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**Introduction**

On 1 April 2015, the Presiding Officer of the Waitangi Tribunal for the Porirua ki Manawatū District Inquiry issued directions that a scoping report be commissioned to assess the research needs of Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa claimants.¹ This scoping report has been completed at a time when the claimants and the research within the Inquiry District are in transition and development. Therefore, this report represents the current situation with the stated claims, but also tries to anticipate the outcome of likely developments over the next six months to a year. It is necessary to do this otherwise the risk would be that the recommendations of the scoping report may soon become outdated and redundant.

**Commission**

The full Commission for this research scoping report is presented in Appendix A. The Project Purpose is recorded as being to assess and recommend options for a project or projects that will provide sufficient research coverage for an inquiry into land and politics, local issues, and oral and traditional history for Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa claims.²

A series of research issues were identified in the Directions and Commission with both documents recording that the scoping report should:

- identify the issues likely to require research in claims registered on behalf of Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa, consulting with the claimants to assist in clarifying their research issues;

- ascertain to what extent Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa tribal history and claim issues are covered in Tribunal reports and evidential material on records of inquiry and identify any gaps specific

---

¹ WAI 2200 #2.3.9  
² As will be discussed further in the sub-section dealing with Terminology, there has been much debate around the nomenclature to be used to describe the respective claimant groups. For the purposes of this report, a certain position has been adopted which is explained below. For now, it is noted that although the Tribunal Directions and Project Brief originally used the term Te Ātiawa/Ngātiawa ki Whakarongoatai, this has been altered in accordance with claimant perspectives
to Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa;

- assess the extent to which existing evidential and published research on specific Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa claim issues, including inter alia the Wi Parata case, the Thoms Whānau claim, the Kāpiti Airport taking and disposal, and the Kāpiti expressway, is sufficient to address the claim issues identified so far, and ascertain any other issues which appear to arise from consultation with the claimants and appraisal of the sources;

- recommend a research project or projects that would best cover outstanding Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa land and politics issues, local issues, and oral and traditional history for the inquiry casebook research programme, including proposed chapter outlines, any oral history proposals, and time and resource estimates; and

- provide a detailed bibliography of primary and secondary research sources, including locations.

Claims

A full list of claims to be considered by this scoping report, as recorded in the Commission, is reproduced as Appendix B. The table records the Wai number, the Claim name, the named claimant(s) and on whose behalf the claims have been lodged. The Statements of Claim for these Wai numbers are listed in the bibliography. Several of the Statements of Claim have been amended. The claims can be summarised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wai No</th>
<th>Claim name</th>
<th>Identified Claim Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Kāpiti Island Claim</td>
<td>• Kāpiti Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tokomapuna Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Motungārara Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tahorameaura Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Paraparaumu Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Muaūpoko Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maungakotukutuku Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hemi Matenga Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Counsel for WAI 648, has advised the Tribunal that the ‘George Hori Toms & Colonial Laws of Succession Claim’ does not really fit with the kaupapa of the Ngātiawa ki Kapiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa suite of claims
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wai No</th>
<th>Claim name</th>
<th>Identified Claim Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaitawa Scenic Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>loss of lands and resources at Waikanae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Whitireia Block Claim</td>
<td>that the claimants were prejudicially affected by the Crown Granting of land known as Whitireia as Māori title had not been extinguished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>that the gift was conditional on the establishment of a school which did not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>609, 612, 875, 876, 877, 1620</td>
<td>Paraparaumu Airport Claims</td>
<td>Collectively, the claimants claim prejudicial affect from:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the operations of the Native Land Court in granting title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Public Works legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Airport Authorities Act 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the 1939 taking of Ngārara West blocks for an aerodrome including the processes of notification and compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the transfer of land to an Airport SOE company in 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the sales of shares in the Airport company to private parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the sale of certain pieces of land by the Crown to private parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the 2005 report of the Auditor General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1018</td>
<td>Otaraua and Rahiri Hapū ki Waikanae Lands Claim</td>
<td>That the claimants, within their recorded rohe, have been prejudicially affected by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- dispossession of whenua by the Crown and the ensuing economic, social and political deprivation including:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the taking of lands under the Public Works Act, particularly for the SH1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- dispossession of land through rating laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the enabling of inequitable leases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- alienation of ownership and kaitiakitanga of land, water, wāhi tapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- environmental damage throughout the rohe and especially in relation to the Waikanae River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- inadequacies of the education system established for Māori especially in relation to te reo in school which particularly resulted in the death of a school child and a resulting community decision to restrict use of te reo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- the dispossession of the rangatiratanga of Māori women and their ensuing marginalisation with particular impacts in relation to leadership, whānau, marriage, whangai, education and health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- failure to protect intellectual property rights especially regarding the writings of the tupuna Pirikawau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1628</td>
<td>Baker Whānau Land Alienation Claim</td>
<td>that the claimants have been prejudicially affected by the taking of two pieces of land in residential occupation for the non-payment of rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Parata Township Claim</td>
<td>that the claimants were prejudicially affected by Native Townships Act 1895 which allowed the Ikaroa Māori Board to acquire the 49 acres which made up Parata township in 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2361</td>
<td>The Kāpiti and MotuNgārara Islands</td>
<td>that the claimants were prejudicially affected by legislation and policies of the Crown resulting in the alienation of iwi and hapū interests. The Kāpiti Island Reserves Act 1897 and the actions of the Native Land Court are particularly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although, at first sight, the claims can each appear disparate in their collective coverage of Treaty issues, this is not necessarily the case. Even claims that have a specific focus (such as the loss of an urupā or the taking of specific properties for the non-payment of rates) have a wider Treaty context that will need to be addressed in the presentation of the respective claims. To demonstrate the broad scope of the claims, the following summary list brings the various claim issues together as a preliminary to understanding research requirements:

- land loss within the rohe including the role of the Native Land Court in awarding title
- public works issues in general, but especially the taking of land for Paraparaumu airport
- the impacts of rating legislation and policies as applied with the rohe
- the Crown's role in the ownership and management of Kāpiti and other islands
- the Whitireia land transfer and subsequent legal action
- environmental issues including past and current examples of damage and issues around the Crown's management of the environment. A particular focus is on the Waikanae River
- the impact of education policies, especially the effect on te reo
- mana wahine issues
- native township issues as they applied to Parata township

The above table represents the claims as they currently stand in existing Statements of Claim. Several of the claimant groups have signalled their intention to further amend their claims in the near future.
Methodology

The Commission required the adoption of the following methodology in the scoping of research for the claims of Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa:

- a full assessment of the sufficiency of existing technical research and documentary coverage on existing records of inquiry
- where coverage is insufficient, an identification of the relevant primary and secondary sources supporting further research
- an evaluation of oral and traditional aspects of the claims through consultation with respective claimants

This methodology has been adhered to during this project. There has been, however, some adaptation in respect of relying only on the current statements of claims as the basis of assessing the sufficiency of existing research and the nature of potential source material. As noted above, several claimant groups spoken with have indicated that they will be soon amending their claims towards a broader statement of issues. In addition, there is the fact that inquiry-wide research is about to be commissioned on a broad suite of Treaty issues. Finally, research analysis for this scoping report has determined that a number of Treaty issues are not yet covered by current Statements of Claim. For these reasons, the scoping exercise has not been constrained by existing Statements of Claim. Instead, a broad approach to claims issues and the assessment of required research has been adopted.

