

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION FOR PAUL MEREDITH – 3 DECEMBER 2012

Questions of Clarification for Mr P Meredith regarding chapter 9 of the Ngāti Maniapoto oral and traditional history report, “Ngāti Maniapoto Mana Motuhake” (Wai 898, A110)

1. On page 601, you state:

Some of this ‘korero’ we have is in their native tongue. Engaging with te reo Māori texts can extend our shared understandings of particular concepts and histories, and sometimes correct inaccuracies and assumptions that may have developed through the absence of the Māori language account. In other cases we have had to rely on a draft or published translation. Such translations have been read with a particular critical eye.

1.1 Would you please clarify what you mean by the sentence “Such translations have been read with a particular critical eye”? Whose critical eye are you referring to? Are you referring to yourself or someone else?

1.2 What criteria have been applied when these translations are critiqued? For example, do you consider the language skills of the author?

1. 1.1 I am referring to myself. I think probably a better phrase might have been ‘a careful eye’.
- 1.2 I think you can often tell when you are reading whether the translation is by someone who is a native speaker thinking in Maori, as opposed to a second language person thinking in English and writing in Maori. Where I know the author, I have considered their language skills. I am not an expert in translation theory, but rely on my own language skills and also assistance from colleagues and kaumatua.

2. On page 601, you refer to words, “Whakarongo mai e Ngati Maniapoto” that Wahanui spoke to a gathering of the tribe to discuss the ‘opening’ of Te Nehenehenui to the Pākehā. Do you know which gathering this was?

2. I am referring here to the gathering 15 March 1883 at Taonui’s house, Taupiri, at Te Kuiti as recorded by Te Reti.

RECEIVED

Waitangi Tribunal

04 Dec 2012

Ministry of Justice
WELLINGTON

3. At pages 602-603, you refer to the following extract from the Kawenata o Maniapoto:

Na runga i te ingoa Kingi-ka taru-a-haetia e Kewha. Katahi ka kino, te tukunga iho, ko nga pakanga, i Taranaki, i Waikato a te pakeha me te Maori o te tau 1860-1864 – koia e waiho nei hei aue mo te iwi Maori tae mai ana ki tenei ra. [It was because Potatau became King that the fighting of this area stopped. Because of the name “King” - the European was envious of this and did not like it. And it was for this reason that War broke out at Taranaki and Waikato between the European and Māori from 1860-1864 and this is left as hurt and pain for the Māori people up to this day.]

- 3.1 Do you agree that the wars of the 1860s were the result of factors considerably more complicated than the fact that Europeans objected to Potatau’s use of the name, “King”? Do you think the rangatira who drafted the Kawenata o Maniapoto understood that to be the case?

3. 3.1 Yes I agree.

I think the rangatira who drafted the Kawenata considered Pakeha dislike of the notion of a Maori King as a key cause of the conflict in Taranaki and Waikato. But I am sure they would have been well aware of other factors.

4. At page 603, you say that “Ngāti Maniapoto were stalwarts of the King Movement”. Is this statement made in reference to a particular time (such as the time when the King Movement was founded) or to the history of the King Movement generally?

RECEIVED

4. I was referring to the beginnings of the Kingitanga. I would say that Ngati Maniapoto has and continues to enjoy a unique relationship with the Kingitanga which stems from the Haurua meeting in 1857 and the Kingitanga’s whakapapa connections within Ngati Maniapoto. There are more learned people within Ngati Maniapoto to discuss this such as Tom Roa and Rovina Maniapoto.

5. At page 604, you set out the following statement of Te Rerenga Wetera:

E mohio ana au i te wa i whakatungia ai a Potatau hei Kingi i tukua te mana o nga whenua katoa o te Rohe Potae nei me o etehi iwi atu kia ia i raro i te mana o tona Kingitanga. [The country was formerly made over to Potatau as King and to his successor Tawhiao, but that was a purely political movement.]

6. Can you clarify what Te Rerenga Weterere meant by the words “but that was a purely political movement?”

6. The words “but that was a purely political movement” are not evident in what was translated. They appear to be an interpolation from the translator. Some further research is required regarding the Maori text.

