OFFICIAL

Porirua ki Manawatu Inquiry (Wai 2200)

Answers to Tribunal Post-Hearing Questions of

Dr Grant Phillipson (Wai 2200 #2.6.302(a))

on

'Muaūpoko Gap-Filling Research Report'

(Wai 2200 #A252)

Bruce Stirling

September 2025

RECEIVED
Waitangi Tribunal
2 Sep 2025
Ministry of Justice
WELLINGTON

Wai 2200 #2.6.302(a)

POST-HEARING QUESTIONS IN WRITING FROM DR G PHILLIPSON, June 2025
Questions in writing for Bruce Stirling (Wai 2200, #A252)

1. Re the map shown at the hearing: How did the Court define the Horowhenua block? Was it based on the surveyed boundaries of a particular claim or claims? Is it possible to supply a map with an outline of the Horowhenua block over the surveyed claim boundaries?

The 1873 Manawatu-Kukutauaki judgment of 4 March 1873 excluded Horowhenua but did not define the area excluded, referring only to: "A portion of the block the boundaries whereof are not yet defined situate at Horowhenua claimed by the Muaūpoko tribe of which they appear to have retained possession from the time of their ancestors and which they continue to occupy" (Otaki MB 1, pp.176-178, cited in #A182, p.250). This left it for the Court to approximately define the Horowhenua block in order to investigate title.

The definition of Horowhenua was heard on Monday, 11 March 1873. Counsel for the five tribes (including Muaūpoko) continued to seek an adjournment until the matter of a rehearing was decided. The Court instead asked the five tribes to define the boundaries of the lands "retained and occupied by the Muaūpoko" at Horowhenua. Their counsel remained reluctant to do so, given "my general instructions not to proceed," but said Te Keepa could make a statement "defining boundaries as intimated." Te Keepa then made a statement "as to what he knows of the boundaries of the Horowhenua block." Being a statement, rather than evidence, it was not recorded in the minutes. The five tribes then withdrew from the Court (Otaki MB 1, pp.183-187, attached as Q1 docs).

The Court adjourned until two o'clock to enable a surveyor to produce a plan. It is not known what this plan was, but it was likely similar to the sketch plan of the Horowhenua block that was later annotated and produced for the 1873 title investigation (ML 4903). The marked-up sketch plan that survives today as ML 4903 was produced to the Court by Te Keepa on 26 March 1873, shortly after Muaūpoko opened their case with detailed evidence of their occupation of Horowhenua. The welter of detail prompted the Court to "suggest the desirability of a tracing being prepared showing all the places pointed out or intended to be referred to by the Muaūpoko claimants." It adjourned until two o'clock

when Te Keepa produced the map and continued his detailed evidence (Otaki MB 1, p.247, attached as Q1 Documents).

Returning to 11 March 1873, after the five tribes left Court, Ngati Raukawa gave evidence defining their version of Muaūpoko interests at Horowhenua. The first witness heard was Karanama Te Kapukai of Ngati Raukawa who defined a small area for Muaūpoko, bound in the north by a line from Tawhitikuri on the coast to Tauateuru on the western side of the lake (well north of the lake outlet) and across the lake top Waitui. That turned out to be the southern boundary, with Te Rauparaha then supplying the other boundaries; from Waeranga (east of Waitui) north to Pouahuia then west to Ngatokorua and on to Ngamana on the coast. A Ngati Huia witness, then Ihakara Tukumaru and Watene Tiwaewae endorsed the boundaries given (Otaki MB 1, pp.183-187 attached as Q1 docs). These boundaries can be seen in faint lines drawn on ML 4903.

Ngati Raukawa then defined their boundaries for Tuwhakatupua (apparently not disputed), before again applying for an award of the Manawatu-Kukutauaki block as modified by the exclusion of Horowhenua and Tuwhakatupua. The Court declined to order the award sought, "as to do so would amount to a decision on *ex parte* evidence of the question of the boundaries of the land owned by Muaūpoko at Horowhenua." It decided instead to make an order for Manawatu-Kukutauaki that excluded its own definition of the Horowhenua block. This was far larger than the narrow strip defined by Ngati Raukawa, and evidently more in accord with the boundaries given by Te Keepa (as shown on ML 4903). The Court excluded from its Manawatu-Kukutauaki award the land from the mouth of the Waiwiri stream east to Pukemoremore on the Tararua range, and from Waingaro on the coast east to Ngatokorua, on to Pouaotehuia and east to the Tararua range. The Court emphasised that this was not the final shape of the Horowhenua block, it was merely to "include all the land in respect of which we think the Muaūpoko may yet be heard as claimants." Counsel for Ngati Raukawa accepted this, on the basis that the area excluded for the Horowhenua title investigation remained customary land that they could contest (Otaki MB 1, pp.189-192, attached as Q1 docs).

This area defined by Ngati Raukawa for Horowhenua is shown not only on ML 4903 but also on the maps produced at the recent Tribunal hearing, which were based on the 1872 plan of all of the land claims between the Manawatu river and Pukahu. The restricted

area defined by Ngati Raukawa as 'Horowhenua' is more clearly delineated on the map produced for the recent hearing which shows how the various Ngati Raukawa claims around Horowhenua overlap with the Muaūpoko claims and the final Horowhenua block award. It is not known how the 1873 boundaries were selected by the Court but it clearly did not accept the very small area allowed by Ngati Raukawa. At the same time, it clearly did not accept all that Muaūpoko claimed around Horowhenua. As set out on the maps produced at the hearing, there were three Muaūpoko claims in the vicinity of Horowhenua; one extending from Kaikainui (north of Waiterere) to Waingaio (44,558 acres); the next from Waingaio to Mahoenui (north of the mouth of the Waiwiri) (70,089 acres) and; the third extending from Mahoenui to Ohau (21,618 acres).

The Native Land Court's boundaries for Horowhenua are not hugely different from one of the Muaūpoko claims marked on the 1872 map and shown at the hearing, being the claim labelled 'Waingaio to Mahoenui'. Or at least the Court's boundaries align quite well on the coast, other than the Horowhenua boundary extending slightly southward of Mahoenui to the mouth of the Waiwiri Stream. Where the Court's definition differs more markedly is in the bearing taken by the lines extending inland to the Tararua range; those on the Court-defined block take a different trajectory from those on the 1872 map. This significantly alters the total area from more than 70,000 acres noted on the maps produced for the hearing to just 52,460 acres shown on the final Horowhenua plan (ML 508). This reduction in area was the result of the Court selecting Pukemoremore as the southern boundary marker on the Tararua range, and having the northern boundary run parallel to the southern.

2. Page 25: Who was Horomona Toremi giving evidence for?

That is not stated in the source cited as it is not a minute book as such but a manuscript record of the evidence given. Horomona described himself as being of Ngati Kahoro of Ngati Raukawa. At the end of his evidence he was "re-examined" by Samuel Williams, which indicates he had been called by Williams and was appearing for his Ngati Raukawa clients. But this must clearly be a misunderstanding on the part of whoever wrote the manuscript because press coverage of the case clearly shows Horomona was one of Fox's witnesses for the Crown ('Thursday, April 9, 1868', *Wellington Independent*, 9 April 1868, p.5).

