

The Court accepts the evidence of these two as establishing the following matters :—

- (1) That the whakapapa submitted by the petitioners mother in 1918 and now by the petitioner tracing descent from Taupara through Whakauika is wrong.
- (2) That the half-brother and half-sisters of the petitioners mother traced their descent from Taupara through their father, Hami Parehe, and not through their mother, Rina Parewhai, as alleged by the petitioner.

On this evidence and on the previous minutes and judgment, this Court considers that the original judgment is correct in refusing to accept the whakapapa put forward.

As to the claim under Kuraiteapata, Mr. Pere submitted that the presence of Tamaho at the Otuhawaiiki fight, and the inclusion of his daughter, Mere Taiakupe, in the Okahuatiu Block, which he described as a " Taupara " block, proved that the decision of the Court in 1918 was wrong where it held that the descendants of Kuraiteapata had disassociated themselves from Whanau-a-Taupara and that no Taupara rights remained to them. We cannot accept this submission as sound, and therefore find that the petitioner's mother had no right to inclusion in the land under the whakapapa from Kuraiteapata.

Another ground for inclusion put forward by the petitioner's mother in 1918 and by the petitioners in this petition was that the fact that her half brother and sisters were included showed that she should be included. The half brother and sisters are Mihaere Parehe, Rangituake Parehe, and Waara Parehe, their father being Hami Parehe and their mother Rina Parewhai, who was also the mother of the petitioner's mother.

Mr. Pere alleged that the half brother and sisters derived their right through Rina Parewhai, the common parent, and that the father, Hami Parehe, had no Taupara rights.

Mihaere Parehe was an original owner, having been admitted in 1881 through aroha, being the husband of a Wahia woman with large rights. His sisters were admitted under Captain Pitt's list of 1918, and the only supporting whakapapa in which they appear is a whakapapa tracing from Taupara through their father, Hami Parehe. This whakapapa is confirmed by the evidence of Waioeka Paraone before this Court. We are satisfied that the rights of the half brother and sisters came through the father and not through the common mother.

Generally, we might add that, even if the opponents to the petition had not been able at this late date to bring forward these two witnesses, we consider that we would not have been able to arrive at any conclusion different from the above.

As to Hineteariki having had to contend with an experienced conductor in Captain Pitt, the minutes show that she presented her case with an amount of skill and an appearance of much experience in the Courts. If the whakapapa she gave was correct, we feel certain that, with all the public interest there was, she would have found one or more of the many present to have supported it.

We consider, therefore, that the petitioners have not established their claim, and that their mother, Hineteariki Pera, was not entitled to be included in the list of owners of the Mangatu No. 1 Block.

For the Court,

D. G. B. MORISON, Chief Judge.

IVOR PRICHARD, Judge.

To the Chief Judge, Maori Land Court, Wellington.

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (563 copies), £7 10s.

By Authority: E. V. PAUL, Government Printer, Wellington.—1948.

*Price 3d.*