

Rent received as per Statement attached. (Amount for distribution, £69 17s. 10d.)

No. of Grantee.	Names of Grantees.	Shares.	Share of Rent.	Arrears.	Deductions.	Amount payable.
			£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1	Kuini Wi Rangipupu	50	11 12 11	..	..	11 12 11
2	Rihania	50	5 16 6	..	..	5 16 6
3	Riakio	50	5 16 6	..	..	5 16 6
4	Kuini Wi Rangipupu	100	11 13 0	..	*8 2 0	3 11 0
5	Te Hauphiroa	50	11 13 0	..	*1 8 6	10 4 6
6	Riakiao	25	11 13 0	..	*4 7 6	7 5 6
7	Haupuhiroa	25	5 16 5	..	..	5 16 5
	Kuini	25	2 18 3	..	..	2 18 3
	Haupuhiroa	25	2 18 3	..	..	2 18 3
	Totals	300	69 17 10	..	13 18 0	55 19 10

* Rent payable by Mrs. Thompson (Kuini) for her lease, and also by occupation licensees.

HENI TE RAU (MRS. BROWN) examined. (No. 6.)

1. *The Chairman.*] Have you anything further to add, Mrs. Brown, to this petition of yours?—Yes, Sir. I would like to explain to the Committee the grounds upon which I have brought forward this petition again. I petitioned the House upon the same subject last year. I petitioned last year for the removal of the control of the Public Trustee from my land, and I am now petitioning again this year. I wish to have my land under my own control. I was given to understand by Major Parris that this particular piece of land was given back to my people on the distinct understanding that it was to be held according to their Maori ancestral rights, and my people occupied the land. They were under this impression, that the land was to be held according to Maori ancestral rights, and that is what was stated by the Commissioner in those days, Major Parris, who put them on this land. It was only when the Public Trustee made an application in 1902 for the subdivision, or rather to ascertain the relative interests of those in the grant, that we discovered that we had absolutely no right whatever to the control of this land. I objected on the grounds that this particular piece of land was set apart for my own people, the Ngatimutunga, but the Public Trustee disputed this and said it was to be held on equal shares with all the rest of those who returned from the Chatham Islands. But there were two or three hapus amongst those who returned from the Chatham Islands, and their respective reserves were all set apart. There was the Ngatitama Hapu, the Ngatimutunga Hapu, and the Kekowai Hapu. These were the three hapus that came over with the Ngatikura. To show that my contention is correct, I would like to point out that it is shown in the West Coast Commissioner's report that when these reserves were made it was on the distinct understanding that they were for the five loyal hapus, the Ngatitama Hapu, the Ngatimutunga Hapu, the Ngatiawa Hapu, the Puketapu Hapu, and the Taranaki Hapu. These were the five loyal hapus. It was under this feeling that my people lived upon this land, and they expected to be treated accordingly. But the Public Trustee, as I have explained, disputed this, and the case was taken to the Native Land Court at Urenui, and the case was given against me. I appealed against this decision of the Native Land Court to show that we were the people for whom this land was intended, and the Judges of the Appellate Court gave their judgment in my favour. I have here a copy of the judgment of the Appellate Court. It is as follows: "Extract from Whanganui Appellate Court Minute-book (No. 8), Folios 251 to 254.—Date, 7th July, 1903.—Judges, Chief Judge Davy and Judge Butler.—Section 2, Block 3, and Sections 24 and 25, Block 4, Waitara.—Appeal of Heni te Rau.—This is an appeal from the decision of the Native Land Court at Urenui on the 19th day of November, 1902, defining the relative interests in the above land. The land in question (789 acres) was granted in 1884 to sixty-nine persons. It is claimed by the appellant that the land was intended exclusively for the Ngatimutunga Hapu, to be held in accordance with their ancestral rights. On the other hand, it is contended that the land was intended for all the persons of that hapu and others who returned from the Chatham Islands in 1865, and that the rights should be equal. The Native Land Court accepted the latter view, and made the shares equal amongst all the grantees. This decision is now appealed from. At this distance of time it is difficult to get such information as would enable the Court to say with certainty what was intended. We find, however, that in 1887 an application was made to the Court to partition the land. At that Court the attendance of persons interested was much more numerous than at the present Court, but it does not appear to have been set up by any person at that time that the shares were equal. On the contrary, all the claims set up were on the basis of unequal interests. It is too late now to claim that the shares should be equal, nor do we think that it was intended. Such evidence as is available seems to point to the land having been intended principally for Ngatimutunga, and that but for their ancestral rights in the district it would not have been awarded. With the exception of Roimata (Te Porihi) none of the persons interested have thought it worth while to oppose this appeal. The following is the apportionment decided on (the amount deposited—£10—to be returned to the depositor): 1, Hami Te Maunu, 20 shares; 2, Apitia Punga, 20 shares; 3, Naera Pomare, 20 shares; 4, Rangipupoaho, 20 shares; 5, Paina Te Poki, 20 shares; 6, Rangihaea, 20 shares; 7, Matarena, 20 shares; 8, Kirihaehae, 20 shares; 9, Te Ratarewa, 20 shares; 10, Makarini, 20 shares; 11, Tangotango, 20 shares; 12, Ihakara Peru, 20 shares; 13, Matire, 20 shares; 14, Makareta Tamihana, 20 shares; 15, Haurangi, 20 shares; 16, Tutere, 20 shares; 17, Tiopira, 20 shares; 18, Mae, 20 shares; 19, Tiarei, 20 shares; 20, Wi Pepene, 20 shares; 21, Rihi Mohio, 20 shares; 22, Tukawariri, 10 shares; 23, Wari Pitiroi, 10 shares; 24, Heremaia Ngamate, 10 shares; 25, Taiake, 10 shares; 26, Kihī, 10 shares; 27, Piri, 10 shares; 28, Riu, 10 shares; 29, Ngahiraka, 10