

the right of Whanau-Apanui to Takaputahi." It may be an inconsistency in the judgment, but that does not get away from the fact that you have to consider that these learned Judges in the most emphatic way disputed the occupation of Ngaitai in Tunapahore. One other point, and then I am done. My friend said that the Commission seemed to rely upon the relationship arising between the Harawaka and the Ngaitai by the fact that Apanui married Te Whaki, who was a Ngaitai. But I desire to point out that the Native Appellate Court, in dealing with that matter, say, "The first assertion is incredible, (1) because there are no descendants of Te Whaki now amongst Ngaitai, proving that when Te Whaki married Apanui she entirely abandoned Ngaitai, and threw in her lot with her husband's people; and (2) because nearly all Whanau-Apanui can trace descent from Te Whaki through her son Harawaka. So that, even if the right did come from Te Whaki, it would avail Ngaitai nothing." So that it is quite clear that any right arising from the marriage of Te Whaki to Apanui would not descend to the Ngaitai. My friend complains that we ask too little. I think we have: I think that upon the evidence we should have asked this Committee to give us the land, and restore the judgment of the Native Appellate Court. But we ask for something fairer than that. We say that the matter should be referred to three Judges, to review it, and to see if justice has or has not been done. I need hardly point out that no one wants to interfere with the registered rights of Europeans in the block.

*Approximate Cost of Paper.*—Preparation, not given; printing (1,500 copies), 27 18s. 6d.

---

By Authority : JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1910.

*Price 6d.]*