The overall finding of this scoping report is that the existing technical research and documentary coverage is not sufficient to provide Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa claimants with the coverage they require to fully prosecute their claims before the Waitangi Tribunal. Therefore, the scoping exercise has focused on identifying the nature of claim issues that are applicable to the Treaty relationship that Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa have had with the Crown in order to identify the relevant primary and secondary sources and scope research requirements.
During the course of the scoping exercise, a number of hui have been held with the respective claimant groups or their legal counsel particularly to discuss their perspective on their claims, the nature of 20th century developments, the identification of local issues and the possible nature and scope of an oral and traditional project. Despite best efforts, however, some claimants have not been able to meet with me and in a few cases I have not been able to contact listed claimant groups. Efforts to do so will continue right up to the filing of this scoping report on the Tribunal record.

The scoping report considers the research requirements for Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa in three sections. For each of these sections, summary narratives of events are provided, where known, on developments relevant to Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims. Research issues arising from these narratives have been identified for the purpose of identifying research needs. Finally, the specific sources or likely sources to be researched are considered and a methodology for research proposed.

- **The Transmutation of Customary Rights - 1819-1900**: Although this Section of the report essentially covers nineteenth century issues, this time period also equates with a key theme for the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims - tracing the way in which customary rights were acquired within the Inquiry District before 1840, how they developed and were expressed in the first four decades after 1840 (both in relation to other iwi and the Crown) and how these customary rights were ultimately undermined through the Native Land Court's awarding of title (this particularly having a significant effect in relation to the large Ngārara block). Customary rights can derive from a range of origins including whakapapa, ahi kaa, raupatu, tuku whenua and mana whenua. Generally, the narrative of these events is sketched out in reports already on the Wai 2200 Porirua ki Manawatū Record of Inquiry. It is argued, however, that the existing level of coverage is not sufficient. Therefore, within this Section of the report, the narrative of events has been set out in some detail, numerous issues which require consideration have been identified and the broad range and large volume of source material available to address these research issues have been noted.

- **Alienation and Loss - 1900-2015**: Essentially having a twentieth century focus, this section of the report strives to identify relevant claims issues. This is done through use of
the author's knowledge of twentieth century issues, the inquiry-wide scoping that has been done on claims issues, and through discussion with respective claimants. Consultation with claimants has revealed that since 1900 Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa within the district have been constantly under pressure regarding their land, resources and community from the persistent encroachment of Crown actions and Pākehā settlement processes that have accelerated during the past 45 years as the suburbanisation of the Kāpiti Coast has rapidly proceeded. This section of the scoping report primarily consists of issues identification as the associated narratives of events will only become evident once research has been completed. Evaluating the nature and scope of source material has been based on an assessment of likely Treaty issues. Where narratives are known on significant local issues, (such as the taking of land for Paraparaumu airport, the Crown management of Kāpiti Island and the problems arising over the Kāpiti Expressway) these are presented within the Section. One significant factor taken into account when considering research requirements for the post-1900 period has been the imminent commissioning of a series of significant inquiry-wide research reports.

- **Oral and Traditional Project**: consideration of a possible scope and structure for this type of project has largely proceeded in consultation with claimant groupings. As a result, an assessment is made of the nature of local knowledge and resources and how these can contribute to research objectives identified for the various claims. A possible structure to access this knowledge is also presented.

Following these three sections, a series of recommendations are presented for proposed projects including timeframes and the resources required to undertake these projects.

**Terminology**

A final matter to note is the terminology adopted in this report regarding the appropriate nomenclature for the claimant groups and their originating iwi - whether this should be Ngātiawa or Te Āti Awa. There has already been some discussion regarding this between the respective claimants and the Tribunal with something of an impasse being reached as some groups felt either one name or the other did not represent who they were. The matter was recently raised,
during the Ngā Korero Tuku Iho hearing held on 22 April 2015, by Deputy Chief Judge Fox who invited comment on which nomenclature was suitable. During the hearing several witnesses used both names, sometimes interchangeably and often citing both names together.

There has been discussion of this matter in the Te Tau Ihu hearing district. This has generally suggested that throughout most of the 19th century the name Ngātiawa (often written as Ngāti Awa) was used for those people who inhabited the area between what is today New Plymouth and the Mokau River. Within 19th Century records pertaining to Kāpiti Coast Māori, when hapū names do not feature, the broader term used for those who came into the area from northern Taranaki is Ngātiawa. Commentators have suggested that it was from the late 19th century that the name Te Āti Awa increasingly emerged to refer to the tribes of northern Taranaki. Over time, this name has been adopted by some, often as a way to distinguish northern Taranaki people from Ngāti Awa of Whakatane. Others, however, have steadfastly continued to used the term Ngātiawa. As has been noted, all the old headstones in whānau urupā use the term Ngātiawa.

This matter of nomenclature is only being raised at this point of the report, not to reach any particular decision, but simply to find a working solution for the purposes of writing this report that might suit the various perspectives expressed on the matter. Having considered the question, and discussed this with various claimants, the following approach has been adopted:

- As evident in this Introduction, when the current claimants and claims are referred to, the phrase 'Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa' will be adopted.

- In the narratives of 19th century events, the term 'Ngātiawa' only will be used as this is reflective of the source material and terms of expression of the time.

- When, in issue-based discussion or in other non-narrative sections, the term 'Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa' will be adopted to reflect the dual usage currently in place.

---

4 See discussion of various usages in Alan Riwaka, 'Nga Hekenga o Te Atiawa', Wai 607. 4 July 2000, pp.8-14
5 Personal Communication, Ra Higgot, 18 Oct 2015
Section I: Transmutation of Customary Rights and Interests: 1819-1900

As indicated in the Introduction to this report, this first section will present a series of event narratives, issues assessment and research evaluation in relation to a time period over which the customary rights of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa that were established within the Inquiry District before and after 1840 were completely transmuted as a result of Crown processes. Three subsections present the narrative and associated issues as follows:

- the way in which customary rights were established within the Inquiry District before 1840

- how customary rights were developed and expressed in the first four decades after 1840 (both in relation to other iwi and the Crown)

- how customary rights were ultimately undermined through the Native Land Court’s awarding of title (this particularly having a significant effect in relation to the large Ngārara block).

