OFFICIAL

‘Local Government in Te Rohe Pōtae’

Wai 898, #A24:

Answers to Questions of Clarification

Jane Luiten

November 2013

RECEIVED
Waitangi Tribunal
1 Nov 2013
Ministry of Justice
WELLINGTON

Crown Law: Geoffrey Melvin/Stephanie Jones (Wai 898, #3.3.476(a)

5. At page 18, you state:

> **Of the blocks listed above as subject to claim, only one has been accounted for in this research, confirming the conclusion that the impact of the legislation was even greater than that established by this report.**

5.1 Would you please specify the "blocks listed above" to which you refer?

The blocks referred to are the subject of claims regarding the alienation of land for unpaid rates listed at #A24, p.18, that is: Wai 948 (re Takotokoraha 3A2A, 3A2B1); Wai 1054 (re Pirongia Allotment no.265); and Wai 2273 (re Manuaitu B9).

5.2 Would you please clarify what you mean by "only one has been accounted for in this research" and specify which block you are referring to?

Of these blocks, information was found regarding only Manuaitu B9, for which a Court order appointing the Maori Trustee as agent for the purposes of alienation under Section 34/1950 was made on 6 June 1951 (see #A24, Appendix 2, p.453).

6. At pages 21-22, you state:

> **Later, the declaration of Maori roadways as public roads on the recommendation of the Native Land Court was also used as a means of defining roadlines through Maori land without requiring compensation to be paid to the owners.**

6.1 Would you please provide the statutory authority under which this occurred?

Sections 48-52 Native Land Amendment Act 1913; Section 13 Native Land Amendment and Native Land Claims Adjustment Act 1928, both discussed in David Alexander, 'Public Works and Other Takings in Te Rohe Potae District', #A63, p.70. Alexander relates that with regard to the 1928 legislation, the Court was given the option of directing that compensation be paid by the Crown or a local authority, or of not requiring that any monetary compensation be paid.

7. At page 23, you state:

> **There has also always been an expectation that landowners would contribute a token amount to the cost of road construction, in addition to their rates.**

7.1 Would you please provide the source for this statement and clarify the basis upon which the expectation to which you refer arose?

The statement is based on my own study of local government over the past five years. This expectation is one of the underlying assumptions of the local government system as developed in New Zealand. It is reflected in the earliest provisions for road boards, where local rates from private land owners were matched with Land Fund subsidies for road improvements; in the provision from 1876

onwards for incorporated local bodies to borrow money for road development (the special rates over affected properties over and above the general rates required for routine maintenance). With regard to dedicated Ministry of Works allocations from 1947 to develop access to farms under Maori Affairs development, for example, the same expectation lies behind stipulations that affected land owners contribute towards the cost of any road project (often the free donation of land for the road, and fencing costs, see for example #A24, p.379).

7.2 Did the expectation apply in the Rohe Pōtae, and, if so, what, typically, was the level of contribution?

As set out in #A24, Chapter 2, pp.69-77, the Crown's role in the settlement of Te Rohe Potae made it primarily responsible for early road development, to be financed presumably from the profits made from its monopoly over land transactions. From anecdotal evidence, a roading contribution also seems to have been 'loaded' onto the purchase price of Crown land balloted to settlers (H Babbage, Kawhia County Councillor in 1907, spoke of a road loading of three shillings per acre, amounting to about £1500, #A24, p.76). Faced with the reality of poor roads, in a number of districts local government subsequently resorted to borrowing to build or improve road access, secured by special rates on affected properties.

8. At page 40, you refer to 142,500 acres of land located within the jurisdiction of the Taumarunui County Council and its exemption from rates under Ngata's consolidation scheme.

8.1 Would you please specify the statutory provision under which this exemption occurred?

The rating exemption of Maori land within Taumarunui County is dealt with more fully at #A24, pp.329-332. It was declared exempt under Section 104, Rating Act 1925, gazetted 9 November 1933, *New Zealand Gazette*, p. 2716.

8.2 Of the 142,000 acres of land to which you refer, how much lay within the Rohe Pōtae inquiry district? (An approximation of the amount will suffice).

