

REPORT ON CASE No. X.

MOEANGIANGI.

This is a piece of land which the Government set aside for the Maoris when the bulk of the land was purchased by them. Subsequently an application was made in respect of this land to the Native Land Court. The case was heard, and a Crown grant issued to three individuals.

A complaint about this land was made to the Commissioners by Paora Hira and others. They gave evidence to the effect that the land had been sold, and that the sale was wrong. They therefore wanted to get the land back, and proposed that the money paid to the sellers should be made a charge against their own land, because the sellers had no right to the land in question.

The persons against whom the complaint was made did not appear. One of them was Pitiera Kopu and the other Winiata Te Awapuni, both chiefs. Pitiera Kopu is dead, and Winiata Te Awapuni did not put in an appearance.

My opinion on the evidence given by the complainants before the Commissioners is, that perhaps it is correct that they had a claim to that land by Maori custom, and also through the Government setting that land aside for the Maoris. But as they did not go to the Native Land Court to state their title, a Crown grant was issued in the names of only three persons.

WIREMU HIKAIRO, Commissioner.

No. X.—MOEANGIANGI.

Ko tenei whenua, he waahi i waiho e Te Kawanatanga hei whenua mo nga tangata Maori i te wa i hokona te nuinga o te whenua ki a ia. No muri iho, ka tukua he tono ki te Kouti Whenua Maori kia whakawakia taua whenua, whakaputaina ana he Karauna Karati mo taua whenua ki nga tangata tokotoru.

A i tukua mai he tono ki nga Komihana mo tenei whenua e Paora Hira ma. I whakapuaki korero hoki ratou ki te Kouti hei whakaatu kua hokona taua whenua a e he ana taua hokonga. E mea ana kia whakahokia atu taua whenua ki a ratou, ko nga moni i riro i nga tangata nana i tuku te whenua ki te hoko me whakaake ki o raua ake whenua, kore hoki aua kaihoko i eke ki taua whenua.

Ko nga tangata e whakapaea ana kihai i tae mai ki te Kouti. Otiia ko aua tangata e whakapaea ra ko tetahi ko Pitiera Kopu ko tetahi ko Winiata Te Awapuni, tokorua aua tangata, he rangatira anake. Ko Pitiera Kopu kua mate ko Winiata Te Awapuni kihai i tae mai.

Ko taku whakaaro mo runga i nga korero a nga Kaitono i whakaatu ai ki te Kouti he tika ano pea he paanga to ratou ki taua whenua i runga i te tikanga Maori, i runga hoki i te wchenga o taua waahi e Te Kawanatanga mo nga tangata Maori. Engari na ratou kihai i haere ki Te Kouti tiaki ai i to ratou paanga no reira i whakaputaina ai te Karaati ki te hunga tokotoru anake.

WIREMU HIKAIRO, Komihana.

REPORT ON CASE No. XI.

PETANE.—Waka Kawatini, Complainant.

Te Waka Kawatini made an application to the Commissioners to inquire into the sale of that land to a European named R. D. Maney. In support of his application he stated—

“I executed the deed of mortgage of this land. My reasons were that that European so continuously urged me to sign, and that he and the interpreter told me that I should get my land back again.

“Maney gave me no money whatever when I signed the deed. I received nothing on account of that land but goods and drink.

“It was agreed that the price of Petane should be £1,000, and I was to have £500 for myself.”

Mr. R. D. Maney appeared and gave evidence. He said that the complainant was heavily in debt to him, and that he had ceased giving him credit. He asked that more should be given him on account of land known as Waikahu, and then he got further credit.

My opinion on the above statements is, that the complainant did not understand the meaning of the mortgage deed; he only thought he would get a lot of money.

I do not understand about the grog, which forms a part of the consideration in mortgages or sales of land. I leave that for the Parliament of New Zealand to consider.

Paora Torotoro, Complainant.

Paora Torotoro made a complaint about the same land. He said that each man was to have received £100; that he got no money, but only goods and rum.

He gave evidence at some length before the Commissioners in support of his complaint.

Mr. Maney appeared to give evidence, but this only went to show the amount which the complainant owed him.

My opinion on this complaint is that it is correct that the complainant got no money, but that he was foolish in running into debt.

The defendant wanted to get the land, so he allowed large credit to the complainant.

The Parliament of New Zealand will know about the question of grog forming part of the consideration in sales or mortgages of land.

The statement made by the complainants, that they reserved a portion of this land at the time of the sale to the defendant, is not clear to me.