7. At page 605, you say:

Ngāti Maniapoto would continue to garrison Paratui for some years after Orakau. However it became increasingly clear that the Puniu river would take on a new significance for Ngāti Maniapoto and the Kingitanga. The Puniu river was now a powerful symbol of the European’s confiscation line and a border between King Tawhiao and Ngāti Maniapoto on one side and the Pākehā on the other. According to Kingitanga historian Carmen Kirkwood, Government recognition is recorded in Kingitanga sources as:

Tawhiao, ko tenei taha o Te Puniu, nga take katoa o tenei taha o Te Puniu, ko te Kawanatanga te rangatira. Na, kei tena taha o Te Puniu, nga take katoa kei tena taha o Te Puniu, ko koe, Tawhiao, tuturu te rangatira. Ko koe te Rangatira [Translation in the original source] Tawhiao, on this side of Te Puniu (river), all matters affecting this side of Te Puniu, the Government is responsible. Now, on that side of Te Puniu, all matters pertaining to that side of Te Puniu, you, Tawhiao, are totally in control. You are the chief.

7.1 Are you able to clarify whether this was a Kingitanga statement (by a member of the Kingitanga) of what it understood the Crown’s position to be, or was it a statement that a Crown official made. In either case, do you know who made the statement and when?

7. 7.1 Reading the Maori, it seems to a Kingitanga record of statement by a Crown official. It could well be a Kingitanga interpretation of what it understood the Crown’s position to be. I recall the late Dr Tui Adams recalling this statement when speaking of the aukati in personal exchange with myself.

I don’t know for sure who made this statement and when. I note that at a meeting between Sir Donald McLean, then Native Minister, and King Tawhiao at Kaipiha (near Pirongia) 26 May 1876, the question of the return of some Waikato burial sites was raised. A record of that meeting gives McLean’s response to Tawhiao as follows:

“The Government are prepared to recognise your authority (*mana*) over your land (*to whenua tuturu*)” AJHR, 1876, G. 4, p. 6.

8. At page 607, you refer to the “offer” that Ngāti Matakore “supposedly” made in 1885 to place 400,000 acres of land under the mana of Tawhiao. Have you used the word “supposedly” because you have doubts as to whether Ngāti Matakore made the offer?

8.1 Your report does not mention the publication of a statement by the Four Tribes in which they condemned the offer. Is there a reason for that? Has your research located the Māori-language version of the statement (termed a “manifesto” by the media)?

8. 8.1 It is certain that some of Ngati Matakore made the offer, ie those in attendance. However, we don’t know who were the Ngati Matakore people involved here and whether they themselves had the consent of Ngati Matakore to make the offer. At the very least, it was a pretty dubious offer as we see that there were other claimants to the 400,000 acres in question.

I should have made mention of the publication of a statement by Ngati Maniapoto and the other tribes in which they condemned the offer. I have not in the time available been able to locate any Maori language version of this statement.

9. At page 607, you state that “Tawhiao did not have unfettered occupation of Ngāti Maniapoto lands”. In support, you give an example of Makereti Hinewai’s opposition to an attempt by King Tawhiao to settle his people at Whenuahou and a somewhat different example of Ngāti Maniapoto leaders rejecting Ngāti Matakore’s “offer” to place 400,000 acres of land under the mana of Tawhiao. Can you clarify what rights and responsibilities Tawhiao had in respect of Ngāti Maniapoto lands?

9. On reflection, I think the Ngati Matakore example was not a good example as it is post the 16 March 1883 agreement when Ngati Maniapoto decided to pursue a path that Tawhiao was not in support of.

In respect of Ngati Maniapoto lands, Tawhiao was the mana over the land. That is, he embodied and represented the political aspirations of mana Maori and the retention of Maori land. This has to be understood in a context where existing cultural ideas and norms were being applied to extraordinary circumstances. Tawhiao’s mana co-existed with the general leadership of the chiefs. Tawhiao could not act without the authority of Ngati Maniapoto over those lands. And he did not.

10. At page 607, you state:

Nonetheless, despite attempts by government officers and newspaper reporters to play up the idea of a widening split between Maniapoto and Waikato throughout the 1870s, Ngāti Maniapoto remained throughout this period generally supportive of King Tawhiao and the Kingitanga movement as representative of Māori independence.