The 1933 gazetted schedule lists 41 Rangitoto-Tuhua blocks, amounting to more than 11,796 acres.

9. At page 57, you refer to the "Homestead Act". Counsel are unable to find an enactment by that name. Would you please clarify what the enactment is?

The clerk of the Karioi Highway Board's reference to the 'Homestead Act' may well have been a reference to the Land Act 1877. The 'homestead system' had been in operation in the Auckland Province during the 1870s, allowing settlers to select 50-75 acres for each person aged 18 or over, free of cost, if they built a house and worked the land for five years. Under the Land Act 1877 (which brought uniformity to the raft of different provincial approaches to land settlement), the 'homestead system' was retained in the Land District of Auckland (see appendix A, Land Act 1877).

10. Footnote 63 at page 69 states:

> **In the memorial presented to Prime Minister Coates in 1927 Premier Stout was said to have reiterated the promises made by Ballance two months before.**

10.1 What is the reference for the memorial to which you refer?

The memorial is discussed more fully at #A24, pp.130-131. The reference is 'Memorial to the Hon. J.G. Coates. Prime Minister and Minister for Native Affairs', in MA 31/4*4 Special file 138: Native Rates and King Country Consolidation Scheme, ArchivesNZ, Wellington.

10.2 Would you please provide a copy?

A copy of the memorial was provided in the Paper Document Bank accompanying my report, Wai 898, A24(a), p. 901a.

11. At page 69, you state:

> **Early European settlement within Te Rohe Potae was orchestrated by the Crown under the Improved Farm Settlement Scheme with newly acquired blocks, for the most part well east of the railway, …**

11.1 Did you mean to say "for the most part well west of the railway"?

Yes, I meant to say west.

12. At page 71, you state:

> **After almost 30 years as an inoperative county, the original 1876 county district was split in two and brought under the Counties Act 1886 by virtue of the Kawhia and Awakino Counties Act 1903. The boundaries were further reduced by the creation of a new inland neighbour under the Waitomo County Act 1904. Kawhia County was finally gazetted in June 1905, and Waitomo County the following month.**

Then, at page 73, you state that:

> **In the case of Waitomo County, it was not until the 1911/12 rating year that Maori assessments were placed back on the rating roll.**

12.1 Is it the case, then, that Māori within the Waitomo County did not bear any legal liability for rates until 1911?

It is the case that for practical purposes, Maori land in Waitomo was not rated until the 1911/1912 rating year.

13. At page 73, you state:

> **A loading of up to four shillings per acre was purportedly added to the sale price for the land for the purpose of making these roads, and one third of the value or rental of the lands disposed of was allocated for road maintenance.**

13.1 What is the source for this statement?

The source is a letter to the editor of the *King Country Chronicle* by D.H. Lusk (then chairman of the Waitomo County Council), published on 14 December 1906, a copy of which is provided in #A24(a) at pp. 2721-2722.

14. At the end of section 3.1.2 on page 107, there is a sentence that does not make sense. Should this be deleted, or should it be replaced with an alternative sentence?

This is an error, which should have been deleted.

15. At page 120, you state, "With regard to Maori rates, the country solicitors …". Should that refer to "the county solicitors"?

Yes.

Wackrow Williams & Davies Ltd: Bernadette Arapere / James Fond (Wai 929, Wai 1255, Wai 987, Wai 1230)

1. **In your "Local Government in Te Rohe Potae" report at page 332 you state that:**

   "Currently Ruapehu District Council has no rates remission policy specifically targeting either undeveloped or multiply-owned Maori land."

   Can you confirm whether since the time you wrote your report Ruapehu District Council has developed such a policy?

