(*k*) The price £240, or 8d. an acre, for 7,224 acres was on a par with the prices paid by the Crown for other large areas set out below:—

	Area (in Acres).	Price Paid.	Price (per Acre).	When Purchased.	Remarks.
Bay of Islands District.					
		£ s. d.	s. d.		
Ororu Block ..	15,000	350 0 0	0 6	Sept., 1856 ..	..
Taraire	7,000	300 0 0	0 10	Dec., 1856 ..	Bush.
Muriwhenua South ..	36,385	1,400 0 0	0 8	Feb., 1858 ..	..
Wharenaru ..	13,555	400 0 0	0 7	Feb., 1858 ..	..
Mawhe	5,000	450 0 0	1 8	Jan., 1859 ..	..
Mokau	7,224	240 0 0	0 8	Jan., 1859 ..	..
Kawakawa	15,000	1,000 0 0	1 4	June, 1859 ..	..
Kohumaru	11,000	400 0 0	0 8	Aug., 1859 ..	Bush.
Waiake or Upper Aorere	6,950	220 0 0	0 7	Aug., 1959 ..	..
Poheke	6,000	300 0 0	1 0	Sept., 1859 ..	..
Maungatauiwha East	8,469	388 0 0	0 11	July, 1862 ..	Bush.
Maungatete ..	11,175	509 0 0	0 11	July, 1862 ..	..
Whangarei and Kaipara Districts.					
Waikiekie	12,000	400 0 0	0 8	Oct., 1856 ..	..
Pakiri	38,000	1,070 0 0	0 6	Mar., 1857 ..	..
Tatarariki	12,000	350 0 0	0 5½	April, 1857 ..	..
Ika-a-rangaranei ..	8,000	500 0 0	1 3	Dec., 1857 ..	..
Okahu	18,000	600 0 0	0 8	Dec., 1857 ..	..
Mata	11,108	600 0 0	1 1	Feb., 1858 ..	..
Matakohe	68,000	2,000 0 0	0 7	Mar., 1858 ..	..
Kaukopakopa East ..	7,200	500 0 0	1 4	Dec., 1858 ..	..
Paparoa	15,021	500 14 0	0 8	Jan., 1859 ..	..
Arapekue	9,500	350 0 0	0 9	Jan., 1859 ..	..
Kaukopakopa West ..	5,223	300 0 0	1 1½	Jan., 1859 ..	..
Pukekaroro ..	8,458	422 18 0	1 0	Aug., 1859 ..	..
Waikeriawera ..	12,758	500 0 0	0 9	Aug., 1859 ..	..
Oruawharo	30,000	1,200 0 0	0 9	Jan., 1860 ..	..
Mirowhakatiki ..	5,500	300 0 0	1 1	Nov., 1861 ..	..
Ruatongata ..	5,450	300 0 0	1 1	Nov., 1861 ..	..
Hikurangi	12,000	600 0 0	1 0	Jan., 1862 ..	..
Maungaturoto ..	6,815	511 2 6	1 6	May, 1862 ..	..
Awakino	16,000	500 0 0	0 7½	28th March, 1854	..

(*l*) In 1859 Manginangina (including what the Natives called "Takapau") was a wilderness, with very little value for any timber in it. Natives made no claim to it until value of forest had been greatly increased by New Zealand's progress and heavy expenditure of public funds.

(6) In view of the importance of the case the Court has set out above and at some length the main contentions of counsel, and will now deal with them under various headings:—

(7) *Long Delay in Claims.*—The petitioners' case was seriously prejudiced by the lapse of eighty years. As a result the evidence of Native witnesses was extremely weak and unconvincing, except in the case of Mr. George Marriner. Counsel for petitioners had to fall back on facts plainly evident from the existing records, and also rely on the moral issues. Counsel for the Crown was entitled to stress the long and quite unreasonable delay, for which the Natives had been able to give no satisfactory explanation. The Court holds that such delay must necessarily weigh heavily against the Native case, but that British justice will not preclude a reasonable measure of redress if other considerations justify it.

(8) *Identity of Land sold.*—Mr. George Marriner's was the only Native evidence which showed care in preparation, and it raised a doubt in the Court's mind as to the location of certain place-names. However, this doubt was not strong enough to justify rejection of evidence based on the survey (Plan 1166) of the 7,224 acres by Mr. Fairburn in 1858. It is hardly possible now to disprove the accuracy of place-names entered on a survey plan over eighty years ago. The Court accepts the plan as identifying the 7,224 acres Wi Hau and others sold.

(9) *Name of Block sold.*—The deed says "Mokau." The sketch on deed is marked "Mokau and Manginangina." In 1859 there was no Native Land Court in existence with power to investigate ownership and give a block a name. The Crown's purchasing agent could therefore accept the vendors' name for a block. Mr. Kemp called it "Mokau." It turns out now that its proper name was "Manginangina." Whether the name "Manginangina" ever covered the portion now called by the Natives "Takapau" is not so clear. There is no real proof either for or against. However, the important aspect for the Court to consider is not so much the name itself, but what it signified to the Natives entitled to the land. Here the Court finds some remarkable features in the case. This 7,224 acres was not an