3. Page 28: What was Grove's reason for saying that this was 'possibly closer to the original'?

Grove did not directly say at p.72 of his thesis (being the page cited) why he thought Te Whatahoro's account may have been closer to the original. His comment on p.73 hints at his reasoning, where he says of that account: "The preceding explanation is supported by another anecdote relayed by Te Matia's grandson, Kipa Te Whatanui." Kipa related what Te Whatanui had said to Te Rauparaha about his plan to again attack Muaūpoko: "No one must climb my backbone" or 'E kore e pikitia tooku tuaraa'). (As noted in #A252 at p.29, Matene Te Whiwhi related the same evidence.)

In other words, Grove sees the customary concepts and language used in Te Whatahoro's account, and in Kipa's statement, as worthy of greater consideration than the English-language versions sourced from the evidence published in AJHR. It doubtless helped that Te Whatahoro's account is rendered in te reo Māori, but it also more explicitly references customary imagery than the versions in English. Grove focused in particular on the metaphor of te raataa maamore 'the branchless rata', where the focus is less on the shelter it provides (which the English-language versions emphasise) and more on the mana it embodies: it is "the rata that towers over all the other trees and one that cannot be climbed, i.e., his mana will not be trampled" (Grove, p.73).

It should also be noted that Te Whatanui used the metaphor of the 'branchless rata' in response to Taueki testing him on what was being proffered: "O friend, Te Whatanui, perhaps presently you shall have passed by and I shall be struck down by your people who are collecting on the shore" (Grove, p.72). Te Whatanui responded with an assurance that his mana ensured that his promise would endure, he being the 'branchless rata' that shall not be climbed.

4. Page 30: What is the specific evidence that only this small gift of land was made to Te Whatanui (see also later in the report)?

It is incorrect to refer to Raumatangi as a 'small gift'; it was a significant present in that it comprised not only occupation land in a prime location but included prized pa tuna near the lake outlet. It should not be overlooked that the abundant tuna of Horowhenua

comprised a very important resource, hence the lake – very much the jewel in the crown of this district – and the land around it was at the heart of the land retained by Muaūpoko.

Peeti Te Awewe (a widely respected Rangitane rangatira) referred in 1872 to the gift made by Taueki to Te Whatanui as comprising "Raumatangi" (Otaki MB 1, p.109). Hoani Meihana in 1872 also referred to the gift as comprising Raumatangi (*Waka Maori*, 24 December 1872, p.159).

Manihera Te Rau of Ngati Raukawa also referred to the gift as comprising Raumatangi. He denied assertions by others of Ngati Raukawa that their claim extended to Taua Te Ruru (north of the lake outlet, near Pipiriki pa), noting he had lived at Horowhenua since before Haowhenua and that Te Whatanui lived at Raumatangi (after Haowhenua) (Otaki MB 2, pp.17 and 21-24).

Erenora Tarataoa (daughter of Nepia Taratoa) referred to the trouble caused when Te Whatanui attempted to sell land "outside Raumatangi" to the NZ Company settler Yule. She also recalled that when Hoera Te Hukiki came to Horowhenua to try to claim land there, he "claimed Te Raumatangi" (Otaki MB 13, pp.249-250). (On the Yule incident at Raumatangi, see also #A182, p.112.) It was also Raumatangi that was previously offered by Te Whatanui to the Company (land that Wakefield rejected) (Spain minutes, 21 March 1843. BPP 1846(203), p.106).

When speaking to Travers about the matter in 1871, Te Keepa referred to the land given by Taueki as Raumatangi, adding it was the land Te Whatanui had tried to sell to the New Zealand Company (Travers, 'Horowhenua Land Dispute', 16 December 1871. MA 1, W1369/27, 1872/272. CFRT Document Bank, pp.4418-4440.)

In 1896, Te Keepa referred once to larger boundaries for Taueki's gift to Te Whatanui, saying it extended from Raumatangi out to the coast, indicating the inclusion of a strip of land along the south side of the Hokio River (presumably to give access to the sea) (AJHR, 1896, G-2, p.188). But, as Te Keepa went on to note, Ngati Raukawa had failed to uphold the tuku whenua – "your people left Taueki's word to one side" – which undermined the reciprocity on which it was based, and resulted in the boundaries being reduced to Raumatangi (AJHR, 1896, G-2, p.188). However, Te Keepa was not

supported in this evidence by his elders who had more immediate knowledge of the gift and who said it was only ever Raumatangi that had been included (see, for example, the evidence of Hopa Te Piki, Makere Te Rou, and Rawinia Ihaia in 1897. AJHR, 1898, G-2a, pp.96, 112, and 134).

5. Pages 31-32: What is the year and hearing in which Erenora and her brother Hare Reweti gave this evidence? Who did they give it for?

This is from the 1890 Horowhenua partition cases, specifically Horowhenua 11.

6. Page 36: What is the case being cited here and what year (about the 1850s arbitration)?

The evidence about the arbitration was given in an 1897 case about the ownership list for Horowhenua 11 (the 1897 evidence does not give a date for the arbitration, which has been inferred from other evidence about the boundary dispute dating from the late 1850s).

7. Page 38: Is this 'Te Hakeke' Kawana Hunia or his father? One witness called him "Kawana Hakeke'?

These are references to Kawana Hunia's father, Te Hakeke who was active in the district from the 1820s to the 1840s. He was also known as Kawana Hakeke (as noted by his descendant Grant Huwyler; #C14, p.3). His son, Kawana Hunia (or Kawana Hunia Te Hakeke) was born in the 1820s and did not come to prominence until about the time of his father's death in 1848 (#C14, p.8).

8. Page 43: Please provide a copy of the pages cited at footnote 225.

Otaki MB 1C, p.202 is attached (as Question 8 Documents). The other source referenced contains a typo in the page number (416), and should read Otaki MB 1D, p.415, which is also attached (as Question 8 Documents). Note that p.415 is the evidence of Rakapa Kahoki who is not named on p.43 (being a sister of Matene Te Whiwhi).

9. Page 53: Is a copy of Hoani Puaha's [sic; Puihi] letter in the supporting documents?

No, only material not already filed was included in the #A252 supporting documents. The letter referred to is fully referenced in #A182, being sourced from the massive

MA 13/69 files included in a document bank of material related to land purchases compiled by CFRT in 2010 for the Taihape and Porirua ki Manawatu inquiries. I am not aware of the ROI reference for these documents, and the letter referred to does not appear in the MA 13 file index and summary prepared by Waitangi Tribunal staff (#A159(a) and (b)). For ease of reference the original letter and translation are attached to these answers (as Question 9 Documents).

