

District, containing 59 acres, is owned by sixty-one persons, and that Lot 452, Parish of Te Papa, containing 41 acres, is owned by 112 persons, with succession orders showing division of shares down to a fraction of $\frac{1}{300}$.

Petition No. 24.

95. This petition raises the general question of the Tauranga confiscation, and is covered by what has been said already on that subject.

WAIKATO DISTRICT.

Petitions Nos. 25 and 28.

96. These deal with the general question of the Waikato confiscations, and are covered by what has been said already on that subject.

Petitions Nos. 26 and 27.

97. The petitioner in these cases is Margaret Lydia Evans, and both petitions deal with the same grievance. The petitioner is the daughter of Mere Ngahoroi, a member of the Ngatitemainu and Ngatiapakura Tribes, whose lands were confiscated after the Waikato war. Parts of these lands were afterwards restored to the Natives, and it is alleged in both petitions that the petitioner has not received or been awarded any portion of such lands. This last allegation is admittedly untrue, and the petitioner's real grievance is that she and the other members of her family did not get the shares to which they thought themselves entitled.

98. The matter came before a Compensation Court sitting at Ngaruawahia in 1867. In pursuance of the award of that Court, a grant was made of a block of land in trust for the loyal members of the Ngatitemainu and Ngatikotara Tribes. In the year 1898 an order was made by the Native Land Court determining who were the persons beneficially entitled under the trust. The petitioner and her brothers and sisters were all included in the list of Ngatitemainu owners. In the year 1902 the respective shares of these owners were settled by the Native Land Court. The petitioner complains that she and her brothers were not awarded the shares to which they were entitled, having regard to the rank of their mother. This was the grievance stated in the petition presented by the petitioner to the House of Representatives in the year 1904. The Native Affairs Committee recommended that the petition should be referred to the Government for inquiry, and this report was adopted by the House of Representatives. The petition was reported on by Judge Johnson, of the Native Land Court. He was the Judge who made the order in 1902, and it appears from his report that in most cases the shares of the respective owners were settled by the Natives themselves. It is true that the petitioner and her brothers and sisters were not represented directly at the hearing before Judge Johnson, but that is not of itself a sufficient ground for reopening an inquiry of that kind. In the petition presented in 1904 the petitioner alleged that the Patene family got more than they were entitled to. The claims of her family, the petitioner said, were equal, if not superior, to those of the late Wiremu Patene's family, as their mother, Mere Ngahoroi, was of a higher rank and a larger landowner than Wiremu Patene. The following is the observation made by Judge Johnson in his report on this question: "It is not necessary for me to go into the question raised by petitioner as to the rank of her mother, Mere Ngahoroi. The opinion of the great bulk of the people of the two hapus as to the position of the descendants of the late Rev. Wiremu Patene is shown by the division made of the total area of the land. An opposing case was set up by Pepa Kirkwood, licensed Native agent, on behalf of Tewi Kingi and party, but it was found to be utterly without merit. The Court then expressed the opinion that Hone Patene's party had really accepted less than they might have claimed." "Every effort," said Judge Johnson, "was made by leading Natives to secure a satisfactory settlement of this long-standing question, and it was thought that they had succeeded."

99. Before such an inquiry should be reopened, particularly after the lapse of a quarter of a century, it must be reasonably certain that a serious injustice has been done, and that it is possible to remedy that injustice. The petitioner has failed, we think, to establish either of these propositions. Although the petitioner's