1. The Gaining of Customary Rights: 1819-1840

The events of the period before 1840 when iwi and hapū from Kawhia and Taranaki came south to the southwestern coast of the North Island through a series of heke has been written about at great length in a number of secondary works. Having acknowledged this, these secondary sources have primarily concentrated on the actions of Ngāti Toa and in particular the chief Te Rauparaha. The one exception is a work completed in 1910 by ethnologist and surveyor Stephenson Percy Smith. Despite the usefulness of this work, there is a wider body of source material, in the form of Native Land Court minutes, that has the potential to provide a more complete account of Ngātiawa heke into the Inquiry District. A preliminary analysis of this source material has been conducted for the purposes of this scoping report. This has focused

6 Stephenson Percy Smith, History and Traditions of the Maoris of the West Coast North Island of New Zealand prior to 1840, New Plymouth, Polynesian Society, 1910
particularly on the perspectives of Ngātiawa commentators. The result has been the producing of a distinct perspective and an often unique narrative. It is essential to understand this narrative in order to fully understand the impacts of post-1840 events. Therefore, a comparatively full summary account is presented in this subsection. This is to provide a chronology of events which places emphasis on the Ngātiawa narrative although the actions of others are mentioned where context requires it. Following the presentation of the narrative, a series of issues will be identified as a basis for considering research needs. It is important to note that in the following narrative, the accounts are drawn from existing secondary works. During consultation with Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa it was noted that there was a need for an account that fully conveyed the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa perspective and that the summary account presented below, where it was based on secondary sources, still left the impression of the primacy of Ngāti Toa and in particular the chief Te Rauparaha. It was noted that in these sources, it was the case that even the actions of Ngāti Toa were often merely characterised as being acts by Te Rauparaha. It has been strongly noted that alternative narratives exist within Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa and that it will be important for those narratives to take predominance within the context of any research that is produced.\(^7\) One matter of importance to note relates to the whakapapa connections between Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa and Ngāti Toa. These connections were with the senior Ngāti Toa hapū of Ngāti Te Maunu, the rangatira of which was principally Te Pehi and Te Rangihiiroa. There are recognised differences between this hapū and the hapū of Ngāti Kimihia, the chiefs of which are principally Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihaeata. These differences, however, were not usually picked up by early Pakeha historians.\(^8\)

**Background: First explorations to Amiowhenua**

The narrative begins in 1819 and the setting out from the north of a taua that travelled south. From that period, through to the attack on the Amiowhenua taua several years later, those mainly involved are groups other than Ngātiawa. This narrative is provided as a background and context to events that involve Ngātiawa.

- **1819 taua**: following a northward visit of Ngāti Toa to Ngāpuhi to gain access to muskets, a group of Ngāpuhi including Tamati Waka Nene and Patuone formed a taua

---

\(^7\) Personal Communication Matiu Baker, 22 November 2015  
\(^8\) Personal Communication Andre Baker, 25 November 2015
intending to travel south as far as Te Whanganui a Tara. As it proceeded south, various groups joined. It has been estimated almost 1,000 warriors participated. The taua visited Kawhia. A Ngāti Toa contingent joined which included Te Rauparaha, Te Pehi and Te Rangihiaeaata. Sources acknowledge the role of Ngātiwa in giving permission for the taua to pass through their territory. A Taranaki contingent joined which included Manukonga and Takaratahi. The taua went down the western coast. Ngāti Ruanui were attacked at Patea. In Rangitikei Ngāti Apa were attacked although peace was later made when Te Rangihiaeta married Te Pikinga of Ngāti Apa. The taua stayed at Ōtaki for some time and Kāpiti Island was visited by Te Rauparaha. Fighting with resident groups occurred, however, at Pukerua, Mukamuka and in the Wairarapa. From Te Whanganui a Tara the taua returned north via the west coast again. On two occasions, Pākehā sailing ships were sighted.

- **Te Heke Tahutahuahi:** in the spring of 1821, a party of about 400 Ngāti Toa set out on a migration to the south, 170 of these being experienced warriors. This first migration was named Tahu Tahu Ahi. This name arose from the lighting of a large number of fires to make the pursuing enemy think there were greater numbers in the migrating party.

---

9 Judges William Gilbert Mair and David Scannell, Judgment in Ngārara rehearing case, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.8; W.T.L. Travers, *Some Chapters in the Life and Times of Te Rauparaha, Chief of the Ngatiota*, Wellington, James Hughes Printer, 1872; Reprint: Christchurch, Capper Press, 1975, p.32 (Travers records a date of 1817 for the taua). See also Thomas Lindsay Buick, *Old Manawatu or the wild days of the Old West*, Palmerston North, Buick and Young, 1903, pp.38-39. See also Wakahuia Carkeek, *The Kapiti Coast: Māori History and Placenames*, AH and AW Reed, Wellington, 1966, p.17


11 Travers, op cit, p.32. (Travers records a date of 1817 for the taua). See also Buick, 1903, op cit, pp.38-39. See also Carkeek, op cit, p.17: Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.8; Thomas Lindsay Buick, *An Old New Zealander or, Te Rauparaha, The Napoleon of the South*, London, 1911, p.49

12 Pikau te Rangi, 21 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, p.298

13 Travers, op cit, p.32. (Travers records a date of 1817 for the taua). See also Buick, 1903, op cit, pp.38-39. See also Carkeek, op cit, p.17: Buick, 1903, op cit, pp.38-39


15 Simcox, op cit, p.19: Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.9; Wi Parata, 6 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.153-155. Although other accounts do not record fighting, Wi Parata named Taihiro as a Kahungunu/Muaupoko pa attacked on the island


17 Wi Parata, 6 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.154-155: Simcox, op cit, p.19

18 Travers, op cit, p.39; Simcox, op cit, p.20: Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.10: Buick initially indicated the beginning of 1820 [Buick, 1903, op cit, footnote, p.55] but later calculated that it occurred at the end of 1821 [Buick, 1911, op cit, p.68]

The reasons for this heke have been discussed by several historians and commentators. Several authors state that Te Rauparaha negotiated with Ngātiawa to ensure his party were granted safe passage. Traditional evidence, however, holds that it was Te Pehi who chose the migration route through Taranaki because of his close whakapapa links to the local people. Te Rauparaha instead had preferred to migrate by way of the Waikato. Several commentators relay the dramatic story from the journey of the need that arose to leave some of the party behind at Marokopa while the wife of Te Rauparaha gave birth; of the eventual return of Te Rauparaha for this party; and of the narrow escape they had when they encountered a Ngāti Maniapoto taua. The migrants eventually arrived at Okoki pa. They remained for 12 months.

- **Amiowhenua taua, siege at Pukerangiora pā and the battle of Motunui:**

  Amiowhenua was a taua consisting primarily of Waikato and Maniapoto warriors that raided the Hawke’s Bay and Wairarapa in late 1821 or early 1822. Returning via the Horowhenua-Kāpiti coast, the taua was attacked in Taranaki by several hapū. The taua was sheltered in Pukerangiora pā by a friendly section of Ngātiawa. The pā was besieged for some time until assistance came from a northern rescue taua. Events culminated in a great battle on the Motunui plain between Taranaki iwi and Ngāti Toa on one side and Waikato on the other. The defeated Waikato tribes retreated home.

*Te Heke Tataramoa to Waiorua*

The next sequence of events to be considered is from Te Heke Tataramoa - the first heke south in which Ngātiawa participated in 1822 - through to the battle of Waiorua on Kāpiti Island in 1824. These events, covering the period when Ngātiawa arrived into the Inquiry District and established initial customary rights, are of importance.