10.1 Does your reference to “this period” refer only to the 1870s, or do you claim that Ngāti Maniapoto still followed the King in the 1880s?

10. “This period” is in reference to the 1870s. There is a shift in the relationship in the 1880s. It was never a matter of simply ‘following the King’ or not. This was one of several significant relationships that the Maniapoto leadership was attempting to manage under pressure from the Crown.

11. At page 608, you refer to the meeting Bryce had at Kihikihi in December 1883 and state that “Taonui described the aukati at that same meeting as “a great policy of ours”. Do you accept that, when Taonui used the words “It was a great policy of ours”, he was actually referring to the political association known as the King movement?

11. Yes he is referring to the King Movement but he also states that “A portion of that policy was the isolation of certain districts and the exclusion of Europeans therefrom.” The latter is obviously referring to the aukati.

12. At p 608, you state that “as late as 1883” Taonui was “re-erecting the posts of the aukati”. Also, at p 611, you state: “These aukati or notional boundaries should not be seen as the traditional boundaries of Ngāti Maniapoto. Certainly both Wahanui Huatare and Hauauru Poutama attested before the first sitting of the Native Land Court at Otorohanga in 1886 that the aukati boundaries of the Rohe Potae as they affected Ngāti Maniapoto were not traditional borders.”

12.1 Was it the aukati that was marked out in 1883, or the lands of the Four Tribes that had not yet been dealt with by the Native Land Court?

12.2 Would you please identify the page number in the document bank where the telegram specified in footnote 1104 is located?

12. 12.1 It was those lands of the Four Tribes that were still in Maori ownership. The aukati was

- reaffirmed on those lands through the erection of the pou.
- 12.2 Footnote 1104 is incorrect. The correct footnote should be Letter from Rewi Maniapoto, Te Ni, and Te Kohika) to Grey 23 April 1883, Grey letters, GNZ MA 197 Auckland Public Library. Translation in the original source.
13. At page 614, you refer to a letter from Titokowaru to Wahanui “warning of the dangers of continuing the conflict”. Which conflict are you referring to? Do you know when Titokowaru wrote his letter?
13. The conflict referred to here is that of the Taranaki, Waikato Wars and the subsequent antagonism towards the European. Wahanui wrote to Titokowaru after the killing of Rev. Whitely 13 February 1869. Titokowaru then wrote back sometime in 1869.
14. At page 624, would you please provide a translation for the sentence: “Ka tohe te Kawanatanga ki a Ngatimaniapoto kia hoatu e ratou tetahi wahi o to ratou whenua ki a Tawhiao ratou ko tona iwi”?
- 14.1 It would appear that the footnote for this sentence should state that this is a letter from Bryce to Tawhiao (in which Bryce sets out the Government’s offer to Tawhiao). Is that correct? Is there a translation of that letter?
- 14.1 That is correct. My translation is “The Government will pressure Ngatimaniapoto to give an area of their land to Tawhiao and his people.”
15. At page 627 you state that “Rewi received a similar letter from Bryce”. Would you please provide a reference to that letter?
15. This may be an error. I have so far been unable to relocate the reference to this.
16. At page 627, you state: “Wahanui and other Ngāti Maniapoto chiefs gathered at Rewi’s settlement on the Puniu river. Here they dwelt at some length on the position Wahanui was placed in by Bryce at the Whatiwhatihoe meeting” (underlining added). Would you please clarify what you mean by the words that are underlined?
16. I should have said ‘as a result of the Whatiwhatihoe meeting’. What I am saying is that Bryce essentially blames Wahanui and Ngati Maniapoto alone for the rejection of his proposals to Tawhiao. At the very least that is the impression that Ngati Maniapoto had. I have no doubt that the response would have been more widely discussed and agreed on by others, including Tawhiao himself. Wahanui was the mouthpiece.

17. Further, at page 627 you state that:

A scheme was then formed by which they could avoid the enormous expense incurred in passing their lands through the Lands Court. A resolution was proposed, and accepted unanimously, that a certain number of men should be sent to better mark their rohe porotaka or external boundary by erecting posts in order to better protect it.

