. Rolleston had visited them with a view to settle disputes about ownership; that certain arrangements for exchange of land had been made, but not carried out; that they have not heard from Government; and therefore pray that the land may be returned to them.

I am directed to report as follows:—

That inquiry should be made to ascertain whether or not it was by the default or neglect of the Native Land Court the evident intention of the Native owners to preserve their tribal settlement was not given effect to, the consequence being that a large number of Natives have been evicted from a piece of land which they imagined had been secured to them by authority of law. That, in the opinion of this Committee, the Native vendors and the European purchaser considered they were dealing only for the land leased to Mr. Braithwaite, which contract would have excluded the land