

in the evidence just quoted as Manginangina. Again, Hone Rameka, who was actually one of the signatories to the petition in 1935, in giving evidence in the Native Land Court in 1933 on the investigation of the title to the two small triangular pieces of land containing 110 acres and called Motukauri (though it was also referred to as part of Manginangina), said that "Mokau" was the piece of land on the other side of Motukauri and was sold to the Crown. He was referring, of course, to the 7,224 acres. He also said: "This" (meaning Motukauri) "is the last block of papatupu land." Obviously, if the case now attempted to be made is correct, the block of 7,224 acres would have been papatupu land. But no such suggestion was made. On the contrary, Hone Rameka admitted that the 7,224 acres had been sold to the Crown. In view of the fact that the alleged original petition was never actually presented and no trace of it can be found, of the doubt therefore as to its actual existence, and of the further fact that the application for investigation of Takapau in 1911 was apparently made by an individual only, and nothing of a definite character was done until 1935 when the first petition to Parliament was presented, there is at least considerable ground for the suggestion that the modern claim is an afterthought, especially having regard to its nebulous character and the conflicting material upon which it is sought to be established.

42. Even the tradition regarding the killing of the woman (Meinga) referred to by some of the witnesses is indefinite. Even if the location of that incident were material, it completely loses its importance or significance by reason of the fact that, whereas an attempt is now made to locate the killing on Manginangina or Takapau (as part of Manginangina) the evidence given in the Native Land Court in 1878 placed it on Mokau No. 2.

43. Knowledge, on the part of all parties concerned, of the sale in 1859 is also to be inferred from a tracing of the history of the lands surrounding this Mokau or Manginangina Block of 7,224 acres. To begin with, on the north-west there is the Matawherohia Block, which was purchased by the Crown, as is evidenced by deed of the 8th June, 1859. The owners of that land, as stated in the deed, were the Chiefs and people of the tribe called Ngati Uru, and one of the signatories was Heremaia te Ara. Wi Hau was not an owner of that land, nor were the Ngati Whiu interested in the ownership, though Hamiora Hau and Hone Peti, two members of the Ngati Whiu Tribe and signatories of the Manginangina deed on the 28th January, 1859, were attesting witnesses of the signatures to the deed of cession of Matawherohia. The plan of the block shows that on the south-east it is bounded by Manginangina, which is noted on the plan as "Government land—Wi Hau's sale."

44. Below the Matawherohia Block and on the western side of the 7,224-acre block which we are investigating is the Omataroa Block, the title to which was investigated by the Native Land Court in April, 1875, and was very shortly afterwards sold to the Crown. This block contained 3,320 acres, and although Tupari Raniera gave evidence that he had a claim on the land from his ancestor, he said that he had agreed to let Hamiora Hau, who was one of the owners, have the land. He said there was no dispute, and, as all other claims were withdrawn, an order was made in favour of Hamiora Hau. The plan of Omataroa shows the land on the east—*i.e.*, the block of 7,224 acres—as Government land.

45. Then to the south of Omataroa Block is the Waitaroto Block, containing 7,590 acres, which was investigated by the Native Land Court in July, 1866, on the application of Waaka Nene and his people, and of this