17.1 Are you using the word “porotaka” here in the same sense as you have used it on page 612 where you say (starting at the bottom of page 611):

By the late 1860s, the various aukati and puru around the territory had effectively become what Wahanui and Rewi described as a ‘porotaka’ an encircling boundary of which the mana Māori dominated under the auspices of King Tawhiao.

17.2 Do you agree that use of the terms “porotaka” and “porowhita” or “porohita” carry the connotation of being “surrounded”? Is this what you describe as the encircling boundary?

17.3 Although you have not cited it, the source for your reference to the scheme and resolution that the chiefs decided upon at their meeting appears to be a letter from Robert Ormsby to the *New Zealand Herald* published on 12 May 1883.¹ That letter states that the area to be defined was the “remaining portion of what was termed the King country, upon which Europeans had no claim”. That would seem to describe an area smaller than that to which you refer when you use the term “porotaka” on page 612. Is that correct?

17.1 The use of it on page 612 is Rewi’s usage. But yes it is that same sense of the external or surrounding boundary of the territory.

17.2 No, I don’t think so. I would have thought when used in connection with the term rohe, it is more about a surrounding boundary. There are other words for surrounded such as pokai and karapoti.

These is no doubt however that Ngati Manaipoto felt a sense of the encroachment all around them by Pakeha settlement. In the 1883 petition, Wahanui and others stated:

Kua oti hoki matou te **karapoti** e nga mahi nanakia katoa, e nga mahi whakawai a nga Horo Whenua tae mai ana ano ki etehi o nga Maori, me nga awhekaihe ... “We are beset on every side by outrageous practices and the temptations we are exposed to by speculators and even Maoris and half-castes ...”

17.3. No I think it is the same. The rohe porotaka at this point in time was to be those bordering lands that separated land in European hands and those still held in by Maori. Rewi’s primary objective was for all lands within the boundary to be governed by Māori

and to be permanently inalienable Māori territory. However, Rewi was seemingly prepared to concede the lands that had been 'acquired' by Europeans: "Regarding the lands the Maoris have disposed of to Europeans, I will not stretch out my hands towards them. I refer only to the lands which have not been dealt with by Europeans."¹

18. At page 628, would you please give the date in January 1883 of the *Auckland Star* cited in footnote 1186?

18. The reference is Auckland Star 10 January 1883.

19. At page 628, you refer to 50,000 acres at Mokau that the Crown "had supposedly purchased". Do you doubt that the Crown had purchased that land?

19. I have not studied the Mokau purchase in depth. I am reflecting contemporary concerns about the Mokau purchase.

20. At page 629, you refer to a letter from Te Rerenga published on 15 January 1883 in the *Hawera & Normanby Star*. Do you agree that the Te Rerenga's letter also stated that Mokau people:

consider they have nothing to do with other people whom the government have been unsuccessful in negotiation with, and as they alone are opening up the country for the Government, they feel it hard that the amnesty promised by the legislature is being so long withheld"

20. Yes but I also note that Wahanui, Rewi and Te Rerenga had called a hui at Totoro in the Mokau region for 26th February 1883 with a view to discussing with the people developing proposals for Bryce. Clearly, in this instance, Te Rerenga believed he had something to do with Wahanui and the other chiefs. Mokau has for a long time being associated with Ngati Maniapoto, hence the saying Mokau ki runga, Tamaki ki raro.

The letter 15 January, to my mind, is some positioning on Te Rerenga's part in his bid to seek a pardon under the Amnesty Act. He was most likely worried that Wahanui and Rewi's position towards Bryce threatened his pardon. Indeed Bryce indicated that he might withhold the application of the Act over the 'King Country'. It should be noted that not long after this Rewi wrote to Bryce asking for a proclamation of amnesty of their district. Rewi clearly had Te Rerenga in mind here.

¹ New Zealand Herald, 23 February 1882, p. 5.