---

21 Travers, op cit, p.36: Buick, 1911, op cit, p.66: Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, pp.9-10: Carkeek, op cit, pp.24-25
23 Buick, 1903, op cit, p.60: Butler, op cit, pp.18-9
24 Smith, op cit, p.368
25 Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.10
26 Buick, 1911, op cit, pp.75-6
• **Te Heke Tataramoa:** after Motunui, in autumn of 1822, a party of Ngāti Toa and Ngātiawa decided to journey south.Various commentators ascribe to Ngātiawa different motivations for going on the heke: some stating it was from reverence felt towards Te Rauparaha; others that Ngātiawa sought security from Waikato; others state that it was at the behest of Te Rauparaha and other Ngāti Toa chiefs; while others note the close whakapapa connection to Ngātiawa of chiefs such as Te Pehi Kupe, Rangihiiroa, and Nohorua. Estimates on the size of the party vary from 100 warriors, to 600 fighting men to 800 warriors. Women, children and older persons were also present. All estimates indicate that the numbers of people from Taranaki who went were considerably greater than those of Ngāti Toa. Although Te Heke Tataramoa crossed Taranaki without encountering conflict, this would change as the heke continued south towards Waitotara where they clashed with Ngā Rauru. Following this, as the heke made its way through to Rangitikei and Manawatū, a tenuous accommodation for safe passage was reached with Ngāi Apa. When Te Heke Tataramoa arrived in Howowhenua, however, initially friendly relationships with Muaūpoko broke down. Although commentators vary, all agree that Muaūpoko attacked Te Rauparaha after inviting him and a small party to partake of a feast of eels. Three of the children of Te Rauparaha were killed—his sons Te Rangi-hounga-riri and Poaka, and his daughter Te Uira. A series of retaliatory attacks resulted. Ngātiawa were involved in these attacks. It has been estimated that these events took place either in early or mid-1823.
Following the attacks on Muaūpoko, the Tataramoa heke initially settled and cultivated on land just to the south of Ohau. After several attempts, Kāpiti Island was taken in a surprise attack under the chief, Pehikupe. The migrants moved south to occupy Waikanae. Around 1823 a large group of Ngātiawa decided to return to their homelands. Historians have suggested various reasons for the return to Taranaki at this time, including the fact that domination over those who had been living in the area had been achieved by several decisive battles; reaction to the overbearing attitude of Te Rauparaha; and the existence of possible threats to kin left behind in Taranaki. The predominantly recorded Ngātiawa view, however, was that those who returned to Taranaki were planning subsequently to return with others of their iwi or hapū. In the meantime, a significant number of Taranaki people remained with Ngāti Toa. Thereafter, an initially successful attack was led against Muaūpoko at Paekakariki although this was followed by a counter attack by a party of Ngāti Kahungunu and Ngāti Ira. The remaining northern heke moved permanently to Kāpiti. An attack on Ngāti Toa by a group of Ngāti Apa took place at Waikanae. It is estimated that up to 60 men, women and children were gathering food. Four daughters of Te Pehi were killed as was Pohe, the wife of Te Rangihiiroa. The chief Tangahoe was also killed. In some accounts, it is said that Te Pehi was present and that the chief lost his musket to the enemy in the ensuing hand-to-hand struggle. Further, it is said that it was this event that motivated Te Pehi to undertake his trip to England to secure more guns for his people.

42 Smith, op cit, p.392; Simcox, op cit, p.20
43 Buick, 1911, op cit, p.83
44 Smith, op cit, pp.392-3
45 Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, pp.10-11; Hoani te Okoro of Ngāti Toa, Kukutauaki No.1, 6 Mar 1874, Ōtaki MBk02, pp.255-256; Hohaia Pokaitara, 31 Jan 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.98-100
46 Buick, 1911, op cit, p.94; Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.11
47 Buick, 1911, op cit, footnote, p. 94
48 Wi Parata at 19 May 1873, Ōtaki MBk02, pp.179-180; Mere Naere Pomare at Ngārara West partition, 12 May 1887, Ōtaki MBk07, pp.235-236
49 Pikau te Rangi, 21 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.294-295. This Ngātiawa perspective is at variance with several historians who suggest very few Taranaki people remained. [Travers, op cit, p.47. Travers seems to suggest that it was after the taking of Wai-kie-ki that Te Atiawa returned to Waitara. [p.48]; Smith, op cit, p.393; Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.11]
50 Smith, op cit, p.393; see also Buick, 1903, op cit, pp.80-81
51 Travers, op cit, p.49; see also Smith, op cit, pp.393-394; Buick, 1911, op cit, p.97; Simcox, op cit, pp.20-21; see also Dreaver, op cit, p.26
52 Buick, 1911, op cit, p.100; Carkeek, op cit, p.32; Ibid. See also Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.11: Hohaia Pokaitara, 31 Jan 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.98-100: Travers, op cit, p.49; see also Smith, op cit, pp.393-394; Buick, 1911, op cit, p.97
• **The Battle of Waiorua 1824**: following these attacks, Rangitane, Muaūpoko and Ngāti Apa decided to launch a combined mass attack on Kāpiti Island. The resulting battle of Waiorua was a complete victory for the island's Kawhia and Taranaki defenders. There has long been debate on the exact role Te Rauparaha played in the battle. There also is evidence suggesting that the full force of the Kurahaupo attack came down on that part of the island occupied by Ngātiawa. After Waiorua, the position of the northern migrants in the area was largely secured. Further attacks on Ngāti Apa and Rangitane were launched from the island base.

---

**Figure 1**

Site of Waiorua Battle (shown as at 1844)


---

54 Smith, op cit, p.396: Buick, 1911, op cit, p.101; see also Carkeek, op cit, p.34. NB. Carkeek refers to Te Raki as Te Ratu: *New Zealand Mail*, 3 Nov 1894; cited in Carkeek, op cit, p.34: Dreaver, op cit, p.26: Rangitane claimant Ruth Harris stated that Donald McLean was told in the 1840s by a Ngati Apa chief that the attacking force numbered 600, whereas Ballara gives a figure of 2000: doc k10, p.9; Ballara cited in Waitangi Tribunal, 2003, *Te Whanganui a Tara Me Ona Takiwa, Report on the Wellington District, WAI 145*, Wellington, Legislation Direct, p.21


56 Smith, 1910, p.398: Waitangi Tribunal, 2003, op cit, p.21: Pikau te Rangi, 21 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.300-301: Paratawhera, 29 Mar 1890, Ōtaki MBk11, p.201 "Ngatitosa were the largest number at Waiorua."

Subsequent Heke

The next sequence of events covers the period from the aftermath of Waiorua through to the early 1830s, a time when several heke came from Taranaki bringing Ngātiawa and other iwi into the Inquiry District. It was also the period where Ngāti Raukawa heke went south.