10. Page 60: Was Kingi the son of Metapere?

I cannot definitively ascertain this as the interests of Kingi's father (Ngatuere) were devised by will so they were not examined as part of a Native Land Court succession in which Kingi's mother might have been identified. There is a brief succession case for Metapere Puihi in 1903, but it concerned only rents from Pukatea (Wairau) land. Kingi was not named among her children in that case, but this is scarcely definitive as these may be the children from another marriage (11 WN 321-322). It can be noted that the name Metapere was maintained among Ngatuere's descendants (e.g., Metapere Kingi Ngatuere in 51 OTI 231).

11. Page 64: Please file a copy of the document or documents where Featherston described Muaūpoko (and others) as 'secondary claimants'. How did he explain that term, and what was his reasoning for describing Muaūpoko as 'secondary claimants'? How did Featherston know (or claim to know) what rights Muaūpoko held in the vast block?

The documents cited at p.64 were referenced more fully in #A182 at p.166 (being from MA 13/72b and MA 13/73a files at Archives NZ). They are quite lengthy memoranda that have already been filed elsewhere on the ROI for this inquiry and discussed in detail by other witnesses (not least those detailing Ngati Raukawa interests), but for ease of reference they have been attached to these answers (as Question 11 Documents).

Featherston's rationale is discussed in #A182 at pp.165-166, citing the above documents. He described those he deemed to be "principal claimants" as people who had, "for a term of years actually resided on the block," and who were also the chief proponents of the deed. Others with interests – including Muaūpoko – were described as "secondary claimants," who were said to be related to the "resident owners by family or tribal ties." He also described them more dismissively as "remote claimants," who he defined as those "who have only a distant tribal connection with the sellers" and whose inclusion

he saw as "practically one of sufferance and who are simply entitled to a present" of a share in the proceeds from the main vendors. Attached to his November 1866 report is a table of "Remote Claimants," which included Whanganui tribes, Ngati Toa, Muaūpoko, Ngai Te Upokoiri, and the "Non-resident section" of Ngati Raukawa. Another table listed the opposite, being the "Tribes claiming in chief," who included Ngati Apa, Rangitane, and the "Resident Section" of Ngati Raukawa."

Featherston drew a sharp distinction between "resident" and "non-resident" individuals, but without having actually established the history of occupation or the rights on which it was based. This distinction was important to him because "non-resident" Ngati Raukawa were among the strongest objectors to the deed (he also dismissed the Ngati Raukawa claims of "right by conquest" to the land). Muaūpoko did not oppose the deed and had joined with Rangitane in endorsing it, but despite the close connections and overlapping rights of the two iwi, Featherston classed one (Rangitane) as 'principal' claimants and the other (Muaūpoko) as 'remote'.

Featherston did not set out any evidence in support of his view, but his reliance on past Crown dealings in the district and those engaged in recent leasehold dealings with early squatters may explain the origins of his views. In that regard, he dismissed the Ngati Raukawa claim of conquest on the basis that they had not raised these during the adjoining Crown purchases. Muaūpoko had participated in several of those Crown purchases, but their participation was not always evident to the untrained eye, so Featherston is unlikely to have detected it. He may also have been influenced by the views of others (such Ngati Raukawa claimants) on Muaūpoko interests.

12. Pages 67-68: When you refer to people being born or living in 'the Manawatu', are you able to be more specific?

In most cases, the evidence about living in Manawatu was given in the 1890s during Horowhenua cases in which occupation rights at Horowhenua were important. As such, it sufficed to refer to an individual as having been living outside Horowhenua in the Manawatu without needing to be more specific about where.

The only clear cases where specific locations are given relate to title investigations for Manawatu lands in which the rights of Muaūpoko individuals who had established occupation rights are named. This evidence and the names of the individuals concerned is set out in relation to the Aorangi, Tuwhakatupua, Puketotara, Moutoa, Iwitekai, Otane, and Rewarewa blocks (Chapter 4).

13. Page 76: How big was this hostel? Could it house this many people?

It appears to have accommodated the 100 referred to. An 1865 press report referred to as "commodious" (when it was briefly taken over by the Native Minister and his staff after the capital was moved to Wellington, leading to temporary shortage of office space; see *Evening Post*, 17 August 1865, p.2). By 1880 the hostel was closed down and parts of it were used for office space when the Government Buildings (now the Law School) opposite Parliament became overcrowded. The Native Department was then moved to "the old native hostelry at the top of Molesworth Street" (*New Zealand Mail*, 13 March 1880, p.18). A few months later the Native Minister told Parliament the former hostel was being occupied by "such Judges of the Native Land court as might happen to be in Wellington, and partly by the commissioner of Native Reserves" ('House of Representatives', *New Zealand Times*, 17 July 1880, p.3).

A photo available online and dated to the late 1860s shows Thorndon from the top of Molesworth Street, giving a good view of the native hostel, which then comprised two large buildings with covered verandas. It appears capable of holding 100 if they were sleeping a la marae (see 'Thorndon, Wellington' 1/1-0178876-G [ca 1867-1869], Alexander Turnbull Library. URL: https://ndhadeliver.natlib.govt.nz/delivery/DeliveryManagerServlet?dps_pid=IE1259554&dps_custom_att_1=emu)

14. Page 77: Where is Parawhenua?

The precise location is unknown, but the published source cited indicates it was a Ngati Apa papakainga in the Rangitikei district. Note that either Featherston or the typesetter may have made an error in the spelling, so it is not beyond the realms of typographical errors and poor handwriting for 'Parawhenua' to be a mangled rendering of Parewanui.

Certainly, Parawhenua is not ever referred to again. Featherston records travelling through Manawatu, arriving at the Rangitikei pa of Ihakara of Ngati Raukawa on the evening of 15 January, and then proceeding on to 'Parawhenua' the next day, so this pa is no great distance from Ihakara's pa, so it quite possibly is a poorly-rendered version of Parewanui.

15. Pages 80-81: How many 'aggrieved runholders' were there, and what precisely is the evidence of what they did?

The report cited at footnote 427 refers only to how "the runholders mustered together" in an effort to drive off the sheep of Gotty, who had been placed on the land by Nepia Taratoa. The use of the plural suggests more than two (plus Gotty, whose wandering sheep had provoked them). The only runholder named is Daniell, but Gotty's 3,000 sheep – too numerous to fit on Nepia's unfenced land – were said to have wandered on to "other portions of the [Rangitikei-Manawatu] block, and a general outcry has been the consequence." The other runholders will have been those on the adjoining lands.

16. Page 82: Please explain why it was 'highly unlikely' that Ngāti Raukawa brought the letter from Wellington? This is not clear from your text.

It seems unlikely that a letter to Kawana amidst this fraught dispute would be given to his Ngati Rauakwa rivals to deliver. There was a mail service for such things. As also noted at p.82, both parties had sent rangatira to Wellington to discuss the dispute, so the letter would more likely have been given to Kawana's representatives to deliver than to the Ngati Raukawa who had travelled there.

