

**Questions of clarification for Jane Luiten**

**Questions in relation to main report (Wai 1750, #A12)**

1. **Page 65:** The author writes:

Opape Reserve was intended by the government as the sole reservation for Te Whakatōhea within the Bay of Plenty confiscation district.

2. Was this intention a specific Government policy (and conveyed in instructions to Wilson), or was this “intention” developed by Wilson in carrying out his role as Special Commissioner? Has the author located any materials (whether contemporaneous or close in time) which record that the Government intended that the Ōpape Reserve was to be the only land reserved to Whakatōhea within the confiscation district?

3. **Page 67:** The author writes:

Years later, Ngai Tamahaua rangatira Te Ranapia Waihuka recalled that exile to Wharekauri, the punishment meted out to the defeated people of Tūranga, was touted to Te Whakatōhea rangatira at Ōpōtiki at this time.

4. Did the author locate any contemporaneous records that refer to Wilson or other Crown officials considering exiling Whakatōhea to Wharekauri, or records of Wilson communicating this to Whakatōhea rangatira?

5. **Page 68:** The author writes:

... suggesting the forced relocation was imposed on the entire tribe.

6. Did the author locate any records that address how the process of relocating Whakatōhea members to Ōpape Reserve was carried out?

7. **Page 147:** The author writes:

Ngāti Ira’s industry in growing food on this ‘fine land’ under the noses of their Pākehā neighbours was remarked on ...

8. Could the author clarify the intended meaning of “under the noses of their Pākehā neighbours” in the context of this statement?

9. **Page 166:** The author writes:

For reasons which are unfathomable, lot 311 was not included among the parcels Under Secretary Fisher referred to the Native Minister to have dealt with under this provision.

RECEIVED

Waitangi Tribunal

30 Oct 24

Ministry of Justice  
WELLINGTON

8212942\_2

10. What were the “reasons” given by the Under Secretary?

11. **Page 176:** The author writes (emphasis in the original):

Te Ūpokorehe mana at Ōhiwa and Waiōtahe rested on widely recognised ancestral *take*.

12. Can the author clarify the use of “widely recognised” here—is it intended to refer to recognition by specific groups? What is the time period referred to—at the time Wilson arranged for the reserves at Hiwarau and Hokianga?

13. **Page 178:** The author writes:

Te Whakatōhea opposition in court to Rakuraku’s claim to Ōhiwa serves as a useful introduction to their pre-war presence at Ōhiwa and the increasing hegemony the tribal confederation wielded over the eastern Ōhiwa district from the late 1830s.

14. Is the author referring to Te Whakatōhea when using “tribal confederation”?

15. **Page 209:** The author refers to 173 beneficiaries of the Awaawakino reserve and 150 beneficiaries of the Waiohoata Hakuranui reserve.

16. Are these figures based on the gazetting of the reserves in “Schedule No 15, 1872” and “Schedule No 28, 1872” in the *Supplement to the New Zealand Gazette* (No 60), dated 12 November 1874 (see 782–783 and 788)? If so, is the author aware that:

16.1 There is no number “55” in the Schedule 15 numbering of women grantees in the Awaawakino Reserve—recorded as “Anawakino” (see page 782 of the 1874 *Gazette* referred to above)? Is the author aware this error also appeared in the Schedule 15 numbering in the 1872 AJHR (see AJHR, 1872 Session 1, C4 at 15)?

16.2 There is no number “40” in the Schedule 28 numbering of women grantees in the Waiohoata Hakuranui Reserve (see page 788 of the 1874 *Gazette*)?

17. **Page 252:** The author writes:

In court, the Crown agent was confronted by counsel for claimant Hoho Ngapuhi ...

18. Is this referring to the following part of Wilson's memorandum to Pollen, dated 25 July 1867 (RBD vol 123 at page 47434)?

In the mean time, a European claimant appeared, who said that having consulted Mr Russell of the firm of Whitaker and Russell, he was well aware that the Govt could not touch the land of one Hoho Ngapuhi, who he represented – with this person I had a good deal of difficulty ...

19. **Page 253:** The author writes:

Wilson's preference was to avoid court if he could, and to 'settle' claims directly.

20. Is this statement based on a record of a statement by Wilson, expressing this preference?

***Questions in relation to report summary (Wai 1750, #A12(c))***

21. **Page 5:** The author writes:

Wi Kingi of Ngai Tai was an important ally in the Crown's military campaign of 1865 ...

22. In relation to this statement, has the author considered the statement of A Agassiz recorded in "Papers Relative to the Murder of the Rev Carl Sylvius Volkner" [1865] 1 AJHR E-5 at 19, which states: "The Chief Wiremu Kingi, of Tumapahore [sic], says he will not interfere with the landing of soldiers. He and all his men will be neutral. He will not allow any soldiers to travel towards the East Coast, nor will he permit any Natives to proceed towards Opotiki ..."?

23. **Page 21:** The author writes:

... to have Bishop Pompallier prepare another 'deed' banning land trade altogether.

24. Is the author saying that Bishop Pompallier's deed would have affected in some way Church Missionary Society missionaries, or that Church Missionary Society missionaries would have considered themselves in any way bound by the Bishop's deed? Does the author consider that Te

Whakatōhea who were not Roman Catholic would have considered this deed applied to them?