According to the Ruapehu District Council website, the council has a 'Maori Freehold Land Rates Remissions' policy, under which applications can be made triennially for the remission of rates. According to the policy document, the policy was first adopted in 2006, and reviewed in 2012. The Council's Maori Land Rates Relief Register records the properties for which the council has agreed to remit rates, based on two categories:

> Category A: Maori Land General Remissions List
> Remits 100% of rates, except targeted rates set for water supply, sewerage disposal or solid waste collection. Where there are no services provided, and/or it is uneconomic to pursue rates, all rates will be remitted. To be eligible, Maori land must be unproductive and unoccupied. In cases where there are dwellings, separate rating units may be created, with rates payable only on the part that is occupied. In addition, 'indigenous vegetation lots', unoccupied land which has traditional or important food, cultural, medicinal, symbolic, spiritual aspects, or important water catchment systems to tangata whenua, can also be

considered for remission. Council also takes into account whether the land has access, contains indigenous forest, is contiguous with forest reserves, is complementary to Marae Reserve Areas, is high land; offers protection of low land development and investment in roads; complements water catchment areas; enhances wildlife areas.

Maori freehold land in multiple ownership with no trust in place for administration, or where the owners' whereabouts are not known may have rates remitted at the council's discretion.

Category B: Maori Land Economic Incentive Remissions List
For the staged remission of rates, from 80% to 20% over a five year period, on potentially productive land, to provide an incentive for economic development. No remission of targeted rates for water supply, sewage disposal, solid waste services.

2. **At page 332 of your report you note that the Ruapehu District Council offers for tender land that has been declared abandoned by the District Council in order to recover unpaid rates and you record figures from September 2010 for the forced rating sales of more than 60 properties. Can you confirm whether any of those properties were located within the Ongarue area?**

I cannot confirm this.

3. **With regard to abandoned lands and the forced rating sales of properties, are you aware of this practice being continued by the Ruapehu District Council in recent times? If so, in what areas is this practice occurring?**

I have no information on this.

Morrison Kent: Bryan Gilling / CM Savali / RM Sandri (Wai 614, Wai 863, Wai 972, Wai 2291) (Wai 898, #3.3.469(a))

1. **On page 59 you state that in the "Waipa County a single 'Native' holding of 130 acres at Puniu was all that remained of the former Ngati Apakura homeland." Are you able to please identify what block you are referring to here?**

The rates book lists the assessment description as '112 Kihikihi 69 Punui', in the Rangiaowhia Riding, of 130 acres: 1 rood: 31 perches, see #A24(b), p. 700.

2. **On page 266 in relation to the Awaroa B5/1 block you identify George Tata and Charles Stewart as "local farmers". Are you able to clarify how you established that George Tata was a "local farmer"?**

George Tata was described in court in January 1954 as a Maori farmer, by the lawyer representing the land owner. The land owner himself disagreed with the suggestion that Tata was a poor farmer. 'George Tata is at least as competent as the average Maori farmer'. George Tata himself also gave testimony about his farming experience of ten years – as a farm worker milking and managing dry stock. He also claimed to have farmed land himself on an informal basis – including haymaking, cropping, and fertilizing. He testified to owning a herd of 28 cows, and farm equipment including a mower and plough, all kept on his brother's property. See Mercer Minute Book 33, pp.265-266.

3. **Bassett and Kay in their report entitled "Crown Administration and the Alienation of Maori Land in Te Rohe Potae Inquiry District c.1931-2010", pages 282-283, also discuss the vesting of part Awaroa B4/4B in the Maori Trustee under section 387 of the Maori Affairs Act 1953.**

   A. **Do you agree that George Tata was also seeking a formal lease of Awaroa B4/4B?**

In court in March 1954, Fred Ormsby the noxious weeds inspector for Kawhia County and Charles Barrett, County chairman, both told the court that the 'son of Tei[?] Tata' and 'son of part owner living on block' – presumably George – would lease Awaroa B4/4B (Mercer Minute Book 33, p.311). On this occasion Houchen, for Maori Affairs, added that 'One of the owners would take lease to preserve sportsground'. The order was made on this basis, but vacated when the issue was revisited later that day. According to Tarahuirua Kerapa, George Tata had been living on the block for more than 10 years. A recent meeting of owners had resolved to reserve an area for a marae and existing urupa, and in addition, a 15-acre area of flat cropping land to support the marae, an area which was also used by the community as a sportsground. Bassett and Kay's work suggests that George Tata sought a formal lease of Awaroa B4/4B by July 1955.