17. Page 98: What is the evidence that Wi Hapi was 'far from being the only Ngāti Raukawa attendee' at Turakina? Who else attended, and in what numbers? What is the source for this?

As noted at p.95, about 50 Ngati Raukawa attended the Turakina meeting. The published report names only those who spoke, among whom were Henare Te Herekau, Heremiha Te Tihi, and Ngawaka (the first is familiar as Ngati Raukawa; the second identified himself as such, and Ngawaka is known to be (see p.112)).

18. Pages 101-102: From your understanding of the evidence, what did the rūnanga actually decide or propose that Wi Pomare would do when he came? What is the source or sources for this?

This is covered in more detail in my first report (#A182, pp.186-187); this part of the gap-filling report is focused more on the firearms issue. I have not located the report of the runanga (and it seems unlikely to have survived) but in a letter about its report that the runanga sent to Wi Pomare it stated: "Well, the runanga Maori did not give their decision in respect of the dispute," having "carefully considered the reasons for leaving this matter open." The reason for not deciding the matter was that Wi Pomare was not at the runanga and, in their view, he should come to resolve the dispute. They quoted from their brief report to the descendants of Te Whatanui and to Muaūpoko which says much the same thing, telling them that when Wi Pomare and Hinematioro came "then it will be clearly understood how to settle the question of your land. That is all." (AJHR, 1871, F-8, p.10). In other words, the runanga anticipated that Wi Pomare would make the decision which they had not made.

19. Page 111: When did Kawana Hunia's men get 180 firearms? How long had they had them by this time?

The distribution and retrieval of firearms in the region is examined earlier in Chapter 3.1. As noted at p.93, Kawana Hunia and nine Ngati Apa serving under him in 1866 were reluctant to return the 10 rifles previously issued to them by the government. Resident Magistrate Booth was instructed to recover them, and it seems likely that he did (pp.93-94). They appear to have subsequently been issued many more firearms: when Ngati Apa were called into action against Titokowaru in 1869, Kawana Hunia was reported in the press to have said he had "200 stand of arms which he would keep until the enemy was completely subdued, if for five or ten years, and then he would return them to the government." As noted at p.94 this appears likely to be an exaggeration, given the few firearms issued to his men that had not already been returned. But it does show he had government-issued firearms in 1869, and the government undertook to issue more for the new Taranaki campaign. The retained firearms plus any new ones issued for the 1869 campaign may have constituted the 180 firearms Ngati Apa and Kawana Hunia retained in 1873.

As also noted, Resident Magistrates in the region were asked to recover any government firearms held by Māori. That led to Resident Magistrate Woon identifying the number held by Ngati Apa under Kawana Hunia as 180; the return of which took place through 1873 and 1874 (p.111).

In addition to the 180 government-issued firearms still held in 1871, it is clear that Kawana and his men also had a number of rifles that were not supplied by the government, as did the many armed Ngati Raukawa against whom they were forced to defend themselves (pp.106-107 and 200).

20. Page 112: On the basis of your research, what is your understanding of why McLean 'failed to deliver the long-promised arbitration'? Have you seen any further evidence about this since your research for your first report (Wai 2200, #A182)?

The preference of McLean and the government was to have the Native Land Court resolve title, not least because this would facilitate land purchasing (which an arbitration would not do as a title investigation would still be required before purchasing could be completed). As noted, shortly before the arbitration was abandoned by the government it noted that purchasing the disputed land would be the "best and cheapest solution" (cited at p.200).

I have not seen any new material relevant to the arbitration since my first report was prepared in 2014.

21. Page 114: Do you know who Puke was?

My #A182 report cites sources identifying Te Puke as a Ngati Raukawa rangatira, who may be associated with Ngati Huia at Poroutawhao (#A182, p.42). However, Karaipi Te Puke also wrote from Muhunoa to offer that land to the Crown in 1863 and again in 1864 (#A182, p.158). He appears to be one of the main Raukawa aggressors at Horowhenua. When an arrest warrant was issued in relation to this conflict, it was in the name of Karaipi Te Puke, indicating he is the man referred to in question 21. Unlike the warrant issued against Kawana Hunia for the same reason, the warrant against Karaipi Te Puke does not appear to have ever been enforced (#A182 pp.299-303).

22. Pages 116-118: As discussed at the hearing, did the court issue a decision about the title of Tuwhakatupua (or decisions for Tuwhakatupua 1 and 2), and did it name a particular iwi (or more than one iwi) in its decision(s)? Please file a copy of the decision(s).

When Tuwhakatupua first came before the Court on 5 March 1873, having been excluded from the Manawatu-Kukutauaki award the day before (as had Horowhenua). Counsel for Hoani Meihana (who was also counsel for the five tribes) asked for a "short adjournment to enable them to consult with their friends who were absent, the object being to prevent future confusion." Counsel for Ngati Raukawa also sought an adjournment until they could decide how to proceed. On 6 March, counsel for Hoani Meihana formally applied for an adjournment until 10 March, "to enable them to consult with their friends who were absent as to the effect of the judgment lately given in [Manawatu-]Kukutauaki." Counsel for Ngati Raukawa asserted they, "have exercised great forbearance hitherto" and sought assurances no further adjournments would be given. Counsel for Hoani responded that the application for adjournment actually originated from Ngati Raukawa, "in consequence of a letter received by Te Keepa, the purpose for which the adjournment is asked is a *bona fide* one" (Otaki MB 1, pp.179-180, attached as Question 22 Documents).

On Monday, 10 March 1873, counsel for the five tribes (including Muaūpoko) advised the Court they would be appealing to the Governor for a re-hearing of Manawatu-Kukutauaki. Counsel for Ngati Raukawa applied for an order "in compliance with the judgment" and asked the Court to define the boundaries of the two blocks excluded from Manawatu-Kukutauaki (Horowhenua and Tuwhakatupua). Counsel for the five tribes replied that the notice of appeal "is sufficient ground for the Court to stay proceedings," but his opponent responded that an order for title was instead needed before a rehearing could be sought. The Court ruled that neither party was yet able to seek a rehearing, apparently because it had yet to define the boundaries of Horowhenua and Tuwhakatupua (which, by default, also defined the boundaries of Manawatu-Kukutauaki) (Otaki MB 1, pp.181-183, attached as Question 22 Documents).

On 11 March 1873 (in the absence of the five tribes, as noted at question 1 above) Ihakara Tukumaru gave his definition of the boundaries for Tuwhakatupua, but the next witness Henare Te Herekau, could not understand the plan before the Court. It adjourned for the

production of a "separate plan" of the block. On 12 March, Ihakara claimed part of Tuwhakatupua for Ngati Wehiwehi, and pointed to the line dividing their interests from those of other Ngati Raukawa, adding: "The Rangitane have lived on this land as slaves of N'Raukawa." Pitihira Te Kuru of Ngai Turanga clarified that one side of the boundary, "belongs to me, the other side to Rangitane and N'Wehiwehi." Reweti Te Kohu of Ngati Wehiwehi at Waikawa said Rangitane had claims inside the boundary given, but that "Huru's section of Rangitane have claims outside the line, Huru joins in the claims of N'Raukawa." (Otaki MB 1, pp.187-189, attached as Q22 Documents).