21. At page 629 in the second full paragraph, would you please clarify why you say that Wahanui agreed “reluctantly” to meet with Bryce at Alexandra on 7 March 1883? What sources do you rely on for the other statement in that paragraph?
21. Wahanui wanted to consult the people first. He wasn’t keen to talk formal business with Bryce. Wahanui later said in a telegram to Bryce:
- I ki atu ahau ki a koe i Areka, kei te iwi nui tonu te tikanga, na i ki atu ano ahau ki a koe, kaua e takohetia, kaore ano te iwi kia ata korero e te Paraihe. Waiho ra kia taka hoki te ahuru kei he manawa te iwi ... [I told you at Alexandra, the right is with the wider people, and I also said to you, don’t rush as the people have not discussed this, Mr. Bryce. Let it be for now lest you upset the people.]²
22. At page 629 to 630, you say “The next day Bryce, treating Ngāti Maniapoto territory as open to all travellers, despatched Charles Hursthouse on an exploratory survey” (underlining added). Do you agree with evidence on the record of inquiry that:
- 22.1 On 8 March 1883, Bryce issued instructions to Hursthouse to begin an exploratory survey;² and
- 22.2 Hursthouse set out on his exploratory survey on 12 March 1883?³
22. 22.1 Yes
22.2 Yes
23. At page 631, you refer to the hui held on 15 March 1883. Evidence on the record of inquiry shows “that the hui was attended by prominent Māori from outside the district”. Would you agree that this suggests that the hui had been pre-arranged and that the leaders who attended were not meeting under pressure imposed by Bryce?
23. I am not sure what the evidence is “that the hui was attended by prominent Maori from outside the district”. The Totoro hui was pre-arranged so it is feasible that prominent Maori from elsewhere may have still been in the district.
- Nonetheless, it is clear that the leaders felt they were meeting under some pressure from Bryce. Bryce’s telegrams to Wahanui and Rewi the day before this meeting are evidence of this. He seeks Wahanui and Rewi’s assistance to clear the path for

² Geo T. Wilkinson, telegram, to Native Minister, 15 March 1883 (includes a letter to the Native Minister from Wahanui) Te Mahuki file MA 23/5 ANZ-Wgtn.

Hursthouse and to see that Ngāti Maniapoto do not turn him around again. Bryce warns Wahanui that “He tika ka taea e ahau ano te whakawatea toku huarahi.” [I am able to clear my own path.] In context, I consider that this would have been seen as a threat.

24. At page 638, you state that, “Wahanui and the others requested a copy of this letter provided to them as written proof for the future of what was agreed.” What is your source for this statement?
24. Cathy Marr states this in her report and refers to “file annotations” presumably on the Te Mahuki file. I should have referenced her at this point. That a copy was requested seems likely. Why else would they have asked for the agreement to be put in writing? I cite Marr in the next sentence where she notes the leaders later used the letter from Bryce as written proof of their understanding of the agreement the government made with them before a government inquiry in 1889.³
25. At page 639, the source you have cited in footnote 1218 would appear to be incorrect. Is the correct reference “Letter from Taonui to Native Minister, 3 December 1884, NO 84/3668, ANZ-Wgtn”, which is at page 467 of your document bank?
25. Yes it is incorrect. The correct reference is that at page 467 of my document bank.
26. At page 640, you state “Wahanui had taken on the burden of making an agreement with Bryce” and on page 642, you state that “Wahanui was no doubt eager to demonstrate he would honour his agreement with Bryce”. At page 643, you refer to the “whakaoati’ that [Bryce] made with Wahanui”. These statements appear to characterise the agreement of 16 March 1883 as one between Bryce and Wahanui alone. Do you agree, however, that Wahanui did not act alone on 16 March 1883 but in conjunction with five other rangatira?
26. I agree that Wahanui did not act alone and that Wahanui himself did not want to be seen acting alone. However Wahanui was at the forefront of these negotiations.

³ Marr, C. Te Rohe Potae Political Engagement 1864-1886, Part Two, Waitangi Tribunal Report, p. 133. For the Taupouniatia Commission, see AJHR 1889 Session I, G-07.

