

1936.
NEW ZEALAND.

THE NATIVE PURPOSES ACT, 1934.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITION No. 113, OF 1934, OF VIOLET NEWDICK, PRAYING FOR RELIEF AND COMPENSATION RESPECTING THE DELAY IN THE ISSUE OF TITLES FOR HER LAND AT MAKETU AND OTHER MATTERS.

Presented to Parliament in pursuance of the provisions of Section 9 of the Native Purposes Act, 1934.

Native Land Court (Chief Judge's Office),
Wellington, C. 1, 26th June, 1936.

The Right Hon. the NATIVE MINISTER, Wellington.

PETITION NO. 113 OF 1934.—MAKETU AND OTHER LANDS.

1. Pursuant to section 9 of the Native Purposes Act, 1934, I herewith transmit the report of the Court upon the grievances alleged in the above petition.

2. In view of that report I have no recommendation to make, but seeing that the petitioner complains of the actions of the Maori Land Board I have gone more fully into the records of the proceedings of the Board with regard to various applications with which the petitioner was concerned and which, unfortunately, have led her to suppose that members of the Board were prejudiced against her.

3. Mrs. Newdick, in her petition, complains regarding three blocks—Maraekaraha Nos. 1 and 2 and Rotohokahoka B South No. 15. In her evidence before the Court of inquiry she mentions the Okurei Block.

4. Maraekaraha No. 2 can be dismissed very shortly. It contained an area of 1 rood, with a single owner, who transferred to Mrs. Newdick. The transfer was confirmed in due course.

5. Maraekaraha No. 1 contained 17 acres 1 rood 4 perches, with eighteen owners. On 10th December, 1919, Mrs. Newdick lodged an application for an assembled owners' meeting to be summoned to consider the sale to her at Government value (which was about £3 per acre), or, alternatively, to lease to her at an annual rental of 5 per cent. on the Government value. On 23rd January, 1920, a meeting to consider this proposal was convened by the Board for 4th March, 1920, at 10 a.m.

6. On 30th January, 1920, a rival application was lodged with the Board for a sale at £4 per acre or, alternatively, to lease at a yearly rental of 4s. per acre. This meeting was summoned for the same time and place.

7. The notices calling the meeting appear to be irregular in that they do not disclose the sale-price nor the rental for the proposed lease.

8. In anticipation of the meeting, the Native owners were approached for proxies by representatives of each purchaser. Some who had already signed proxies in favour of a sale to Mrs. Newdick later signed proxies in favour of her opponent.

9. On the 3rd March, 1920, an owner in whose favour Mrs. Newdick's proxies had been made out telegraphed to the Clerk of the Board asking for an adjournment until three o'clock the next day. Mrs. Newdick claims to be a party to sending this telegram. No action was taken upon it.