

some of them—namely, Rawiri Kahia, Mere Hapi, Hami Pahiroa, Erue te Moho, and others—had complained that they had not had an opportunity of making their claim. They therefore applied to have the title to Ngaruroro investigated. This was gazetted as follows:—

NATIVE LAND COURT, OCTOBER, 1880.

Notice of Times and Places for investigating Claims.

NOTICE is hereby given that the claims, on behalf of themselves and others, of the several persons whose names are mentioned in the first column of the Schedule hereunder written, to the several blocks of land of which the names and localities are mentioned in the second column, the boundaries of which were published in former notices, will be investigated at Napier on the 25th day of October next, and following days.

The maps of such of these lands as have been surveyed can be seen at the Courthouse of the Resident Magistrate, Napier.

A. J. DICKEY, Registrar.

Native Land Court Office, Auckland, 10th September, 1881.

Names of Claimants.	Name and Locality of Block.
Rawiri Kahia, Mere Hapi, Hami Pahiroa, Erue te Moho, Hoeta te Hata, Pekamu Patana, Ririmu te Rakato, Tahau, Paurini Karamu, Hariata Taihoa, Katarina Ngaweherua, Werewere, Te Rehutai, and others	} Ngaruroro, near Taupo.

The Native Land Court officers did not then apparently know that Ngaruroro and Owhaoko were the same.

Owhaoko next appears in the papers in the form of an application from certain persons to subdivide. The letter is signed by Karaitiana te Rango and others. The letter was minuted,—

WRITE to Dr. Buller asking what has been done about the encumbrances on this estate—*i.e.*, the survey charges. I am anxious to get the affair discharged from our books.—F. D. FENTON, 16/2/82.

I must now refer to what took place about Owhaoko No. 1 (School Reserve) and Owhaoko No. 2. It will be observed, from what I have said previously, that this question of Owhaoko No. 1 (School Reserve) came first before the Court on the 16th September, 1875, and that Noa Huke said that there were other people than the three claimants—namely, Renata Kawepo, Noa Huke, Hira te Oke—concerned in the land. The names of only three, however, were given on this date. I also notice that the land was to be “inalienable” and for a school endowment, and that was the reason given why the people did not object to it being put through the Court. All the people—those present and those absent—had apparently consented to the land being “inalienable” and being given as an endowment for school purposes. The area given in the block was 38,220 acres, but it appears from the evidence that there had been no proper survey. The boundaries given were only sketch-lines. The Judge stated that he had no doubt about the title, but until the survey had been completed the memorial of ownership could not be ordered. None of these two blocks came again before the Court. On the 1st August, 1876, when the chief block called Owhaoko was before the Court, it was stated to contain 164,500 acres, and this would include the school reserve and Owhaoko No. 2. There is no entry in the minutes of anything about this school reserve from the 16th September, 1875, until the minutes dated 1st December, 1876, at page 413. I give a photograph (annexed) of these pages, and of pages 417 and 418. In my opinion the minute-book has been altered. My reasons for so stating are the following: The words “Court adjourned,” in the