

1916.
NEW ZEALAND

NATIVE LAND AMENDMENT AND NATIVE LAND CLAIMS ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1915.

REPORT BY THE NATIVE LAND COURT ON PETITION No. 438 OF 1914, OF KAHU RENSHAW, *RE*
SUCCESSION TO INTEREST OF ERUERA TE PARAHĪ (DECEASED) IN TAUPIRĪ, No. 474A
No. 2 BLOCK.

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

Native Land Court (Chief Judge's Office), Wellington, 22nd July, 1916.

SIR,—

As provided by section 23 of the Native Land Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1915, I transmit herewith the report of Judge Holland on petition (No. 438 of 1914) of Kahu Renshaw, praying for inquiry *re* succession to the interest of Eruera te Parahi in Taupiri No. 474A No. 2 Block.

I find on further inquiry that the succession order objected to has been registered under the Land Transfer Act, and that the land was sold some time prior to the 26th March, 1915, and, of course, before the Act referred to became law.

I can only recommend that no further action be taken in the matter.

JACKSON PALMER,
Chief Judge.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

Office of the Waikato-Maniapoto District Native Land Court, Auckland, 7th July, 1916.

*Reference of Petition No. 438/15 by Kahu Renshaw, re Succession to Eruera te Parahi in Taupiri
Lot 474A No. 2.*

SIR,—

I have the honour to report upon the above reference as follows:—

Inquiry was held at Thames on the 3rd May last. Both petitioner and respondents were represented.

On the 7th September, 1907, Parepumai te Whetuiti was appointed by Judge Edger the sole successor to Eruera te Parahi (deceased) in Taupiri Lot 474A No. 2 Block. There were then no objectors to the order.

An extract from Judge Edger's minutes is attached hereto. It will be seen from the extract that the successor then appointed derived her right through Toapota, uri of Paoa.

The block, as a whole, was dealt with by Judge O'Brien, at Thames, on the 28th March, 1895.

From his minutes it appears that the Natives themselves had settled the list of owners before the case was dealt with. It is also clear that the owners were members of the N'Paoa and N'Ringatahi Tribes.

The manuscript list handed in at original hearing shows that the deceased was not included as a N'Ringatahi, and it must therefore be assumed that his right was as a N'Paoa.

The evidence given before me showed that the petitioner had very little knowledge of the "takes" to the land, and based her claim upon the fact that she and her sisters were nearest-of-kin to deceased. She admits that she is not of N'Paoa.

I am satisfied that the source of ownership was Paoa, and such being the case the next-of-kin through Paoa must succeed. Petitioner cannot trace her descent from Paoa.

I append also a copy of my minutes taken upon inquiry [not printed].

I have, &c.,

The Chief Judge, Native Land Court, Wellington.

A. J. HOLLAND, Judge.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (750 copies), 17s. 6d.

By Authority: MARCUS F. MARKS, Government Printer, Wellington.—1916.

Price 3d.]

1. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

found on the Table of the House of Representatives.

The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

Reference is made to the letter No. 48815 of Kama Hama, re: Succession to the position of Native Land Judge, dated 1911.

I have the honor to report upon the above reference as follows:-

1. The first step in the process of identifying a problem is to recognize that a problem exists. This is often done by comparing current performance with a desired state or goal. For example, if a company's sales are declining, it may indicate a problem with its marketing strategy or product quality.

It should be noted that the original document was handed in as original document and was not a copy. It was also noted that the original document was not a copy of a copy, but a copy of the original document.

1. The first of these is the fact that the United States is not a party to the Convention. This is a serious defect in the Convention, as it leaves the United States free to ignore the Convention and to continue to operate its own system of copyright protection. This is a serious defect in the Convention, as it leaves the United States free to ignore the Convention and to continue to operate its own system of copyright protection.

I enclose a copy of my minutes taken upon inquiry.

The Chief Judge, Justice James Connel, Washington.

1. The first of these is the fact that the Commission has not yet received any information from the Government of the United States regarding the results of its investigation into the activities of the Committee for the Liberation of the Americas (CLA) in the United States.