5. Steps were then taken to comply with the promise and sections were duly selected for the purpose. About the same time sections for other purposes were set aside and the names of the tribe to benefit were in each case clearly indicated on the papers.

6. The matter of whom these sections were to be reserved for was referred to Mr. P. Sheridan who in the course of correspondence referred to the tribes mentioned in the certificate as Ngatiwhakaue, Ngatirangiwewehi, and Ngatiuenukukopako. This evidently led to misunderstanding, the owners in the title were Ngatiwhakaue only, but the title was made subject to the provisions of an agreement made before the investigation between the three tribes and the Government.

7. On the 28th May, 1897, the area of 20 acres described in *Gazette*, 1897, pp. 1131 to 1343, was reserved and dedicated for the use of Aboriginal Natives of the Ngatiwhakaue, Ngatirangiwewehi, and Ngatiuenukukopako tribes.

8. On 2nd September, 1898, certain Natives purporting to act for the whole of Ngatiwhakaue addressed a letter to the Surveyor-General enclosing a clipping from the *Hot Lakes Chronicle* saying that the 20 acres had been reserved for the three tribes, and offered the objection that Pukeroa-Oruawhata had been awarded to Ngatiwhakaue alone, the claim by the other tribes having been rejected and asked that the tribes objected to be omitted.

9. On this the Surveyor-General directed a reply to be sent that the reserves were to be granted to the sellers and that the names mentioned in the certificate were the three tribes already mentioned.

10. It is quite evident that Mr. Sheridan was acting under a misapprehension in advising the Surveyor-General that the persons for whom the land was to be set aside were the three tribes. On the 9th March, 1897, he had minuted the papers " This reserve belongs to the whole of the Natives who sold their interest and not to any particular tribe or committee." On 19th December, 1898, there is another minute of his " The reservation was for the benefit of the whole of the original owners of Pukeroa-Oruawhata No. 1 Block, and not for a particular tribe or tribes, hapu or hapus."

11. By section 32 of the Native Land Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1924, the reserve was vested in the Waiariki District Maori Land Board to hold the same for the purposes set out—viz., on behalf of the three tribes.

12. Petition No. 252 of 1927 asked for the deletion of the names of Ngatirangiwewehi and Ngatiuenukukopako tribes from the schedule of the Act of 1924.

13. As a result of this section 65 of the Native Land Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1927 (No. 5), in schedule directed an inquiry by the Native Land Court.

14. The result of that inquiry is contained in parliamentary papers G.–6G of 1928. The Court thought the names of Ngatirangiwewehi and Ngatiuenukukopako should not appear in the title to the reserve.

15. As a result of this report section 33 of the Native Land Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1929, was passed enabling the Court to decide who was entitled to the reserve irrespective of the statement that the land was reserved for the three tribes.

16. The Court which sat in pursuance of this legislation held that Ngatiwhakaue alone were interested in the reserve. A Court sitting in 1901 came to a similar conclusion.

17. From what has preceded it will be seen how the mistake of introducing the names of Ngatiuenukukopako and Ngatirangiwewehi arose:—

(1) The two memoranda of Mr. Lewis show that the reserve was clearly intended for sellers only.
(2) Only the owners in the title could be sellers.
(3) The Court had held that Ngatiwhakaue were the owners and rejected the claims of the other two tribes.
(4) The only way these tribes were mentioned in the certificate of title was (and this may have misled Mr. Sheridan) in stating the parties to a pre-investigation agreement.

18. The result of the subsequent statutes has been to correct the error and give the reserves to owner-sellers of the Pukeroa-Oruawhata Block.

Dated the 21st day of May, 1936.

For the Court—
R. N. JONES, Chief Judge.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (412 copies), £2.

By Authority: G. H. LONEY, Government Printer, Wellington.—1936.

Price 3d.]