- **Te Heke Nihoputa:** the battle of Waiorua, and the belief that any threat from Kurahaupo had been brought to an end, often has been considered by commentators as the reason for the several Taranaki and Ngāti Raukawa heke that occurred in the aftermath of the battle.\(^{58}\) The evidence suggests there are alternate explanations. From a Ngātiawa perspective, the Nihoputa heke appears to have been undertaken without knowledge of the outcome of Waiorua.\(^{59}\) Instead it represented a response to the continuing threat from Waikato \(^{60}\) and a continuation of Taranaki action whereby the groups involved, following the establishment of rights, had returned to their homelands to bring more settlers down.\(^{61}\) Estimates have numbered those on Te Heke Nihoputa as being more than 500.\(^{62}\) Ngāti Mutunga provided the largest numbers but there were also members of other hapū. Another heke which occurred thereafter was known as Te Heke Whirinui\(^{63}\) and there may have been other hapū-focused heke.\(^{64}\)

- **The migration of Ngāti Raukawa:** commentators have noted how Ngāti Toa actively courted the possibility of Ngāti Raukawa coming to the south. Many commentators have assumed that the efforts of Ngāti Toa efforts towards achieving Ngāti Raukawa migration were intended to augment Taranaki migration in order to provide total security against

---

\(^{58}\) Travers, op cit, p.51: Wi Parata, 6 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.158-159
\(^{59}\) In doing so, Smith is at odds with his informant Rangipito who suggested that Te Heke Nihoputa occurred one year after Te Rauparaha left Urenui. Smith cites other sources (Shand, Travers, and Watene Taungatara) to show that a consensus exists that the migration occurred after Waiorua [Smith, op cit, p.399]: Smith, op cit, p.401
\(^{60}\) Rangi-pito quoted in Smith, op cit, p.400: Smith, op cit, p.400: [See also Ballara, op cit, p.18 who cites sources as including,Shand, op. cit., p.87; Reel 10, Wairarapa M.B.1, p.9, Te Harawira Tutawha of Ngati Tama re Ohariu; Reel 15B, Wellington M.B.1C, p.12, Hori Ngapaka of Parewanui hapū of Taranaki re Te Ar; ibid., p.81, Mohi Ngaponga of Ngati Haumia of Taranaki.]; Pikau te Rangi, 22 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, p.302
\(^{61}\) Watene Taungatera at Ngārara rehearing, 30 Jan 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.81-83: Statement of Enoka Tatairau read by Stafford during Te Kauwae at Ngārara Commission, 3 Dec 1888, MA 70/1, ANZ-W, pp.5-6
\(^{62}\) Carkeek, op cit, p.52
\(^{63}\) Smith, op cit, p.446; see also Carkeek, op cit, p.53
\(^{64}\) Statement of Enoka Tatairau read by Stafford during Te Kauwae at Ngārara Commission, 3 Dec 1888, MA 70/1, ANZ-W, pp.5-6; Watene Taungatera, 30 Jan 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.81-83: Karihuaa, 3 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, p.112: Pikau te Rangi, 21 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.295-296: Wi Parata, 6 Feb 1890, Ōtaki MBk10, pp.158-159: Paratawhera, 29 Mar 1890, Ōtaki MBk11, pp.199-200
any Kurahaupo threat. There is some evidence, however, that Ngāti Toa encouragement of Ngāti Raukawa migration may have been aimed at achieving security against and containment of Taranaki interests in the area. Competition over land soon resulted although initially this was addressed by an allocation of land which seemed to have been accepted by all parties.

- **Te Heke Tama te Uaua, 1832**: in Taranaki in 1831 and 1832, a series of attacks from Waikato resulted in the fall of the Pukerangiora pā and the successful defence of Ngā Motu Pa. In the aftermath of fighting, a very large migration of more than 2000 persons – Te Heke Tama te Uaua – came to the south from Taranaki.

**Haowhenua and Kuititanga**

The tensions between Ngāti Raukawa and the arrival of new migrants from Taranaki eventually resulted in armed conflict: in 1834 at Haowhenua and 1839 at Kuititanga.

- **Haowhenua to Kuititanga, 1834-9**: as further Taranaki heke eventuated, new pressures were placed on the tenuous accommodation that had been reached between the competing groups. A specific action of the theft of food led to open hostilities between Taranaki iwi and Ngāti Raukawa. A series of conflicts stretched over a year beginning with the siege of Rangiuru pa. After Waikato and Tuwharetoa reinforcements arrived to assist the Ngāti Raukawa pā defenders, the conflict moved to Pakakutu pā which was a Ngātiawa pā. Subsequently, the fighting focused on Haowhenua pā belonging to

---

65 E. O’Donnell, *Te Hekenga: Early Days in Horowhenua; Being the Reminiscences of Mr. Rod McDonald*, Palmerston North, Bennett and Co, 1929, p.14
66 Carkeek, op cit, p.43: Travers, op cit, pp.53-54; see also Simcox, op cit, p.21: Buick, 1911, op cit, p.111
67 Smith, op cit, pp.461-7: Skinner quoted in Smith, op cit, pp.471-82
68 Smith, op cit, p.485: Date given by Diefenbach; cited in Ballara, op cit, p.53
69 Smith, op cit, p.53: Dreaver, op cit, pp.28-29
72 Travers, op cit, p.70; see also Buick, 1911, op cit, p.195-196; Butler, op cit, pp.64-66: Reel 6, Ōtaki 1D, pp.403, 413-4, 418, 427, 439, 441, 514, evidence re Himatangi given by Hohepa Tamiahengia, Rakapa Kahoki, Te Karira Tonoa, Kawana Paipai, Metekingi Paetahi, Kawana Hunia Te Hakeke; see also Burns, *Te Rauparaha*, pp.177-8; cited in Ballara, op cit, p.24-25: Rangi-pito quoted in Smith, op cit, p.517; see also Carkeek, op cit, p.55: Butler, op cit, p.66
Ngātiawa and their allies. Ngātiawa victories there were followed by a defeat at Kenakena pa. This year-long campaign is now collectively known under the name of Haowhenua. Within Ngāti Toa, those chiefs with Ngātiawa whakapapa backed their kin, while a smaller party, including Te Rauparaha and Te Rangihiaeta, supported Ngāti Raukawa. The conflict was brought to an end through a peacemaking arrangement. Tensions remained, however. These culminated by 1839 in a large scale attack by Ngāti Raukawa on the Ngātiawa pā of Kuititanga which was a decisive victory for the Taranaki allies and was the last conflict on the coast. (During feedback from Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa, Kuititanga was noted as being a site of great significance for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa. It was also noted that the battle clearly demonstrated the senior Ngāti Te Maunu and Ngāti Awa whakapapa alliances of Te Pehi and Te Rangihiairoa and the close hononga of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa with Ngāti Mutunga, Ngāti Rahiri and Ngāti Rarua.)

**Research Issues**

As noted in the introductory paragraphs to this section of the report, few secondary works have examined the pre-1840 period with a focus on Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa motivations or actions. As the methodological subsection will later show, the many hundreds of pages of available Native Land Court minutes provide a significant resource to undertake this exercise. The need to clearly understand, with as much detail as possible, the pre-1840 arrival of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa within the Inquiry District, lies in the relationship between these events and the post-1840 relationship that Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa experienced with the Crown and Crown processes in relation to their

---

75 Butler, op cit, p.64
land interests. The specific nature of this relationship will be discussed in later subsections of this report. To assist with the research efforts, a series of issues for the pre-1840 period will be identified.

