

The owners of Waioture, therefore, are—

Tahupotiki Wiremu	$\frac{1}{10}$
Hinepua Wiremu	$\frac{1}{10}$
Erina Wiremu	$\frac{1}{10}$
Pera Pehimana	$\frac{1}{30}$
Ihipera Korua Taurua	$\frac{1}{30}$
Ratana Tamaiparea	$\frac{1}{20}$
Whakarongo Tamaiparea	$\frac{1}{20}$
Tiniwa Taiaroa	$\frac{1}{120}$
Nanc Taiaroa	$\frac{1}{120}$
Nakata Taiaroa	$\frac{1}{120}$
Eroparene Taiaroa	$\frac{1}{120}$
Rauamoia te Ngoo	$\frac{1}{2}$

At the inquiry the next-of-kin of the original grantee—the Ratana family—owning one-half of the block, were not present or represented, but it was stated on their behalf that they were willing that the land should be returned to the original owners, the Pakakohe Tribe.

The petition was opposed by Te Ngo Ngarangikatitia, the father of the devisee under the will of George Broughton. This devisee was not in any way closely related to the original grantee, but obtained her interest, as shown above, through two wills.

The petitioners alleged that the grant was made to Taurua not in his own right, but as trustee and representative of the Pakakohe Tribe.

Te Ngo Ngarangikatitia's grounds for opposing the petition were as follows:—

- (1) Taurua's name appears in the Crown Grant and the land belongs to him.
- (2) From him the land descended to his successors.
- (3) It is some years now since Taurua died, and no claim has been made. The petitioners have waited until the elders who knew all the circumstances about this land have died.

In the Court's opinion the position in this case is exactly the same as in Pukorokoro, a report with regard to which was forwarded to you on 2nd August, 1934.

There is no doubt Waioture is Pakakohe tribal land and was held in high regard by the tribe as being the first place on that part of the coast on which their great ancestor Ture settled. The spring on the land named after him, Waioture, is still in existence. The Court has no doubt also that land was returned by the Commissioners to Taurua because it was a place of historical interest to his tribe, the Pakakohe. Taurua made no attempt to alienate it during his lifetime, and it seems to the Court to be a reasonable inference to draw that he regarded himself as a trustee for his tribe. It is a notable fact that his next-of-kin, who own half the block, are prepared to hand it back to the tribe, while the owner of the other half, a stranger in blood to him, desires to retain it.

No evidence was offered as regards Section 141.

The following are forwarded herewith for your information.

- (1) Copy of the evidence taken on the inquiry.
- (2) Copy of the report of the 2nd August, 1934.
- (3) Petition.
- (4) Native Office file 19/1/145.

JAS. W. BROWNE, Judge.

Approximate Cost of Paper.—Preparation, not given; printing (436 copies), £2 15s.

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

Price 3d.]