

added the said six names, numbered from 722 to 727, inclusive, to the list attached to the file, and recommend that they be included in the order for the main block accordingly for the relative shares therein set out.

Appeal No. 171.—By Tuhitaare Heemi and others.

Appeal No. 172.—By Mehaka Tokopounamu and others.

These two appeals were withdrawn on behalf of the appellants, and, there being no objectors, we recommend that they be dismissed.

Appeal No. 165.—By Hinehau Hapeta and others, claiming the inclusion of forty-six additional persons. This request was agreed to without objection. We have accordingly added the said names, numbered from 728 to 773, inclusive, to the list of persons attached to the file for inclusion, and we recommend that they be so included in the order for the main Parekohe Block for the relative interests therein set out.

Appeal No. 168.—By Tamehana te Puia and others, claiming that the interests of twenty-three persons in the order be increased. This has been agreed to. We have therefore added a list of their names, showing the numbers standing opposite their names in the order, and the increased shares agreed upon, to the file of papers for this block, and we recommend that their shares be so increased accordingly.

This appeal further asks that the names of certain persons in the order be struck out therefrom. After due inquiry and consideration of the evidence, we are of opinion that the objections advanced against the said persons have not been sustained. We therefore recommend that that portion of this appeal be dismissed.

Appeal No. 166.—By Mika te Tawhao and others.

Appeal No. 167.—By Akuhata te Kaha and others.

These two appeals object to the names of certain persons included in the order by the previous Commission, and were duly heard and inquired into by this Commission.

The appellant Akuhata te Kaha, however, during the course of the inquiry, abandoned his Appeal No. 167. We therefore recommend that it be dismissed.

Appeal No. 166 was heard by us to its conclusion, as also was the case of objection thereto, and after due consideration we are of opinion that, as the persons who are now objected to by the appellants were not objected to by them at the time of the previous Commission, and as it is known that the persons objected to have rights to the Otarupua portion of this block, the case of objection now advanced and the lists of names submitted thereunder by Akuhata te Kaha and Mika te Tawhao should, therefore, be disallowed and the appeal dismissed, and we recommend accordingly.

The seven persons whose names are hereunder set out are the persons who have been selected by the owners of the land from amongst their number and proposed by them to be the members for the Hapu Committee for this block, and agreed to by all the owners present before this Commission sitting at Whakatane on the 8th day of March, 1907:—

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Numia te Ruakariata. | 5. Haturini Papaka. |
| 2. Te Whetu te Paerata. | 6. Te Wharau Tapuac. |
| 3. Te Pouwhare te Roau. | 7. Wati te Wakaunua. |
| 4. Mika te Tawhao. | |

GILBERT MAIR.
D. F. G. BARCLAY.
PARATENE NGATA.

MAUNGAPOHATU AND TAURANGA BLOCKS.

We will now proceed to deal with the case advanced by Wi Pere on behalf of his hapus of the Ngati Kahungunu Tribe, for whom he appeared before us—namely, the Ngati Hingaanga, Ngati Maru, Ngati Rua, and Ngati Hine Hapus, under the following six appeals, viz:—

Appeal No. 26.—By Peka Ngahere and others.

Appeal No. 32.—By Meretene te Rongo.

Appeal No. 33.—By Peka Kerekere.

Appeal No. 34.—By Arani Kunaiti.

Appeal No. 35.—By Wi Pere.

Appeal No. 75.—By Peka Kerekere.

This case was inquired into by this Commission at Te Wairoa, Hawke's Bay, on the 7th December, 1906, and subsequent days, and again at Whakatane on the 11th January, 1907, and subsequent days, in the presence of the representatives of all the contesting parties to the case. A very great deal of evidence was given before us, and has been entered in the minutes of the proceedings of this Commission.

The points now to be considered by us are—

(1.) Whether any of the land belonging to the hapus on whose behalf Wi Pere appears has or has not been included within the boundaries of the Urewera District Native Reserve.