27. At page 641, you note that, according to Hakarata, Bryce agreed to Wahanui's request to wait for two weeks before sending in his surveyors and on page 642 you state that Bryce had already breached his agreement with Wahanui by sending in his men early. Do you agree that, in her report at page 782, Cathy Marr states that "[r]eports indicate that Bryce agreed to no more than a two day delay", and that, in the event, it "stretched to almost a four day delay"?⁴
27. Yes that is what Cathy Marr states. I am not sure what reports Marr is relying on for those two days. I am relying here on Hataraka's account who clearly states that Wahanui told Bryce to wait for two weeks. When Bryce asked why, Wahanui replied: "The tribe is absent. I alone am here, and they must assemble and hear what has been said by me ..."⁴ Hataraka claimed Bryce agreed to this. This is consistent with Wahanui wanting to more widely consult.
28. At page 642, you state "Following the Te Mahuki incident, Bryce travelled through the King Country himself with Te Rerenga Wetere as his guide". Do you agree that:
- 28.1 before the Te Mahuki incident, Bryce had signalled his intention to travel from Alexandra to Mokau; and
- 28.2 when Bryce did travel he did so as part of the survey party?
- 28 28.1 Yes
- 28.2 Yes but the symbolic significance of Bryce as the "firm" Native Minister, travelling though the King Country was not lost on Maori or Pakeha. See for example the article, Reception of Hon. Mr. Bryce. Taranaki Herald, 18 April 1883, page 2.
29. At page 643, would you please:
- 29.1 give the date of the *New Zealand Herald* to which you refer in footnote 1230; and
- 29.2 provide a reference for the stoppage in the Ohura district in April 1884, to which you refer?
29. 29.1 Should be 21 April 1883, page 5.
- 29.2 See New Zealand Herald, 29 April 1884, page 4.

⁴ Wanganui Herald 12 May 1883 p 2.

30. At page 644, you state “Wahanui, nonetheless, spoke of a ‘piringa pono’ or a bond of good faith, no doubt in connection with the ‘whakaoati’ that Bryce had made: ...”. However, in the English translation that follows, you refer to “a bond of faith” (not to “a bond of good faith”). Is that difference intentional?

30. No it was not intentional. I don’t think a bond of faith and a bond of good faith are too dissimilar in translation particularly when read in context.

31. At page 645, you set out part of a letter from Wahanui published in the *Wanganui Herald*, 11 June 1888, at page 2. However, the full part of that passage in Wahanui’s letter states:

Now our principal reason in consenting to have our land in the Rohe Potae here surveyed and adjudicated at Court was the promise made to us by the Hon. John Bryce when he was (Native?) Minister. We placed absolute reliance on that word of Mr Bryce, for he personally told us that he would give due respect to our land, and that he would prevent all evil practices from being done in our district.

31.1 Do you agree that, in this passage, Wahanui does not appear to be talking about the meetings of March 1883 but is apparently referring to the December 1883 survey agreement?

31. 31.1 My first impression was that he was talking about the 16th March 1883 meeting. It may be that he is referring to the December meeting but I’m not sure we can be certain either way. It could be referring to the course of dealings over that year with Bryce.

There are other instances where Wahanui and others are talking about Bryce’s promise and I think they are referring to the 16 March meeting. For example there is Taonui’s letter to Ballance, 3 December 1884. There is also John Ormsby, in correspondence with Wahanui in early 1884, concerning in part the railway exploration, referring to “e ai ta te whakaoati a te Paraihe i Whatiwhatihoe.” [according to the ‘whakaoati’ of Bryce at Whatiwhatihoe.]⁵

32. At page 654, the reference in footnote 1264 appears to be incorrect and should be the *New Zealand Herald*, 1 December 1883, page 6, “The Native Minister and the Kingites”. Is that the case?

32. Yes the correct date is 1 December 1883, page. 6.

⁵ Ngakuru Te Rangikaiwhiria – Waiata, ATL Ref. MS-Papers-0189-106.