   B. **Are you aware of what the aspirations of George Tata's were in acquiring the formal lease?**

George Tata had expressed farming aspirations in court in January 1954 regarding Awaroa B5/1.

   C. **Were you aware that George Tata was also a significant owner in the Awaroa B4/4B block?**

The court minutes suggest that at the time the application was first heard, in March 1954, it was George's father who was a major owner, whose interest George presumably succeeded to. George Tata appeared as the principal spokesperson when the issue was again before the court in January 1955 (Mercer MB 34, p.190-1).

   D. **Do you agree that in January 1955 the Court appointed the Maori Trustee to manage the bulk of the block under s387 of the Maori Affairs Act 1953?**

Yes, the order was made at that time under Part 25, Maori Affairs Act 1953.

4. **On page 307 you state "judges presiding over the majority of applications in Te Rohe Potae – Beechey and Prichard – were partisan to local body interests. Judges who displayed a little more circumspection in applying the Act were simply removed." Is Judge Gerard O'Malley who you discuss in chapter 6.2.1 of you report an example of one of the judges who was removed?**

Yes. As far as I could discern, this was Judge O'Malley's first and last appearance hearing such applications in the Waikato-Maniapoto court.

5. **On page 70 of your report, you note that Seddon met with the tangata whenua at Maketu following his visit to Kawhia in May 1903. The premier heard complaints about the "delay in having the native township lands settled on both sides of the harbour, and road access formed through the Tararoa block." On page 405, you note that the road reached Taharoa School in 1968 following a 43 year campaign for road access.**

   A. Can you please clarify why you do not consider this request in 1903 to be part of the 'campaign' for the road to Taharoa?

The 1903 appeal for road access seems to have resulted in the original dray road being formed from Taharoa to the coast at Te Maika, and was not included for this reason. I took the 'campaign' commencement to be their first articulated appeal to have this roadline improved for vehicular traffic, in 1925.

6. **On page 80 of your report, last sentence you say "From a local government point of view, the townships of particular significance are those which built on significant Maori foundations: Te Kuiti, Otorohanga and, to a lesser extent, Kawhia.**

   A. Can you please explain what you mean by "significant Maori foundations"?

Te Kuiti and Otorohanga were both communities that invested in significant improvements – in the way of modern buildings, community facilities like public halls and stock yards, and street formation, well before the advent of local government. They were existing Maori townships, strategically located on the railway route.

   B. Why do you consider them to be of more particular significance than, say, Parawai Native Township?

My understanding is that Parawai Native Township was laid off where there was no such Māori investment in settlement, largely to give Pakeha settlement a foothold in an area the Crown were unable to acquire by purchase (the extent of prior Maori occupation is set out briefly in Bassett and Kay, 'The Impact of the Native Townships Acts in Te Rohe Potae', #A62, pp.64-65).

Mark McGhie (Wai 1738) (Wai 898, #3.3.474(a))

1. **Did the government publish figures – in the NZ Gazette or AJHR – showing the amount of "thirds" and "fourths" – referred to at page 27 of the Report – paid to local bodies?**

The practical implementation of Crown settlement falls outside the scope of this project, and I am not familiar with records that were kept or published by the government with regard to these payments. The annual report of the Department of Lands and Survey (C-1) might be one possible source of such information.

2. **At page 28 of the Report you say:**

   The same principles were employed by the Government within Te Rohe Potae: the Crown's monopoly right of purchase ensured that nominal prices were paid to Maori for their land. These lands were then cut up into 'Crown settlements' throughout the district, the Crown titles balloted to Pakeha, and the profits from these transactions put towards providing the access guaranteed to Crown tenants, built and maintained by the PWD.

   When you say Maori were paid nominal prices for their land, does that mean the prices paid were not based at all on the lands actual value?