**Broad Overview Research Issues**

- The initial requirement is to gain a clear picture of the situation in Taranaki before the heke began. Who were the hapū of the area who eventually came south? What is their whakapapa? What were their relationships to one other? How are they connected with neighbouring groups? Who were the hapū chiefs in the period from 1800? Available evidence reveals how Taranaki hapū acted independently: alliances were formed and changed. Joint action was undertaken based on whakapapa or opportunity. The political situation was ever-changing depending on circumstance. The first step to understanding the complexities that emerge after 1840 is to understand the groups and people involved.

- There is a need to ensure the chronology of events is correct. When it comes to unbundling the existence or timing of various heke and the events that occurred, the secondary literature demonstrates a wide divergence of views especially in relation to Ngātiawa. An effort should be made to consider the source material in depth, especially that provided by Ngātiawa commentators, with a view to developing an accurate picture. It may well be that the result of this exercise will be to learn that there was no real consensus between accounts. At least, however, that understanding will have been reached based on a full rather than partial analysis. On the other hand, the analysis may also provide insight into why there are varying perspectives - did different hapū have different views? Were the views of those on the heke different than those born afterwards? Were varying narratives constructed to meet land title objectives being sought?

- Finally, there is a broad requirement to gain as detailed as possible an understanding of the rights and interests held and exercised by those who came as this matter becomes an essential area of debate in post-1840 events. What was the nature of Ngātiawa occupation and how did the evident mobility of the population before 1840 (to Taranaki, Whanganui-a-Tara or Te Tau Ihu) affect customary rights? Although rarely mentioned in existing secondary accounts, what role did tuku whenua play in the gaining and
expression of customary rights?\textsuperscript{79} Also, what was the nature of leadership in this environment? Again, it is likely that there is no one agreed narrative or, possibly, even a consensus of opinion. It is essential, however, to understand the different streams of narrative that exist.

Specific Research Issues

In addition to the broad research issues raised above, the preceding overview narrative of pre-1840 events raises a series of specific research issues. Collectively these specific issues can be summarised as the need to find and collate as much detail on every event in which Ngātiawa was involved with before 1840 in order to gain a Ngātiawa-focused tribal history. This will also assist to develop an understanding of the rights and interests of Ngātiawa within the Inquiry District and their relationships with other groups.

- **Te Heke Tahutahuahi**: although, as noted above, commentators mention that Te Rauparaha negotiated a safe passage through northern Taranaki, traditional evidence is that it was Te Pehi who chose that route. Who in Taranaki was involved in the discussions? What were the specifics of the arrangement? Were any agreements reached in relation to the subsequent heke further south?

- **Amiowhenua taua, siege at Pukerangiora pā and the battle of Motunui**: These events and the differing and possibly changing positions adopted by various Ngātiawa hapū towards the Waikato/Maniapoto taua reveals the complexity of relationships. Although past accounts have ascribed the attack to Te Rauparaha,\textsuperscript{80} and Ngāti Toa clearly became involved, the events that took place are primarily a Ngātiawa story. These events need to be studied closely and carefully considered to ascertain whether they shaped subsequent relationships or decisions and actions made about the heke.

- **Te Heke Tataramoa**: there is a need to consider anew the Ngātiawa motivations in going on this heke and the role they played. A Ngātiawa focus and perspective needs to be developed of the heke and the events that occurred. Although many narratives are

\textsuperscript{79} Personal Communication Matiu Baker, 22 November 2015.
\textsuperscript{80} Buick, 1911, op cit, p.75
focused on the actions of and happenings to Te Rauparaha and Ngāti Toa, from a numerical perspective alone, the heke could be seen as a largely Ngātiawa initiative. And yet, the specific actions of Ngātiawa groups often are barely recorded. Similarly, the return of a significant number of Ngātiawa to Taranaki to gather people for another heke south should be examined. The aim will be to find out who and how many went, and their recorded reasons for the return.

- **Waiorua**: A significant turning point for those who had migrated from the north, there are varying stories about the involvement of Te Rauparaha, Ngāti Toa and Ngātiawa. In some accounts, Ngātiawa bore the brunt of the battle. A full assessment of the role of Ngātiawa is important especially given later rights that were claimed by Ngātiawa in relation to Kāpiti.

- **Later Taranaki Heke**: After 1825 a number of heke from the north arrived within the Inquiry district. Many of these involved groups from Taranaki. In part, heke such as Te Heke Nihoputa, were in response to the encouragement given by those who had returned from Te Heke Tataramoa. For later heke, occurring after 1830, the incentives arose from the increase of significant attacks in Taranaki from Waikato. The published record is not clear on these heke. Varying views are recorded on their number, their names, their timing and who travelled with them. It may not be possible to reconcile varying understandings regarding these heke, but it is important to gain a clear idea of the Ngātiawa perspectives even if there are several varying perspectives. Other heke include:

  a) 1832 migration to Waikanae, estimated to include 2000 persons, named Te Heke Tama-te-Uaua which included Ngātiawa hapū and notable rangatira Tautara, Rauakitu, Haukaione, Te Wharepouri, Te Puni, Rangiwhaia, Teito, Wi Tako Ngatata-i-te-rangi and Te Matangi;

  b) the Ngātiawa migration to Waikanae in 1833 called Te Heke Paukena involving approximately 1,000 persons and led by Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitaake and Te Ura;

  c) the last migration called Te Hauhaua in 1834 led by Te Puoho-o-te-Rangi and Kaeaea arriving at Haowhenua to provide support in the battle against Ngāti Raukawa.\(^\text{81}\)

\(^{81}\) Personal Communication Andre Baker, 25 November 2015
Ngātiawa and Ngāti Raukawa: In addition to understanding the specifics of the later Ngātiawa heke, the impact of the migrations of Ngāti Raukawa needs to be fully understood as the ramifications of pre-1840 events feature throughout the nineteenth century. As noted in the narrative of events, several historians see the encouragement by Te Rauparaha of Ngāti Raukawa migration as a means to increase the security of all migrants on the coast. There possibly are other interpretations that may arise from considering a Ngātiawa perspective. It will be important for the researcher to closely consider this information and form an evidence-based view. Soon after the arrival of Ngāti Raukawa, there was conflict between them and Ngātiawa with Ngāti Toa chiefs and hapū acting variously in accordance with their whakapapa relationships. The initial allocation of land to Ngāti Raukawa, the impacts of post-1830 migrations, the Haowhenua and Kuititanga fights and the nature of the brokered peace agreement are all of the utmost importance to understand. In this case, it is not only important to gain a complete familiarity with all aspects of Ngātiawa understandings, but it is key to ascertain where and how these understandings differ with other groups particularly Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Toa. The post-1840 relationship between the three groups, which manifests as varying forms of competition but also cooperation, will be informed by a clear understanding of inter-iwi relationships among the migrant groups.
2. The Development and Expression of Customary Rights: 1840-1880

With the question of customary rights within the Kāpiti district being in a state of flux right up to 1839, and the battle of Kuititanga, it is only natural to expect that the nature and form of customary rights would continue to develop in the period after 1840. These were shaped, in part, by the various forms of occupation adopted by Ngātiawa at the hapū, whānau and individual level. It was also shaped, however, by the increasing involvement of Pākehā and Crown officials within the Inquiry District. From the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi at Waikanae, the Crown began to play a role in iwi affairs. By the 1850s and 1860s, this involved the transaction of land within the Inquiry District. The expression of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa customary interests within these land transactions, and how they were dealt with by the Crown and Crown processes, is a significant matter to consider as part of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims. Also, from 1870, Crown processes in respect of the awarding of title over Māori land had also come into effect. The role the Native Land Court played in respect of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa customary land interests is of importance to consider. In this subsection a summary narrative of known events will be presented followed by an identification of research issues.

