

the affair whenever it arises. As to the Atiu people coming here to interfere, the Resident Commissioner will know how to deal with them should the occasion arise; it is not a matter that this Court can entertain or consider.

We will now consider the claim of Te Au. This is a very unsatisfactory case. Tararo has laid down a definite boundary that the Court can understand, but that of Te Au is absurd. It includes the Taotu land already awarded to Tararo; it includes the mission-house which was given by Tararo, and his right to do so never disputed. It also includes the church and school sites of the London Missionary Society. It is, however, on record in the Taotu case that the northern boundary was there fixed as between Papa Marangai and Tararo, and as the former has now joined his case to that of Te Au, the Court fixes the following boundary for present purposes, and leaves the piece of land cut out to be dealt with on a future occasion. The northern boundary now laid down for the Makatea is as follows: From the iron peg at the junction of the Taunganui Road with the Church Road near the house of Te Au, thence westerly by the Taunganui Road to the south-east corner of the mission-house grant, thence north and west by the boundary of that grant to its junction with the Taotu Block, and following that boundary to its north-west corner, and thence by a straight line to Tararo's peg on the reef near Taunganui—viz., Te Opuā o Uoa. As to this case, the Court is of opinion that there need have been no dispute as to this line had Papa arranged beforehand with Tararo. There is evidently much personal feeling that ought not to have been imported into the case. Papa has been used as a tool by Te Au. The claim of Mana is altogether untenable. He bases this claim on the fact that he is one of three survivors of the Ngati-Arua, and that he owned this land before his tribe was destroyed. This contention may be perfectly true, but during the last two hundred years the lands of Ngati-Arua have been held by different sections of the Areora conquerors, and the evidence of Tararo shows that Takere Marama protected Mana's ancestor and gave him land whereon to live. Any claim that Mana may have is under Tararo, whose Mataiapo he is. He is not the chief owner of Te Makatea. The claim of Tarei and Tamuera are really one and the same, since they both contend that the upper portion of this block is not Te Makatea, but Araki. There are many inconsistencies in these two claims, and we think that these cases would not have come before the Court were it not that the people are afraid that any award made by the Court would dispossess those living thereon under the old mission arrangement. And now as to the evidence. Tamuera's witnesses are all people who have a personal interest in the award to Tamuera, whereas three of Tararo's witnesses are leading men of Tamuera's own tribe who have no interest, but who have intervened in order to prevent what they believe to be an attempt at robbery. The Court has no doubt in its mind that Te Makatea belongs to Tararo and his people. The award of the Court will therefore be in favour of Tararo and such other people as the Court may find to have an interest in the block, but subject to the old residential rights acquired under the *akonoanga oire* before referred to. The Court congratulates Tararo on his attitude with respect to the land called Taputurangi. It was a wise and kindly action to present it to Tamuera, and it has removed the religious question from the Court.

It has been reported to the Court that threats have been made, that certain persons who have brought their lands before the Court will, when the Court leaves, be turned off the lands. We hope that no one will be so foolish as to interfere with owners of land who have placed themselves in the hands of the Court. There must be no interference with such people, or the offender will be heavily fined. The Court will, moreover, report any offence of this nature to the Government of New Zealand, and recommend that the offender, whether Ariki or Mataiapo, be removed from his office.

W. E. GUDGEON,
Chief Judge.

No. 71.

SIR,—

Government Schooner Department, Rarotonga, 30th September, 1904.

I have the honour, by direction and in the absence of the Resident Commissioner, to forward you herewith an approximate statement of the accounts of the schooner "Countess of Ranfurly" to date, which are virtually the accounts for the six months ending the 30th instant. The loss for the six months is shown to be £136 10s. 6d. approximately, which compares more than favourably with former losses. It must, however, be borne in mind that the next half-year will show a large expenditure for repairs, as Captain Champion has reported that the schooner requires a thorough overhaul and a new suit of sails on her arrival in Auckland.

I have, &c.,

E. BLAINE, Secretary.

Hon. C. H. Mills, Minister for the Islands, Wellington.

Enclosure.

APPROXIMATE ACCOUNT OF SCHOONER "COUNTRESS OF RANFURLY" for Six Months ending 30th September, 1904.

	Receipts.			£	s.	d.
Passenger-fares	102	12	0
Special charters	319	0	0
Freights	404	0	8
Commission Account	3	16	9
				£829	9	5