

1950  
NEW ZEALAND

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITION No. 113 OF 1938, OF  
JAMES RAIHE REWETI AND ANOTHER, CONCERNING SURPLUS  
LAND IN THE WHAITI KURANUI BLOCK**

---

*Presented to Parliament in Pursuance of the Provisions of Section 18 of the  
Maori Purposes Act, 1939*

---

Maori Land Court (Chief Judge's Office),  
P.O. Box 3006, Wellington C. 1, 20th November, 1950.

Memorandum for The Hon the Minister of Maori Affairs, Parliament Buildings,  
Wellington.

WHAITI KURANUI BLOCK

1. Pursuant to section 18 of the Maori Purposes Act, 1939, I transmit to you the report of the Court on the claims and allegations contained in Petition No. 113 of 1938 of James Raihe Reweti and another concerning surplus land in this block.

2. In view of the Court's report, I have no recommendation to make.

D. G. B. MORISON, Chief Judge.

In the Maori Land Court of New Zealand, Waiariki District.—In the matter of section 18 of the Maori Purposes Act, 1939, and in the matter of Petition 113 of 1938, by James Raihe Reweti and Another, praying for an inquiry into surplus land in the Whaiti Kuranui Block.

At a sitting of the Court held at Te Poi on the 8th day of February, 1949, and succeeding days, before John Harvey, Esquire, Judge.

Upon reference by His Honour the Chief Judge of the said petition for inquiry the following report is submitted :

(1) At the hearing the petitioners were represented by counsel in Mr. C. McDavitt and Mr. T. Machin. The Crown was represented by Mr. V. R. S. Meredith and Mr. F. McCarthy, who were assisted by senior officers of the Maori Affairs and Lands Departments. The inquiry was remarkable for the vast quantity of maps, minute-books, and documents produced by the Crown to show the history of the Whaiti Kuranui Block, as well as for the thorough and able manner in which counsel for both sides presented their respective cases.

(2) At the outset it was felt that, if the order of proceedings were confined strictly to the letter of the petition, the scope of the inquiry would be so narrowed that the petitioners would have difficulty in opening a case at all, while the Crown's case, which had been prepared at considerable expense to meet any form of attack, would not become