Figure 2
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Customary Rights and Crown Interaction: 1840s

The decade after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi saw a gradual increase in contact between Ngātiawa and Pākehā in the form of whalers, traders, settlers, the missionary Octavious Hadfield and the first resident Crown official, Police Magistrate Durie.

Within this context, the first land transactions occurred. These pre-Treaty land transactions, included areas of land occupied by Ngātiawa:

- The three land transactions negotiated by the New Zealand Company led to a claim to having acquired extensive interests throughout the lower North Island and northern South Island. The deeds, signed in 1839, involved Ngāti Toa signing at Kāpiti, a signing by Ngātiawa, Rangitane and Ngāti Apa at Queen Charlotte Sound and a further signing by Ngātiawa at Te Whanganui-a-Tara. An intended signing at Waikanae did not occur. Instead Wakefield and his party arrived at the same time that Kuititanga was being fought. In fact, some historians have suggested that the possibility of Ngātiawa participating in a land transaction with the Company was one of the many contributing causes to the outbreak of hostilities. In the aftermath of the battle, Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitake and a few other chiefs accompanied Wakefield to Queen Charlotte Sound where a signing occurred involving around 30 chiefs.\(^2\) Typical of these New Zealand Company purchases, later evidence indicated that those who signed had a different view of the transactions than that held by the officials of the New Zealand Company. When later giving evidence before the Old Land Claims Commission, Reretawhangawhanga of Ngātiawa recorded his view that the transaction involved land on Arapaoa Island only.\(^3\)

- Other pre-Treaty land transactions occurred. Around 30 claims were made to areas of land in Porirua and on Kāpiti Island. These involved Ngāti Toa, however. In addition, the partners Daniel Cooper, James Holt and William

---


Barnard Rhodes, before 1840, transacted a number of land transactions allegedly involving more than a million acres in the Bay of Islands, Hawkes Bay and Wellington districts. These included a specific claim [OLC 130] to the Ōtaki and Waikanae districts. This deed was signed on 6 November 1839. One of the signatories can be identified as Reretawangawhanga. In addition, Te Rauparaha signed as a witness.84

A number of different views have been expressed about the way in which the various Ngātiawa hapū occupied their land after 1839. It has been said that, with Kuitianga uppermost in their mind, those Ngātiawa living in the Kāpiti area were under a constant threat of attack. As a result, they kept together for mutual support, residing in two or three pā only and not spreading out over the land.85 There were exceptions: the Puketapu hapū generally occupied the southern part of the district and had their own pā,86 and Otaraua hapū concentrated their residence within an area that later became known as the Muaūpoko block. The hapū did, however, cultivate in other parts of the block.87

In the early 1840s, Ngātiawa, situated as they were between Ngāti Toa and Ngāti Raukawa to the north and Ngāti Toa to the south, potentially were in a less than secure situation. This did not prevent them, however, in taking a stand to actively support the Crown during the conflict that arose between the Government and Te Rangihaeta in 1846.88

During the mid-1840s a decision to return to Taranaki was made by Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitaake and some of the Ngātiawa migrants living at Waikanae. The Crown, which was in the midst of trying to acquire more land for the New Zealand Company's colony at New Plymouth, became heavily involved in trying to prevent the return migration from going ahead. Once it was clear that it would, Governor George Grey sought to control the area that Wi Kingi could occupy in Taranaki.

84 When this claim was heard it was still supported by Reretawangawana. As a result, Commissioner Spain awarded the partners 727 acres. However, as the partners had a number of claims for often huge tracts of land, they ultimately received a maximum award of 2,560 acres which it appears they occupied elsewhere. The Waikanae award, therefore, was never granted. See Case files Daniel Cooper, James Holt and William Barnard Rhodes, Ōtaki and Waikanae, OLC 130, ANZ-W, ACFC 16153 OLC1/5. Also AJHR 1863 Sess I, D-14 p.10
85 Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, pp.14-5
86 Ihakara te Ngārara (Ngati Puketapu hapū of Ngati Awa), 11 May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.226
87 Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.15: Mere Naera Pomare, 11 May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.230
88 Carkeek, op cit, p.120
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Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitaake

[Ref: Courtesy of Apihaka Mack]
When Grey's overtures were rejected, Grey threatened to destroy the migrants' waka and to arrest Kingi (a tactic he later used to curb the influence of Te Rauparaha).\(^8\)

As the planned return of Wi Kingi became more widely known of, it became evident to him that a careful exit strategy was required as it was soon being reported that either Ngāti Toa or Ngāti Raukawa might occupy any land that was vacated. It appears that Kingi sought to work with Crown officials to prevent this from happening.\(^9\) He was prepared to give up some land to the Crown, but he also had to negotiate with the remaining Ngātiawa as to the land he could relinquish. Thereafter, Wiremu Kingi and 600 followers left for Waitara in 1848 in a flotilla of 44 canoes, as well as Pākehā boats and a convoy of 42 horses travelling overland.\(^10\)

Within this context Ngātiawa settled their boundaries - especially their northern boundary - with Ngāti Toa. After a series of tough negotiations Te Maire was settled on.\(^11\) Nevertheless, there were dissentients with Metapere, the mother of Wi Parata, maintaining that Te Hapua (located to the north of Te Maire) was the more correct boundary.\(^12\)

For those Ngātiawa who stayed behind, the Government laid out a model village named Kawewai. Although many moved here, others remained at the old Kenakena pa.\(^13\)

Within the context of the events noted above, there is also the narrative associated with Prikawau to consider. From 1846 to 1857, Prikawau (the younger brother of Wiremu Kingi) was Governor Grey's interpreter and travelling secretary. He often spoke on Grey's behalf and even travelled with Grey to South Africa after he left the colony. The position of Prikawau will be an important matter to consider especially within the context of a specific claim that has been made of theft of intellectual property rights. These relate to the writings of Prikawau having gone into the possession of people such as Grey who utilised the material without acknowledgement.\(^14\)

\(^{8}\) G. Clarke, quoted by Gore Browne, 4 Dec 1860, Dispatch to Duke of Newcastle ‘On Seigniorial Rights'; cited in Carkeek, op cit, p.119; Wells, History of Taranaki, p.140; cited in Carkeek, op cit, p.120

\(^{9}\) Ibid


\(^{11}\) M.L.C. Wi Tamihana te Neke at the Ngārara hearing, 1890; cited in Carkeek, op cit, p.121: Carkeek, op cit, p.121-122: Wiremu Tamihana te Neke of Ngati Awa, 19 May 1973, Ōtaki MBk02. pp,180-181: Wiremu Tamihana te Neke of Ngati Awa, 6 Mar 1874, Kukutauaki No.1, [840 acres within Ngārara], Wellington, Ōtaki MBk2, pp. 240-242