Again, the Crown's purchase policy with regard to Rohe Potae has been included only to the extent that it provides important context for ensuing local government issues. It was widely acknowledged at the time that the prices paid by the Crown as monopoly vendor were well below those which may have been achieved on an open market (see for example Stout and Ngata's conclusion, articulated in 'Native Lands in the Rohe-Potae (King Country) District', AJHR 1907, G-1b, p. 4). The same point has been made by Paul Husbands and James Mitchell in their report, "The Native Land Court, land titles and Crown land purchasing in the Rohe Potae district, 1866 -1907", Wai 898 #A79, p.280 for example.

Te Mata a Maui Law: David Martin Stone / Augencio Bagsic (Ngati Te Wehi) (Wai 898, #3.3.429)

1. **On page 264, you wrote about the court order regarding Moerangi 3E2A.**
   A. Who are Barrett and Cunneen?

Charles Barrett was chairman of the Kawhia County Council at the time. Douglas Cunneen was the Kawhia County clerk. Both men were relatively new in these roles.

B. What is their interest in the block?

Their interest in the block was related to successfully prosecuting the county's applications under Section 34/1950, Moerangi 3E2A among the first batch of Kawhia county applications to come before the court at Te Kuiti, in September 1952.

C. Was there any opposition filed by the Apiti family?

At the initial hearing in September 1952 one Totorewa (possibly Dave Apiti's brother) confirmed that Dave Apiti was living on the land. The minutes record: 'Totorewa says he could farm the land or part of it', and the 'he' in this case, given the context, could possibly refer to Dave (Otorohanga MB 77, p.310). The order was made nonetheless. As the report relates, the Minister of Maori Affairs' consent to the order was withheld after an appeal was made by the owners that they wanted to farm the area themselves. By August 1953, Dave Apiti's farming initiatives on Moerangi 3E2A, together with his offer to pay rates, appears to have successfully thwarted ongoing council lobbying to have the section advertised for lease.

2. On page 269, you wrote about the neglect to farm application on Moerangi 3G3B.
A. Are the Randall family the sole owners of this block at that time? If not, who are the other owners.

From unofficial court minutes in Kawhia county files, it appears there were other owners, but these are not specified. Kori Martin, George Randall's nephew, testified that 'one of the other owners', ie not from the Randall side, agreed to the proposal for him to farm, and he was told by the court that the approval of 'other owners' would be necessary for the lease (see #A24(a), pp.2593-7).

3. You also wrote at page 269 that, "The block was occupied, in that a number of the owners were living in 'shacks' on the land.'
A. Who are those owners?

The court minutes do not say who they were.

4. On page 270, you wrote about the neflect to farm application on Aotea South 3D and that 'Twelve of the 52 owners had been sent notice, and none of them appeared in court."
A. Who are these twelve owners?

The court minutes identify the owners sent notice only by number, that is: 'No 1, 7, 14, 29, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 49, 50, 52' (see Mercer Minute Book 33, p.343).

B. Why didn't the court send the notice to all 52 owners?

It was the county, not the court, which was responsible for notifying the owners. Fred Ormsby, the county's Maori rates collector, testified that 'quite a number [of owners] are deceased and although I made enquiries for other owners, I could find no more addresses.' (see #A24(a), p. 2609)

5. **On page 296, you wrote that 'Within Te Rohe Potae these included the Komiti Whenua of Rakaunui (Raglan), Taharoa, Te Akau, Te Whaanga and Ngati Te Wehi, all of whom, between July and December 1958 wrote to the Minister of Maori Affairs – now Walter Nash – advising him of their establishment and calling for empowerment to administer their lands."**

   A. Did it say who were led by Ngati Te Wehi?

The letter sets out the members of the Ngati Te Wehi Komiti Whenua as Tumu Totara Te Huia, (Te Mua Elderly Controller, of Frankton); Maihi Hapimana (Chairman, of Ohaupo); Mau Tewehi (Vice-Chairman, of Te Mata); Ropata Tauira (Secretary, of Te Mata); Paretauira Hapimana (Treasurer, of Fairfield); Matarau Rangiawha (Member, of Te Mata); Niho Rangiawha (Member, of Te Mata); Taotao Rangiawha (Member, of Te Mata); Pango Tamati (Member, of Frankton); Ngarangi Rangiawha (Member, of Rukuhia); Tunui Rangiawha (Member, of Frankton); Hori Maihi (Member, of Te Mata), see #A24(a), p. 1093.

