

1920.
NEW ZEALAND.

NATIVE LAND AMENDMENT AND NATIVE LAND CLAIMS
ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1919.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITIONS NOS. 234/1919, 61/1918, 26/1919, AND 231/1919,
RELATIVE TO TITLE TO TAHORA 2F.

*Presented to both Houses of the General Assembly in pursuance of Section 34 of the Native Land
Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1919.*

Office of the Chief Judge, Native Land Court, Wellington, 3rd September, 1920.

Re Tahora 2f—Petitions 234/1919, 61/1918, 26/1919, and 231/1919.

PURSUANT to section 34 of Act No. 49 of 1919, I herewith transmit combined report of Native Land Court on above petitions.

In view of that report, I have to recommend that no legislative action be taken as far as the titles are concerned.

Your attention is, however, called to the concluding paragraph of the report, in which it is stated that it appears the Crown obtained 803 acres more than it should have done.

R. N. JONES, Chief Judge.

The Hon. Native Minister, Wellington.

Native Land Court, Ruatorea, 23rd June, 1920.

Tahora No. 2f.

IN accordance with your reference under subsection (1), section 34, of the Native Land Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1919, I inquired into the undermentioned petitions at the sitting of the Native Land Court at Wairoa on the 2nd February last and following days, viz.: No. 234 of 1919—petition by Haenga Paretipua; No. 61 of 1918—petition by Rutene Tuhi and others; No. 26 of 1919—petition by Hawea Tipuna and others; No. 231 of 1919—petition by Waata Kunaiti and others: and beg to report as follows:—

All four sets of petitioners make practically the same request—namely, that the investigation of Tahora 2F No. 2 be reopened in order that the names of persons alleged to have been wrongfully included in the title should be struck out, and that, consequent thereto, the relative interests of the owners should be redefined.

In addition, the petitions of Rutene Tuhi and others, Hawea Tipuna and others, and Waata Kunaiti and others allege that the area awarded to Tahora 2F was 22,556 acres, and that the area as surveyed is 19,965 acres only. They ask that an inquiry should be held to ascertain how the deficiency has arisen, and, if through the boundary between 2F and 2C having been wrongly surveyed, then that the matter should be adjusted. If, on the other hand, it is ascertained the deficiency came about through a mistaken estimate of the area of No. 2F, then that the Crown, which has purchased a portion of 2F, and has had its interests defined on the basis that the total area of the block was 22,556 acres, should bear a proportion of the deficiency, instead of the whole falling on 2F No. 2.

The block affected by the petitions is sometimes called therein “Tahora No. 2F” and sometimes “Papuni.” It is really, however, Tahora 2F No. 2, being the residue of Tahora No. 2F after cutting out the Crown interests, and is vested in the East Coast Commissioner.