

SESSION I.
1912.
NEW ZEALAND.

NATIVE LAND CLAIMS ADJUSTMENT ACT, 1910:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION ON PETITION No. 225/08, RELATIVE TO OHUIA BLOCK.

Laid before Parliament in compliance with Subsection (4) of Section 28 of the Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1910.

Native Land Court, Wellington, 26th October, 1911.
The Hon. the Native Minister, Wellington.

Re Ohuia Block.

PURSUANT to section 28 of the Native Land Claims Adjustment Act, 1910, I referred to the Native Land Court for inquiry and report the petition of Haenga Paretipua and others herein.

I enclose the report herewith, and beg to call your attention to paragraph 15 thereof. The Court referred to therein sat for months on the case, and when I eventually went to Wairoa to ascertain the cause of the delay in completing the matter I found that it was occasioned by the thoroughness of the inquiry.

I would most strongly recommend that the matter be not reopened, as I am satisfied that the parties have had a fair trial and have received substantial justice

JACKSON PALMER,
Chief Judge.

In the Native Land Court of New Zealand.—In the matter of **Petition No. 225 of 1908**, by Haenga Paretipua and others seeking inclusion as part owners of Ohuia No. 1 Block.

To the Hon. the Chief Judge of the Native Land Court.

This matter having been referred by your Honour to the Native Land Court for inquiry and report, I beg to report as follows:—

1. The matter came on for hearing in the Court at Wairoa on the 26th September, 1911, after due notice given.

2. I was one of the Judges constituting the Appellate Court which excluded these people from the title, but the Natives were good enough to raise no objections on that score. Personally, had it been convenient, I should have preferred some other Judge to have taken the matter. No doubt, however, your Honour will make such allowances as are necessary on that score.

3. The title to this block has had such a chequered career that it may not be uninteresting to have it recounted here. First, then, the block was investigated by the Court, and seven persons were included as owners on the 25th September, 1868.

4. The next step was to reopen the matter under the Equitable Owners Act, 1886, and on the 19th February, 1889, an order was made substituting 270 owners for those found on the first occasion.

5. A rehearing of these proceedings was applied for, and on the 5th February, 1890, the Chief Judge made an order cancelling the order mentioned in paragraph 4, on the ground that the order on investigation of title was made under an Act to which the Equitable Owners Act did not apply.

6. Subsequently, the Supreme Court decided that such titles were within the provisions of the Equitable Owners Act, and the Chief Judge remitted this with other matters to the Native Land Court to be dealt with again.