6. **On page 369, you wrote that "In the local history of the Te Mata Aotea district, at least 11 of the 21 listed early suppliers to the co-operative dairy factory at Te Mata were Maori from the northern reaches of the Aotea harbour" and in footnote 77 you listed 11 Maori dairy farmers. Then on page 373, you wrote that "in 1935 the petition of Tom Wete and 10 others to the Native Minister for access came up again familiar barriers."**

   A. Are the 11 Maori dairy farmers the same farmers who petitioned the Native Minister in 1935?

No, it appears not. The early suppliers to the Te Mata factory seem to have been based slightly more north around Makomako. The letter from Tom Wete and 10 others appealing for the road is not on file, but a map showing a suggested road line (the Aotea Road extension) gives the landowners as John Paki, Douglas Whatu, T Reti, Mahara, Whare Moke and Turinui Rauroha. See #A24(a), p. 93.

7. **On page 370, you wrote that, "Ngata's personal interest in land development around the Aotea harbour seems to have prompted the completion of the Kawaroa Road."**

   A. What is Ngata's personal interest in Aotea harbour?

All that was meant was that land development was Ngata's particular passion, and that he visited the King Country, including Kawhia, over the summer of 1929-1930 to personally convince land owners of the merits of coming under state development schemes. His interest in the success of these ventures seems to have extended to negotiating with county councils and Public Works over necessary access, a role which was subsequently taken over by Maori Affairs generally.

8. **On page 370, you wrote that, "At this time, these roads were said to serve 18 properties, all of them Maori land, and 10 of them in dairy production 'with a big likelihood of more coming in especially if the road is metalled."**
   A. Who are these owners?
   B. Who were those people in dairy production?

There is no comprehensive list of these owners or suppliers. Vowles' letter refers to 'Kahu's'; the Scheme's farm director refers only to Wiri Waitere; a 1940 approach for maintenance of Kawaroa Road refers to the units of Whatu Apiti, Tumutotara Te Huia, Paretira Te Huia and Polly Waitere (see #A24(a), pp. 694-99).

9. **On page 370, you wrote that, "The Department's farm director discounted Vowles' claim that the council was not maintaining the road in a bid to force dairy farmers to drop their cream at Oparau, but he did agree that Union Road was 'a very important length which should be metalled.'"**
   A. What was Vowles' basis for such allegations?
   B. In your opinion, was his claim founded?

The basis of Vowles' claim was that Union Road at that time was not being maintained (metalled) by the Kawhia County Council. The farm director's response suggests that none of the roads serving Maori land within Kawhia County were well-maintained, even though metal supplies were handy. However he discounted the allegation regarding cream delivery on account of the easier route from Makomako to Oparau, and comparative distances, if this was improved.

10. **On page 373, you wrote that, "What was asked for was 1½ miles of road, to service seven dairy units under the Kawhia Development Scheme, and a number of other properties farmed independently."**
    A. What did you mean by "independently"? Did you mean without any government assistance?

Yes.

11. **On page 374, you wrote that, "By this time the county was receiving rates from some Maori landowners: over £45 was paid in the 1944/45 year from properties which would be served by the road – a small sum, but significant in the context of the county's history."**

    A. Who were these Maori landowners?

B. Are the petitioners some of these?

This information was not on file, however counsel is directed to #A24, pp.194-196, which discusses Kawhia County Council's attempts to seek rates from development land. Moka Hopa, Rautahi Rukutai, Charlie Pikia, Whare Moke, Douglas Te Whatu and Hone Paki were farmers first sent rates demands in 1938 (see #A24(a), p. 1694). To this list of farmers under the development scheme sent rates demands by 1943 were Nora Pikia, Wi Arapo Edwards, Whatu Apiti, Tumutotara Te Huia, Ngawai Tangirua, and Paretira Te Huia (see #A24(a), pp. 1702-03; 1705).