33. At page 679, you state that “During the 1880s a paper outlining the principles concerning the mana of a chief was circulated around the country and signed by leading Native Land Court Māori Assessors [including] John Ormsby of Ngāti Maniapoto”. Do you agree that John Ormsby was identified as the chairman of the Kawhia Native Committee?
33. Yes. In a newspaper article that I originally cited around this, the signatories were merely described as Native Assessors. I note that John Ormsby became an Assessor of the Native Land Court in 1886.
34. On pages 683 and 684, you discuss the reaction of Tawhiao to Ngāti Maniapoto’s petition in 1883 and the agreement to allow an exploration of the survey line, and Wahanui’s response.⁵
- 34.1 Do you understand that Tawhiao and Wahanui said this to each other at a meeting between the two in 1884 or 1885?
- 34.2 Do you agree this is a significant rupturing of the relationship between the two at this stage?
34. 34.1 I am relying here on Tohe Rauputu’s oral evidence here. He is a significant authority on Ngati Maniapoto traditions. I note that Mr Rauputu gave some evidence on Tawhiao’s presentation of guns to Mair in 1881 which very much aligned with a newspaper account of the time that I cited.
- 34.2 There is a difference of opinion between these two leaders as to the best course forward and they pursue different paths. It would be better to characterise the reaction as one of disappointment by Tawhiao to a firm resolve by Maniapoto to pursue an engagement policy. It is important to note however that Maniapoto was never excluding the King, but wanted him to agree to their approach. They would have preferred to have proceeded under the mana of the Kingitanga if they could.
35. On pages 687 and 688, you describe John Ormsby’s speech on 15 April 1886 when Native Minister Ballance, Wi Pere and Major Ropata met Wahanui and the Kawhia Native Committee members.
- 35.1 Was John Ormsby also inviting Ballance to attend the meeting on the 20th?
- 35.2 Did he also ask that Ballance look into the issues with the Land Court, and seek his assistance in developing a policy for the district?
35. 35.1 Yes.
- 35.2 Yes.

36. On page 688, you note “Unfortunately no detailed account of the meeting from the 20th [April 1886] at Te Kopua has been located. However it was at this meeting that it was decided to make a renewed application for their external boundary which was duly dated 28 April 1886.”
- 36.1 Have you considered the short report in the *Waikato Times* on 27 April 1886 “The Ngati Maniapoto Meeting at Kopua. The King Country to be put through the Court”?⁶
36. 36.1 I don’t think I have looked at this. It is very brief. I was looking for a more detailed account of the hui, including transcripts of speeches, to get a better understanding of what transpired.
37. On page 689, you note that “In the past the Native Land Court had received applications which cut into the Rohe Potae boundary but had not acted on them and even sometimes referred them on the to Kawhia Committee.”
- 37.1 Please identify those applications that were referred to the Committee, and your sources for this.
37. 37.1 I relied here on Marr p959-960 and footnote 3189. I am trying to locate the letter referred to in that footnote: Letter John Ormsby (te reo) to Mr Hamand, 9 September 1885, (p 25) John Ormsby letterbook, copy in Otorohanga Historical Society Museum.
38. On pages 691 and 692, you record criticism of the presence of Native Agent Wilkinson at the first Native Land Court hearings at Otorohanga.
- 38.1 During this period, was Wilkinson the Government’s permanent representative in the district?
- 38.2 Are you aware that when John Ormsby raised a concern with Native Minister Ballance about Government agents purchasing land before subdivision in January 1887 “Ballance ... stated unequivocally that “The Government would not purchase any land until the sub-divisions had been made...”?⁷
- 38.3 Have you seen the positive endorsement of Wilkinson given at that time?
- 38 38.1 I understand that at the time of the hearings he was the Native Agent, Alexandra to the Under-Secretary, Native Department.
- 38.2 No I was not aware of that, although it is clear from this statement that it was an intention to purchase despite constant pleas from Ngati Maniapoto that their land be made inalienable.

38.3 No I have not.

39. You quote Wahanui on page 692 and provide a reference at footnote 1408.

39.1 Should “acclaim” in the second line read “a claim”?

39.2 Should “in act” in the fifth line read “intact”?

39. 39.1 Yes.

39.2 Yes.

40. On page 693 you provide a quote from Paratene Ngata’s record of what he said during the Rohe Potae Block investigation: “[I say your problem is that you are trampling on yourselves. The organisation of your cases are lost in the clouds, and coming to nothing. Your survival is with yourselves, but you must take action here and now. You must remove your cases from the hands of your lawyers, you must cleanse the paths of the bad things that have said and the accusations made.]”

40.1 What exactly do you think he is saying in this context? For example, it appears that he is encouraging them to come to agreements among themselves rather than litigating old disputes before the Court. He appears to be saying that internal dissension has meant that the court sitting has extended for four years and led to the costs specified.