As noted in #A252 at p.118, when Tuwhakatupua was again called by the Court in April 1873, it was as Tuwhakatupua 1 and 2, when Te Keepa's request for adjournment of both blocks was unopposed. Note that the reference given at p.118 in footnote 595 on this point is incorrect; it should read Otaki MB 2, p.79 (not p.80).

In May 1874, Tuwhakatupua 1 was investigated and an award made subject to survey. Hoani Meihana's successful claim was "in favour of himself and tribe and others whom they admit as per list of names put in." Neither the award nor the title named the tribal group to whom title was awarded, but it is clear Rangitane were the main group and that the 'others' admitted included Muaūpoko. Title was awarded to 10 owners on the face of the title and 54 others on the reverse under the 1867 Act (s.17). The Tuwhakatupua 1 title is in the #A252 Documents at pp.404-409. As the claim was uncontested, the title investigation comprises just a single page which is attached (Wairarapa MB 2, p.114, attached as Question 22 Documents).

Tuwhakatupua 2 was investigated in July 1885, being claimed by Roiri Rangiheua of Ngati Turanga, who had "arranged with others outside" about the claims. Rangitane were to have Tuwhakatupua 2A, with the rest of the block for Ngati Raukawa. As there were no objections the Court merely asked for lists of owners for the two blocks. Te Keepa and Hoani Meihana asked for the 2A list to be adjourned to a pending sitting at Palmerston North. When the Court sat at Palmerston North in September 1885 to receive the list of owners for 2A, Horomona Paro told the Court Rangitane "had agreed to hand over land awarded to them to Major Kemp." Te Keepa did not seem prepared to accept this, asking: "Can the Court make it a matter for future consideration, leave it over for another Court," but the Court said it could not do so. He then agreed to the title being

ordered in his name only. Wi Mahuri of Rangitane responded that he had proposed giving the land to Te Keepa "along with the Rangitane" and said he thought he should "take my own share out of it." Hoani Meihana wanted them to withdraw from the Court to consider the ownership, which was done. On returning to the Court, Hoani Meihana said he had asked Wi Mahuri to "leave the matter as arranged in Foxton, and to let any other proposal stand for the future." Te Keepa agreed "to convey to parties if a division is desired at a future time." The Court then awarded title to Te Keepa alone (see Otaki MB 7, p.25, and Wairarapa MB 5, p.140, attached as Question 22 Documents). The certificate of title to Tuwhakatupua 2A has not been located by me.

23. Page 126: Why was Ngawhakaraua cut out of the Aorangi block. On your understanding, to whom did the court award Ngawhakaraua 1 and 2?

I did not consider why Ngawhakaraua was investigated as a separate title, as that is merely part of the normal process of applicants making claims to the Court for title investigation. To say, as I did at p.126, that it was 'excluded' from Aorangi was poor phrasing, as Ngawhakaraua 1 and 2 were not so much excluded or 'cut out'; they were merely investigated before Aorangi, being heard in 1869 and 1870 based on the customary interests asserted to them (which were evidently distinct from those in the adjacent Aorangi and Tuwhakatupua blocks, both investigated several years later). (For a location map of Ngawhakaraua, see #A212, p.146.) During the title investigation of Ngawhakaraua 1 it was noted that the land had been excluded from an adjoining Crown purchase arranged by Hirawanu Kaimokopuna of Rangitane (Otaki MB 1G, pp.79-80). To that extent it may have been a form of reserve from the purchase. However, my only interest in Ngawhakaraua was the connection to the Rangitane and Muaūpoko tupuna Tireo (and his parent Puakiteao).

The 1869 claim to Ngawhakaraua 1 (76 acres) was made by Hoani Meihana and those of Rangitane applying with him, but he clarified that he did not claim in the block (his interests instead being in Ngawhakaraua 2) and was instead acting for the claimants. The claim was objected to by Ihaka Te Rangimanuiora of Rangitane, who claimed with others from the tupuna Tireo. Te Reihana (Reihana Te Piki) of Ngati Wehiwehi was said by Peeti Te Aweawe to have joined in the latter's claim to the block, with Peeti also relying on descent from Tireo. Paora Taurua of Ngati Raukawa said the block belonged to them

and to Ngati Mairehau of Rangitane: “It first belonged to the latter, afterwards our tribe took possession of it and we have occupied it conjointly ever since” (Otaki MB 1G, p.82). The court awarded title to Ngati Raukawa and Ngati Mairehau (of Rangitane). Hoani handed in a list of 10 owners: Renata Paehora, Miriama Te Rangi, Karanama Paehora, hare Rakena Te Aweawe, Matiu Te Kotoi, Horima Mutuahi, Reihana, Erena Te Aweawe, Reweti Te Kohu, and Te Warihi. Other names were added to the title under the 1867 Act (s.17), comprising 26 Ngati Raukawa and 15 Ngati Mairehau (Otaki MB 1G, pp.58-85).

The 1870 claim to Ngawhakaraua 2 (86 acres) was surveyed on the instructions of Tutere Tiweta and Wi Mahuri of Rangitane. Hoani Meihana of Rangitane claimed the land, naming Roka Te Aweawe and Ripeka Hiha as his co-owners and adding: “We are of Ngati Rangi ‘hapu’ of Rangitane.” He rejected Tutere Tiweta’s claim, saying his ancestor’s land was southwest of Ngawhakaraua 2. Hoani named the ancestor for Ngawhakaraua 2 as Tireo ki te rangi, and he showed the descent of he and the other two claimants from Tireo (three generations earlier). He gave extensive evidence ab out the history of the occupation of the land, including a dispute about it with other Rangitane hapu (Ngati Hineaute and Ngati Mairehau) which was decided by a runanga in 1865. After also hearing from Tutere, the Court awarded the block to Hoani Meihana, Roka Te Aweawe, and Ripeka Hiha (Otaki MB 1F, pp.782-792).

24. Page 130: ‘In the Court’s view, the 1869 decision ... had the question even been asked). Proceeding on that ahistorical basis...’ The meaning of these statements is unclear. Are you saying here that the court misunderstood or misinterpreted the 1869 judgment, or that the court considered the 1869 judgment was wrong?

The 1869 decision did not involve Muaūpoko so I have not considered it in any detail. It is the subject of much existing evidence. What I am saying here is that the Court’s view in 1904 was that the 1869 decision meant that Rangitane had no customary interests in the Rangitikei-Manawatu block. Whether the Court’s 1904 view of the 1869 decision is correct is a matter for legal submission, as is the extent to which the 1869 decision can be seen as ‘right’ or ‘wrong’. In either case, it is irrelevant to Muaūpoko as it did not consider their interests.