12. On page 375, you wrote that, "Within five years, four properties served by the new road, and another one in the vicinity without access, were targeted by the Kawhia County Council for application under Part 25 of the Maori Affairs Act 1953 on the grounds of neglecting to farm."

A. Why did you use the word "targeted"?

As well as satisfying one of the grounds set down in Section 34 of the Maori Purposes Act 1950 (unoccupied, not cleared of weeds, rates unpaid and charged, or neglect to farm), there were other factors county councils had to bear in mind in making application for Section 34 orders. As related by Raglan County Council, (see #A24, p.256), local bodies had to show there was a demand for the land, and that it had an economic value, or was potentially productive. Selecting lands for application therefore required some forethought. In the case of Kawhia County Council, a number of Moerangi sections which had been developed in the past were included in the initial applications (although the council steered clear of farms which were still under Maori Affairs control), which would now be more attractive as farming units because of the access. The council's approach was outlined to the Minister of Maori Affairs by the county chairman in May 1953 when he took exception to the minister's invention in the order over Moerangi 3E2A:

> Barrett: We have had experience there of land that has been developed by the Maori Affairs Department. Small uneconomic sections that have been broken in and developed. Small houses built on them and handed back to the owners when paid off. These are the first sections we have had advertised. (#A24(a), p. 2561).

13. On page 376, you wrote that, "The marginalisation of Maori farming initiatives through local body neglect was arguably a factor in Kawhia County's steady decline."

A. Was this marginalisation by neglect limited only to Aotea? If not, where else?

The report also sets out the experience of the Taharoa farming community, whose appeal for a road was ignored by the council throughout its existence as a local government entity (#A24, Chapter 10), and briefly discusses the circumstances of the Rakaunui community, who built the mile of road connecting the settlement to the Awaroa-Waiharakeke Road themselves (#A24, p.366). The general

lack of local body service to Maori in the Kawhia County, and the reasons for this, are described in the report.

Wackrow Williams and Davies Ltd: Dominic Wilson (Ngati Hikairo) (Wai 898, #3.3.477(a))

1. **At page 59 of your main report you refer to a section in the Puniu area as "… the last that remained of the former Ngati Apakura homeland". Is this your view or is this a reference from the Waipa County Council Rates Book?**

The description is mine, referring to the single assessment listed as occupied by "Natives", and described as '112 Kihikihi 69 Puniu' in the Rangiaowhia Riding of Waipa County (see #A24(b), p.700).

2. **Also at page 59 you refer to "… three holdings at Ngaroto amounting to 265 acres", can you please clarify which three Ngaroto sections were assessed by 1883?**

Counsel is directed to the #A24(b), p. 698. The descriptions appear to be '82 Ngaroto' of 50 acres; '387 Ngaroto' of 15 acres; and '112/5[?] Ngaroto' of 200 acres. There appear to be occupiers' names for each of these listings, but these are very hard to read.

3. **Have you come across any evidence of Kawhia County Council correspondence or reports relating to Paretao (Kawhia S) the swamp or lake immediately north of Kawhia Township, and a desire to have it drained and leased?**

No.

4. **Have you come across any evidence of Kawhia County Council correspondence or reports relating to Oweka, the swamp or lake immediately south of Kawhia Township, overlapping the Kawhia M & Kawhia P Blocks, and their draining it?**

No.

5. **Have you come across any evidence of the dispute between Taui Wetere and the Kawhia County Council over his claim to land adjoining his on the Kawhia shore, which was a result of accretion and the Council threatening to destroy his fence, and the taking of the case to the Native Land Court?**

No.

6. **At page 196 of your main report you mention that Nora Pikia was "perhaps the first woman farmer under the development scheme". Could you please clarify to which particular development scheme you refer**.

The Kawhia Development Scheme.

7. **Have you come across any evidence in relation to the Kitengamoe bridge and its funding (this is a bridge that has provided access to the Pirongia West 3B2G2 and 3B2G3 blocks over the Oparau awa, see T Pokaia evidence, #N36)?**

No.