family was not represented before the Court in 1902, the claims of the family must have been considered, for the shares of the children were all fixed, and it is reasonable to conclude that they did not suffer really by reason of their absence. It would be absurd, we think, to reopen the inquiry now on the somewhat fantastic ground that sufficient importance was not attached by the Native Land Court to the rank of Mere Ngahoroi. In connection with that question it is to be noted that the petitioner's own witness, Aire Huirama, said that Wiremu Patene was the paramount chief of the tribe. But if the inquiry were reopened it would not be possible to readjust the shares of the respective owners without inflicting serious hardship on those who would be deprived thereby of shares which they had enjoyed for twenty-five years. We think, therefore, that the petitioner has not made out any case for relief.

TARANAKI DISTRICT.

Petition No. 29.

100. The case made in connection with this petition was this: In the report of the West Coast Commission of the 13th March, 1880, it was recommended that 25,000 acres of confiscated land should be set aside as a continuous reserve, extending the whole distance between the Oeo and Waingongoro Rivers. This reserve, on survey, was found to contain 25,363 acres, while the total area granted to Natives was only 20,348 acres. The petitioners, who are members of the Ngatitu hapu, claim to be entitled to a grant of approximately 5,000 acres. It appears from Sir William Fox's letter to the Native Minister of the 8th March, 1882, that the Government decided to deduct 5,000 acres from the reserve, and that is why more land has not been granted to the Natives. The Government was entitled, of course, to do that, as the Natives had not acquired any legal or moral claim to have full effect given to the recommendation of the Commission. We think, therefore, that the petitioners have not made out any case for relief.

Petition No. 30.

101. The petitioner, George Ashdown, alleges that his mother, Maata Pekema, a member of a Taranaki tribe belonging to the Ngatitairi hapu, was interested in certain lands in Taranaki which were confiscated, and that she did not receive any compensation in respect thereof. The petitioner admits that he himself got 218 acres, but alleges that he got these in right of his uncle Raukutauri, whose interest was 600 acres. He claims to be entitled to some land in right of his mother also.

102. According to the evidence of Mr. Moverley, who was called as a witness by Mr. Taylor on behalf of the Crown, the name of the petitioner appears in a Crown grant of land in the Ngatitira Block along with the name of his uncle and with the name of his sister. It is reasonable to conclude that he must have got into the grant in right of his mother, who had died in 1875. That was in 1883, and the petitioner afterwards got over 300 acres on a partition of the land granted. The reply made by the petitioner is that the land he got was through the Ngatitira hapu, and that he is entitled to claim also through the Ngatitairi hapu. It was suggested by Mr. Smith, on behalf of the petitioner, that the matter might be referred to the Native Land Court for further inquiry. In view of the facts proved by Mr. Taylor, we think that the petitioner has not made out any case for further inquiry.

Petitions Nos. 31, 33, 35, 36, and 40.

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

Petition No. 32.

104. This deals with confiscation generally, and the petitioners claimed also that a promise to return some of the confiscated land to them had not been carried out. Mr. Taylor contended that the promise had been more than fulfilled. In view of the recommendation made on the subject of confiscation, it seems unnecessary to express any opinion on this disputed question.