

W.H.O 87/526

by the Survey Office at 1/8 per acre.

Pava Pakiki & Tamaiakohe were not present at this time.

I have also to remark that Pava Pakiki when present had undertaken to represent no. 5.

On the following day, ^{13 April} Tamaiakohe appeared & objected to any order for survey, costs in Tahora & Oamaru blocks. He said "I was no party to cutting off any part of Oamaru for the Crown - I should like this matter to stand over until I have communicated with Government - I look upon this survey (meaning both Tahora & Oamaru) as a murder, & I look upon the result of the proceedings of this Court in the same light".

Pava Pakiki at same time appeared & said "I agreed to cutting off land for Crown out of Oamaru - I consented if Government allowed us at the rate of 2/6 an acre - I was not here when matter was done, & I don't agree".

Te Ha Tawhito at same time said "In reference to No. 5 I protest against the arrangement made, & acreage cut off for Government to defray the cost of survey - I protest also in reference to arrangement as to No. 6 portion =

In reference to these 3 persons I would remark that for no 6 Ruanui Apototanga represented them & no doubt was authorised to do so - As to no 5, if Te Ha Tawhito & other Apatutahere chose to absent themselves (having notice of the matter) it was their own neglect - qui facit per alium facit per se - Does it apply here? There is no doubt that this matter had been discussed outside at the R. N. Court as well as in the N. L. Court

between the natives (or such of them as chose to accompany
the Bush Survey) one or not two days - or portions
of them -

I think I should also remark that it was a
sharp sense of injury ^{alleged to be} sustained by what was called
the surreptitious survey of Tahora no 2 that stimulated
the opposition in this matter. It was witnessed the
day after I made the order for the Survey over
Tahora.

L. O'Brien

12. 6. 89