My point is that relying on the 1869 decision to conclude Rangitane (or Muaūpoko) have no customary interests at Puketotara (or elsewhere in the Rangitikei-Manawatu block) is

incorrect and ahistorical. The evidence clearly shows both groups have customary interests in the Rangitane-Manawatu block generally and in the Puketotara block specifically. The Court's error in 1904 was to view the Puketotara award as a purely political concession by the Crown that was based solely on occupation as of 1866, when those interests were customary and based on ancestral connections and occupation before and after 1840.

25. Page 133: Please provide the exact quote of what Nireaha Tamaki was recorded as saying about Puakiteao (top line of page 133). Did he describe Puakiteao as his Muaūpoko ancestor?

Nireaha said: "Hoani Meihana's mana was derived through Puaki Te Ao" (Otaki MB 38, p.176). My point about Puakiteao being Hoani's Muaūpoko ancestor is not sourced from Nireaha. But the importance of Puakiteao and Tireo (eldest son of Puakiteao) for Hoani is noted elsewhere (see, for example, AJHR, 1898, G-2a, pp.55-56, 68 and 78. Note also that Puakiteao is referred to more than 100 times in this 1898 source). The link between Puakiteao and Hamua (Nireaha's hapu) is also noted (AJHR, 1898, G-2a, p.79). On Puakiteao and Muaūpoko, see #A182, pp.103-104, and on the links between Puakiteao and Tireo see #A252, pp.122 and 126).

26. Page 134: Why did the court decide in 1893 that it had no jurisdiction over Puketotara 336?

The source given at p.134 is a 1904 minute by the Court Registrar who notes: "The land having been granted under the Rangitikei Manawatu Crown Grants Act was not dealt with by the Court. An application under the Equitable Owners Act came before the Court on 4th September 1893, but was dismissed, probably for want of jurisdiction" (#A252 Docs, p.521). No record of a sitting of that date has been identified in any relevant Minute Books. Based on the Registrar's comments, the dismissal is because the grants were not issued under the Native Lands Act 1865 and were thus not subject to the Equitable Owners Act 1886 (which had a relatively narrow application).

27. Pages 188: In 1956, it had become 'normal practice' to remit all but the last five years' of survey lien interest. Have you seen any evidence as to when this became 'normal practice' – was it with the introduction of the Māori Affairs Act 1953? Is it reasonable to assume that this 'normal practice' was limited to Crown purchasing, where the department was involved (this was stated in the context of trying to negotiate a Crown

purchase), since A court recommendation was no longer involved (section 410 of the Māori Affairs Act 1953)?

It was the Director-General of Lands who wrote in 1956 (in the source cited) that five years interest was normal practice. This is not provided for in Māori land law so it appears to have become a practice adopted at the discretion of the Lands Department and its Minister. The Native Land Acts 1909 (s.402), 1931 (s.500), and 1953 (s.409) provided for interest at five percent to be charged with no reference any time limits. The 1931 Act (s.503) and 1953 Acts (s.410) provided for the Minister of Lands to remit survey charges (a Court recommendation being first required under the 1931 Act only). As the question indicates, where it was in the Crown's interest to remit the charges – or remit the interest, or remit all but the first five years of interest – it was prepared to do so. Such remissions were a feature of consolidation schemes and, as in this example, Crown purchasing; circumstances in which it was in the Crown's interests to make such remissions.

28. Pages 187-188: Do you know if the remission actually occurred at this time, when the purchases did not go ahead but later some land was purchased? Were the remissions actually ever carried out for the Horowhenua blocks as proposed?

I need to clarify that the 11 August 1953 correspondence cited at footnote 913 states that the Minister of Land's approval of the waiving of the survey liens and interests was "in principle" only. That is, it depended on the purchase negotiations succeeding. In the case of the Horowhenua titles referred to, the purchase negotiations were abandoned and thus neither the liens nor the interest were remitted.

29. Pages 193 and 202: When and why was the Hokio A block vested in the Māori Trustee for afforestation? Was it the whole block? Is this already covered in existing research?

The short answer is that it was vested in the Trustee in 1968 to sell or lease for afforestation. There was a need to better utilise the land in order to generate income, prevent erosion of dunes, and clear noxious weeds, and the Trustee was appointed to act on behalf of the owners to achieve these ends. The owners did not want to sell, only to lease. The vesting was not all of Hokio A: it excluded the area earlier sought for a child welfare institution, which had been vested in the Trustee in 1965 for the purposes of arranging a long term lease of the area thought to be wanted by the Education Department (about 98 acres). That land was later taken rather than leased, as noted in the existing

research (and touched on in #A252). The owners strongly opposed the sale of Hokio A, and did not agree with the terms of the proposed afforestation lease negotiated by the Trustee with the Forest Service, so in 1975 the vesting was cancelled. This is set out in more detail below.

My earlier #A222 report was prepared on the basis that Hokio A had been addressed in the existing research, but that appears to have been in error. The existing research covers the Hokio township, some aspects of Hokio A (related to a public works taking for a child welfare institution, the revesting of some township land in Hokio A, and accretion issues at the township), and some rating issues (#A193, p.563). As a result of my misunderstanding, only some additional material on rates-related issues affecting Hokio A were included in #A222, an issue which necessarily touched on the afforestation lease negotiations of the early 1970s (at pp.190-193). The existing research did not cover the issues around the attempts to afforest the land that are detailed in #A252.

Hokio A was amalgamated in 1963. In 1965 the Court heard an application to vest Hokio A in the Maori Trustee for afforestation, but the Forest Service was only interested if it could "obtain considerable further areas inland" of Hokio A. The Trustee did not want to accept the trusteeship for all of Hokio A but would accept it for the part being sought by the Education Department for the child welfare institution. What was then proposed was a long-term lease of the land sought for this institution and the Trustee was appointed on that basis (Otaki MB 71, p.341, attached as Q29 Documents). The 1965 order apparently made an error about the titles involved, which was corrected by a variation to the vesting order in 1967 (73 OTI 114, attached as Q29 Documents).

In 1968, the County Council applied for Hokio A to be vested in the Trustee for sale (due to noxious weeds). The Court heard that negotiations for a forestry lease with the Ministry of Works were then underway, and the Council urged afforestation to retard erosion. The Court ordered a s.438 vesting in a trust to sell or lease the lands but imposed a 50-year limit on the lease (Otaki MB 74, pp.191-192, attached as Q29 Docs). In 1972, the Trustee old the Court he had been negotiating a forestry lease with the Forestry Service but it was to be for 99 years (more than the 1968 order provided for). Variations were also needed to correct the areas referred to in the existing orders and titles. A fresh

vesting order was made to enable the 99-year forestry lease (77 OTI 49, attached as Q29 Docs).