40.2 Please provide more information about the context for this statement.

40. 40.1 I think he was essentially saying to Ngati Maniapoto to take control of their destiny. The Native Land Court process was merely causing internal divisions and ruptures. I note that he tells them to essentially do away with their lawyers.

40.2 Paratene also said to the chiefs, “ko to koutou mate, he takahanga na te Kawanatanga, ara me ona kaiwhakahaere i tetahi tikanga nui, ara, e ritie ana he tino Tiriti whaimana.” [Your problem is that the Government, that is his officials, have breached a major agreement which is akin to a Treaty of significant standing.]

The agreement he is referring to here is the Aotea agreement. He claims Ngati Maniapoto agreed to one survey map and one Court for the whole block.

Ngata notes that before all this, this land was designated Maori land where Maori law prevailed under the mana of the Maori king.

Ngata says he told them that he advised them to seek a Royal Commission of Inquiry from the Government. Ngata noted he was prepared to assist them.

Ngata also suggested they ask the Minister to come so that they may place their

grievances before him. There is then a recollection of the visit of Mitchelson, the reading of a petition by Ngati Maniapoto and his agreement to request a Commission. Ngata then talks about his involvement in assisting Ngati Maniapoto in what he suggests was the resulting Royal Commission. I think he is referring to the Taupouuiatia Royal Commission.

41. On page 695, footnotes 1415, 1416, and 1417, you refer to n 2, n 1, and n 4; what are these references to?
41. n.2 should be Te Heuheu Tukino - Claim to have his children's names inserted in the Rohe Potae list, Alexander Turnbull Library, MS-Papers-4760-5; Collection Record: Grace, John Te Herekieke (Sir), 1905-1985 : Grace family papers (MS-Group-0218).
n.1 should be Rohe Potae - Te Heuheu's Case, Otorohonga MB No. 3.
n. 4 should be Chapters 7 and 8 of the Pouakani Report Wai 33, (Waitangi Tribunal, Wellington, 1993).
42. On page 696 you note that: "In 1888 Wahanui wrote to Ballance complaining about the Native Land Alienation Act being repealed in favour of the Native Land Administration Act 1888."
- 42.1 Was Wahanui in fact concerned about repeal of Native Land Administration Act 1886 by the Native Land Act 1888, and the associated amendments in the Native Land Court Act 1886 Amendment Act 1888?⁸
42. 42.1 Yes it should read 'Administration' Act.
43. On page 699, "Wahanui would be translated describing the agreement with Bryce on the 16th of March 1883 as a compact and a contract. Others would describe it as a 'curious compact'. More importantly though Wahanui spoke of his "absolute reliance on that word of Mr, Bryce, for he personally told us that he would give due respect to our land."
- 43.1 Can you pin down the discussion Wahanui relied on to the 16 March meeting?
- 43.2 Or, for example, was Wahanui referring to the December meeting and the survey agreement (which was the focal point of Maniapoto claims in 1889)?⁹
43. 43.1 I am primarily relying on Hataraka's account, attested to by Wahanui himself and Wahanui's recollection of the meeting when he met with Ballance February 1885 at Kihikihi.
- 43.2 As to the latter quote from Wahanui, I don't think we can say for certainty which meeting Wahanui was referring to but I also think Wahanui would have considered

them both equally important meetings. However, with regard to his references to compact and contract, I am certain he is referring there to the 16 March meeting. He talks about the railway exploration and the intention to send a petition to Parliament etc. It is clear he is talking pre the December meeting here.

44. On page 700, you conclude, “Nor could they hold back the construction of the railway, te ara o Turongo, the path of Turongo, ...”

44.1 Are you suggesting that the Rohe Pōtae leaders wanted to hold back constructions of the railway after the February 1885 agreement was made?

44.2 Did they not seek to ensure in their 1883 petition that the Government benefit from the railway without Rohe Pōtae Māori being deprived of their lands?

44. 44.1 I am suggesting that they wanted to use the construction of the railway as leverage to get what they wanted, ie the retention of the control of their lands. As Rewi said: “You want a railway and we want local self-government. You grant us the one, and we will grant you the other.”⁶

44.2 See 44.1

⁶ Bay Of Plenty Times , 7 February 1884, Page 3.