

1915.
NEW ZEALAND.

NATIVE LAND CLAIMS ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1913:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITION No. 46 OF 1913, HAKI AMOPO AND ANOTHER.
RELATIVE TO KAWHIA A, R, S, W, AND M BLOCKS (KAREWA TOWNSHIP).

Laid on the Table of the House of Representatives pursuant to Act.

SIR,— Native Land Court (Chief Judge's Office), 7th July, 1914.

Section 2 of the Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1913, provides—

- (1.) That the Chief Judge is authorized to refer to the Court for inquiry and report the petitions set out in the schedule to that Act.
- (2.) Upon such report the Chief Judge is to make such recommendations to the Minister as appear to accord with the equities of such case.

I have the honour to enclose the Court's report upon one of such petitions as referred to the Court by me pursuant to the above-named Act—namely, the petition of Hake Amopo (No. 12) and others.

In this matter I have the honour to make the following recommendation to you, namely, that this title should not be reopened.

JACKSON PALMER,
Chief Judge.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

In the matter of the Kawhia A, R, S, W, and M (Karewa Township) Blocks; and in the matter of a reference by the Chief Judge in terms of section 2 of the Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1913, to the Court for inquiry into the petition of Tema Pouwharetapu Kawene and another.

SIR,—

Referring to the above matter, I have the honour to report as follows:—

Petitioner appeared before the Court at Ngaruawahia on the 5th day of June, 1914, and briefly stated the reasons for his petition. The petition was opposed by three persons, who also briefly stated their grounds of objection.

After hearing all parties I am satisfied that the petitioners on their *whakapapa* are entitled to share in the above blocks. That they were alive at the time of the investigation of the Kawhia Block as a whole is an indisputable fact. I am at a loss to understand, however, why the father (Pouwharetapu) of the petitioners, who was one of the leading Natives in the Kawhia Block, and who undoubtedly took a principal part in bringing the block before the Court, should have omitted two of his own children. It would appear that there was some well-founded reason for doing so, but what that reason is I have been unable to discover. I am not satisfied that the reason alleged by the objectors is the real one.

If this petition is granted and the titles are disturbed by the inclusion of the petitioners similar petitions will be lodged, as there are many Natives who were children at the time the Kawhia Block was investigated and who were omitted from the title.

I have roughly calculated the acreage the petitioners would be entitled to were their petition granted: In Kawhia W, about $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres each; in Kawhia A, about $3\frac{1}{2}$ acres each; in Kawhia R, (? no right); in Kawhia M, about $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres each; in Kawhia S, under 2 roods each.

The above blocks have been divided, and I am not prepared to say into which, if any, of the divisions petitioners should go.

I attach copy of minutes taken at inquiry.

The Chief Judge, Native Land Court, Wellington.

A. J. HOLLAND, Judge.