In 1975 the Trustee returned to the Court, advising that despite "protracted negotiations" with the Forest Service had reached a stalemate and a "deadlock" in 1974, at which point the owners sought the revesting of the land in the owners. Accordingly the Trustee asked that the 1972 vesting be cancelled, which was ordered (79 OTI 83-84, attached as Q29 Docs). In 1976, Hokio A was vested in a s.438 owners trust, who retain administration of the land today.

30. Pages 195-199: Why did the calculation of costs for renting seem 'almost frightening' to the Forest Service – what was meant by that statement?

This quote is from documents cited in my #A222 evidence (at p.191). The document (a Forest Service memorandum of 3 February 1971) is reproduced in the supporting documents to #A222 at p.6 and states: "The complications involved in leasing several small areas of Maori land are almost frightening." The complications referred arose from the Forest Service's desire to purchase or lease the numerous parcels inland of Hokio A, which were described as "a complex of Maori, freehold, and leasehold." The perceived complexity lay in dealing with multiple titles under differing tenures (as opposed to the single title of Hokio A). It was considered "desirable to acquire and afforest" the land but, as of 1971, this was seen to be "neither urgent nor likely to be profitable."

31. Page 200: How was this 'steering committee' appointed? Was it done through the court or the Trustee (as this land was vested in the Trustee)? Was the land vested for non-payment of rates?

The document cited at footnote 962 refers only to the existence and membership of the steering committee, not how it was appointed. The Trustee told the Court in 1975 that the committee was, "elected by an informal meeting of owners at which discussions [on] certain terms of lease were verbally agreed upon by all parties concerned' (79 OTI 83, attached as Q29 Documents). As the committee was established under the Trustee's administration, the records relating to it will be held by the Trustee and are not accessible.

The committee appears to have been formed in 1972, prior to the variation of the terms of the vesting (see question 29 above). It is not referred to prior to then, and appears to

have been established to enable the owners to more effectively liaise with, and communicate their wishes to, the Trustee who, as recently as September 1971, was advocating for the sale of the land despite the owners being firmly opposed to sale (see, for instance, Conservator of Forests, Palmerston North, to Forest Service, 28 September 1971. #A252 Docs, p.704). In July 1971, the Forest Service had proposed dealing only with the Trustee for Hokio A "without further reference to the owners" but it understood "he is unlikely to agree to do so" (Conservator of Forests, Palmerston North, to Forest Service, 8 July 1971. #A222 Documents, p.5). The owners committee enabled the Trustee to better reflect the owners' wishes when dealing with the Forest Service.

Regard the vesting part of the question, as noted in reply to question 29, in 1968 Hokio A was vested in the Trustee (for lease or sale) on the application of the County Council (which had applied for the land to be sold). In Court, the Council referred to noxious weeds and erosion issues but – as noted in the existing research (#A193, p.563, and; #A222, pp.190-192) and also in this report – rates charges were a factor in the vesting, with the Court, the Council, and the Crown colluding over use of rates charges to press for a purchase (#A252, pp.200 and 204).

32. Page 204: Did the lease of Hokio A not happen at all? Was no protective forest or other planting carried out by the Forest Service? Without this forestry opportunity, what were the owners able to do with their land?

No. As noted at p.204, the Trustee and the Forest Service abandoned lease negotiations in 1975. As noted in reply to question 29, in 1976, Hokio A was vested in a s.438 owners trust. A small part of the block adjoining Waitarere Forest is afforested (this is also noted on the memorial schedule as pre-1990 forest for the purposes of carbon credits). The rest of Hokio A has been the subject of short-term farming leases returning very modest rents (see historical memorial schedule reference to a 1977 lease for five years at $350 per annum and a further five-year lease from 1982). The trust was varied in 1982 to provide for longer leases (up to 30 years) and to enable the trustees to "engage in silviculture." In 1986, 25 hectares of Hokio A was leased to the Levin Borough Council for five years at a rental of $1,000 per annum. In the same year, 341 hectares of Hokio A was leased to a farmer for 15 years at an annual rental of $3,000 per annum (see historical memorial schedule, attached as Q32 Documents).

The owners, or their current trustees, are best placed to advise on what else has been done, and is being done, with the land.

33. Page 214: What ultimately happened to the Kupe rūnanga house? Was Kupe located in or near Pipiriki pā?

I have not seen any further references to the Kupe whare runanga. Its location is shown only very approximately on the ML 4903 Horowhenua block sketch plan, being close to Panui o Marama (near the lake outlet), which is at least one kilometre southwest of Pipiriki pa (which was nearer the point Te Rae o Te Karaka around which a substantial Muaūpoko papakainga existed.

In 1897, Raraku Hunia noted having recently built a house "near Kupe" (AJHR, 1898, G-2a, p.40). Raraku's house is clearly marked on the 1900 survey plan of 'Horowhenua Pa' at Te Rae o Te Karaka, the new house being on 11B2, near the lake and just east of Panui o Marama (ML 1655, LINZ). Had Kupe still been standing in 1900 it seems likely it would have been noted on the survey plan. On the other hand, Te Rewanui Apatari referred in 1897 to someone who had lived at Puata, "near where Te Kupe now stands" indicating the whare runanga was still standing (although much would turn on what tense was used in te reo Maori and how well it was translated) (AJHR, 1898, G-2a, p.48).

34. Page 217: Is there any information as to how these two 'artificial eel ponds' were created? Were they closer to the lake or the Hokio Stream?

There is no information in the very limited sources referred to as to how these ponds were created. The evidence relating to other sites of significance refers to the digging of channels ('whakamate') to create eel-trapping areas (see, for example, Ngakawau at p.238, O-hita at p.239, and the extensive work for Tangi-mate at pp.265-266).

The approximate position of the two ponds (Te Ua o te Kahu/Roto a te Kahu and Ukiuki is shown on ML 4903. They are well to the south of Raumatangi and about equidistant from Hokio River (to the north) and the lake (to the east). Te Ua o te Kahu is shown on the map in blue as a small lake (or lagoon) while Ukiuki is defined by a dotted circular line (indicating it was not a permanent water body). Te Ua o Te Kahu was said by

Te Keepa to be “an eel lake of Muaūpoko” (Otaki MB 1, p.252). It was Kawana Hunia who referred to it as “an artificial eel pond. Ukiuki is also another” (Otaki MB 2, p.6).

35. Pages 231-232: How far up the ranges did the Te Arapaepae trail traverse? To what extent did Muaūpoko use the Tararua ranges?

Arapaepae refers to the broad ridge in the foothills of the Tararua ranges, and the evidence about it emphasises food gathering (birds such as kiwi and weka as well as hinau berries and aruhe) (#A183(a)). Hinau bark was also gathered for dyeing. This indicates it was in the foothills and lower part of the ranges, rather than the higher mountains where such foods would have been limited and harder to access. As noted in #A252, Arapaepae is also a spiritual pathway for Muaūpoko to the afterlife.

Muaūpoko have related that the forest there is also home to ngarara (lizards) that are of significance to Muaūpoko, being associated with the atua Whiro and valued as kaitiaki of the spiritual pathway of Arapaepae. The Arapaepae ridge was a place where travellers would karakia before ascending or traversing the Tararua ranges (Muaūpoko Tribal Authority and Lake Horowhenua Trust, ‘Assessment of effects on Muaūpoko values Otaki to North of Levin Highway Project’, 2022, at 4.4.2).

Muaūpoko use of the Tararua ranges is beyond the scope of my research and is a matter best addressed by claimant witnesses. What can be noted here is that Arapaepae was not the only trail into the ranges. Another trail began at Te Kopi bush and entered the ranges via Ohau (p.214). Urungahuatau was another trail that passed over the Arapaepae ridge into the ranges (p.221), and Te Aratoaka was a trail in this area used for birding and gathering mahinga kai, including the pith of the mamaku (tree fern) (#A252 p.233).

Evidence of past Muaūpoko occupation and use of the Tararua ranges includes an old whare found by a surveyor in the upper Mangahao catchment in 1879 and an adze found in 1900 at what is now known as Broken Axe Pinnacles, east of the dividing ridge (Baber, SO 11456, LINZ, and; C. Bannister to G. B. Wilson, 16 May 1937. MS-Papers-1003-7, ATL). Leslie Adkin found a flint knife near Waiopehu Hut in 1928, associated with what is thought to be a moa hunter site. Another adze was found in 1932 on the track above Field Hut, while other finds in the ranges include tools and flakes of obsidian. Based on

such finds and local knowledge (not least from Muaūpoko), Adkin identified several trails over the ranges used by Muaūpoko and their whanaunga on the eastern side (G. L. Adkin, 'The Waipoehu flint knife and moa remains, annals of the Tararua range 2, pp.374-376. MS-Papers-0261-31-2. ATL; *Evening Post*, 7 February 1928, and; Adkin, 'Maori lore of the Tararua range', 1951 lecture. MS-Papers-0261-22. ATL).

Among the trails identified by Adkin in the vicinity of Horowhenua is one up the Mangahao Gorge, on which an adze and a sperm whale tooth have been found (Adkin, 'Discovery of a sperm whale tooth in Tararua Range', MS-Papers-0261-31-3, and *Horowhenua*, p.7. The adze was found above the Mangahao power house in 1988.) Working north to south along the ranges, obsidian was found on Pyramid Knob (The Camelbacks) in 1970; an obsidian knife on Schormanns Track in the 1990s; an adze near Makoriko stream about 1900; obsidian below Square Knob; a flint knife on the trail at Waiopehu Hut in 1928; a waka kereru and a number of umu on a trail east of Manakau, and; a number of adzes along the trail beside the upper Otaki river.

Another trail "used often by hostile parties" leaving from Ohau heading east from Kuku stream and up to Oriwa before crossing Pukematawai and the Arete-Bannister ridge down into Wairarapa (Adkin, *Horowhenua*, p.6 and 'Maori lore of the Tararua range', 1951 lecture. MS-Papers-0261-22. ATL, and Phil Barton (former ATL Map Curator), 'Maori trails in the Tararuas[sic]', MS 77-089. ATL). Another trail went inland up the Ohau River and along the Tararua range to link up with the headwaters of the Otaki River, as was recorded by the early traveller James Crawford, and traces of the "well-trodden but very old track" were found by Pakeha trampers in 1928 (James Crawford, *Recollections of travel*, 1863, p.203; Adkin, *Horowhenua*, p.88, and; G. B. Wilson, 'Tararua lake of legend, Tararua 3, MS-Papers-1003, 1949, pp.5-9).

Another form of 'use' of the Tararua ranges by Muaūpoko is also reflected in the establishment of wāhi tapu located high in the hills. On the summit ridge of the ranges is the wāhi tapu Awa-riki (between the source of the Otaki river to the west and Waingawa river to the east) (#A252, p.232). Another wāhi tapu atop the ranges is Tawhirikohukohu ('whirling mist'), above the source of the Ohau river, as well as the wāhi tapu peaks of Ngapuketurua. Te Hanga-o-hia-tangata is a peak sacred to Muaūpoko at the heart of the

ranges. The tapu lake Hapuakorari is in the ranges, as is Oriwa, a former lake (emptied by earth movements) near the summit ridge (pp.234-235).

36. Page 232: What was the nature of the wahi tapu 'Awa-riki'? Was there information about it in the minute books?

The source at p.232 is Adkin's book. No reference to it has been seen in minute books.

37. Page 238: Why did Muaūpoko move from Namu-iti pa to O-Toi with the coming of Christianity?

The arrival of Christianity here in the 1830s was used rather loosely and inappropriately for the purposes of dating the move, partly because O-Toi was the site of the first church built at Horowhenua in the early 1840s. By then, Muaūpoko were living at many places around Horowhenua. I must emphasise the reference to Christianity was my addition: the sources at p.238 do not give a time period for the move to O-Toi (beyond noting in 1873 that Te Namu-iti was "an old pa of ours"). Muaūpoko had of course been forced to abandon fortified island pa such as Te Namu-iti before 1830, as they were not defensible in the era of musket warfare.

38. Chapter 8: Have any of the whakamate survived? How many of these lagoons and wetlands have been drained?

The current state of the land in the vicinity of these whakamate is not known to me, but it seems unlikely any could have survived land clearance, drainage, and land development (not to mention the near total eradication (outside of the lake) of the tuna for which they were constructed). Muaūpoko claimants may be able to provide further information.

39. Page 250: What is the evidence that these burials were 'more likely' a result of an epidemic?

It is more a matter of deduction than evidence. It has been shown that the colonial-era estimates of hundreds of Muaūpoko having been killed in the attack on Papaitonga in the early 1820s are wildly inaccurate. Even Ngati Toa and Ngati Raukawa witnesses concurred with Muaūpoko that the dead numbered only a few dozen (#A252, Chapter 1.1). The presence of the large number of koiwi of those who (if Buller is to be believed)

had been buried at Papaitonga within a short period can thus only be explained by the arrival of a deadly epidemic disease (such as the dreaded ‘rewharewha’ known to have swept the motu in this era).

40. Page 256: Do you know if the tree fort was attacked with muskets in the 1820s or 1830s?

There is no reference to these forts being used in the era of musket warfare, for they would have been next to useless against musket-armed foes. After seeing the effect of muskets at the lake, it is extremely unlikely Muaūpoko would have resorted to these traditional tree forts. Muaūpoko themselves refer to the forts being used in times of “traditional warfare,” rather than in the early nineteenth century when they first came in to contact with those bearing firearms (Muaūpoko Tribal Authority and Lake Horowhenua Trust, ‘Assessment of effects on Muaūpoko values Otaki to North of Levin Highway Project’, 2022, 4.4.9).