\(^{12}\) Carkeek, op cit, p.122

\(^{13}\) Carkeek, op cit, p.126. See Kemp, Survey of the Maori Population in the Wellington District, 1850; cited in Carkeek, op cit, pp.126-127

\(^{14}\) Statement of Claim, 9 August 2010, WAI 1018, 1.1(b)
**Whareroa and Wainui Purchases**

Beginning in the 1850s, the Crown undertook extensive negotiations to purchase land within the Inquiry District. Initial negotiations to acquire land at Whareroa in the Waikanae district were commenced in 1850 by Land Commissioner Donald McLean after an approach had been received from Ngātiawa. In addition, however, at a hui held on 21 November, McLean learnt of Ngāti Toa opposition to the proposed sale and their claims that they were the only interest holders in the land. Ngātiawa rejected this suggestion.\(^{96}\)

According to the missionary Richard Taylor, in 1852 Governor Grey asked Te Rangihaeata to sell the Waikanae area. The chief 'flatly and rudely refused': "You have had Porirua, Ahuriri, Wairarapa, Wanganui and the whole of the Middle Island given up to you and still you are not contented; we are driven into a corner, and yet you covet it."\(^{97}\) Nevertheless, by 1853, it was reported by the *New Zealand Spectator* that Native Secretary Kemp had for some time been negotiating to purchase 8,000 to 10,000 acres in the Waikanae district from Ngātiawa who, the newspaper suggested, were anxious to sell and return to Taranaki. Others were resistant to such a purchase. On October 13 and 16, Grey held a hui at Ōtaki and discussed this issue with Te Rangihaeata, 'the principal chiefs of the district', and 300 Māori whose tribal affiliations were not identified. Negotiations were deferred at this point, however.\(^{98}\)

Instead, the next set of negotiations in which Ngātiawa were involved was for land within Te Tau Ihu. From 1853 to 1856, Chief Land Purchase Officer Donald McLean was engaged in negotiations to purchase all land interests in an area that roughly equates with the former Nelson and Marlborough provinces. The Waitangi Tribunal has investigated and reported on these land transactions finding them to have a number of Treaty breaches in relation to the inadequacy of reserves, low value of payments and the methods deployed by McLean in achieving a purchase. Knowing the complexities of customary tenure in Te Tau Ihu and to avoid getting embroiled in conflicting claims of resident iwi, McLean began his negotiations by securing deeds from those who had interests in Te Tau Ihu but who were not necessarily permanent residents there. Two deeds were signed at Porirua and three deeds were signed with Ngātiawa in the North Island. The

---

\(^{96}\) McLean to Colonial Secretary, 26 Nov 1850, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.17, p.258

\(^{97}\) Anderson and Pickens, op cit, p70

\(^{98}\) T.J.Hearn, ‘One past, many histories: tribal land and politics in the nineteenth century’ June 2015, Wai 2200 #A152, p142
first deed of 2 March 1854 was signed at Taranaki by 11 Ngātiawa chiefs headed by Wiremu Kingi Te Rangitaake. In return for £200, the deed focused on a certain location within Queen Charlotte Sound. On 10 March 1854, a second deed was signed in Taranaki. In return for a £500 payment, those who signed were said to give up all claims to a series of listed kainga located in Te Tau Ihu. A total of 46 Ngātiawa signatures were recorded on the deed. On 24 November 1854, in return for £200, a deed was signed at Waikanae by five Ngātiawa headed by Te Herewine Te Tupe. The focus of the purchase seems to be on land interests at Te Awaiti, at the entrance to Queen Charlotte Sound, although there is also mention of 'all our lands in the other Island'.

In the meantime, the initial negotiations at Waikanae were not followed up until the end of the 1850s when District Land Purchase Commissioner William Searancke was appointed to acquire land within the Inquiry District. However, the government’s reluctance to pay the price asked for by Ngātiawa and further issues regarding reserves meant that only a part of the Whareroa block was eventually purchased by the Crown.

Searancke estimated the original block to be 60,000 acres in size but he did not clearly record the boundaries of the block other than to note that it extended from the coast to the Tararua ranges. Before the block was surveyed he paid an advance of £140 to both Ngātiawa and Ngāti Toa. Despite this, in May 1858, when Searancke attempted to survey the Waikanae area in preparation for purchase, he ran into problems due to the 'numerous conflicting claimants', the issue of price and the demand for large reserves.

It appears that the block being negotiated extended all the way to the Kukutauaki stream with Searancke writing about the setting aside of almost 2,500 acres of reserves in the vicinity of Waikanae. The block was now estimated to cover 95,000 acres for which Searancke intended to pay £3,200 - 9d. an acre. Searancke had suggested a higher than usual price because of the size

---

100 Searancke to McLean, 5 July 1858, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.45, pp.274-276
101 Searancke to McLean, 31 May 1858, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.44, pp.273-274
102 Anderson and Pickens, op cit, p78.
103 Searancke to McLean, 6 Aug 1858, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.47, p.279
of the land and its position, and as a means to bring to an end "the jealousy existing among the various Natives" over land issues.\textsuperscript{104}

Searancke was, however, struggling with the issue of reserves. The vendors involved had sought 6,000 acres of reserves which initially Searancke had agreed to. Over time, he sought to alter this agreement. Stating that these reserves were causing 'endless trouble', and allegedly believing that Ngātiawa, once in receipt of the reserves would onsell them for a high price, Searancke sought to get agreement from Ngātiawa for the size and location of the reserves being decided on by the Government after the purchase was completed. The supposed agreement he reached with Ngātiawa did not hold for long:

I was then of the opinion that all the difficulties were, by their leaving the extent of the reserves to be referred to His Excellency the Governor, amicably settled. I was, therefore, much surprised at the demand of the friends of Rev. Riwai Te Ahu, that the land should, prior to any sale, be surveyed and conveyed to them; also insisting that the disputed portion of the block, about fifteen hundred (1500) acres in extent, should also be reserved, in addition to the reserves which I had consented to let them have, in extent about twenty-five hundred (2500) acres; this I could not consent to, but have agreed to refer it to you.\textsuperscript{105}

Another problem was soon to arise. Searancke was informed that rather than 9d. an acre, he was to offer 6d. only.\textsuperscript{106} Due to the lower offer, the Crown's purchase offer was rejected and the planned large purchase did not proceed. Instead, the smaller 34,000-acre Whareroa block was acquired by the Crown for £800 with no recorded reserves, despite Searancke reporting that two small reserves were included.\textsuperscript{107}

The following year Searancke secured a further purchase. Amid the 98 signatories to the deed were representatives from Ngātiawa and Ngāti Toa. The Wainui block, estimated at 30,000 acres, was located to the south of the Whareroa block. For this land Searancke paid £850 allocating just 787 acres of reserves — less than three per cent of the estimated purchase area. From the Commissioner's perspective, in contrast to Whareroa, he had allowed for large reserves

\textsuperscript{104} Anderson and Pickens, op cit, p79. Subsequently, in July 1859, Searancke also explained that the Wainui block was valuable to the Crown because of its proximity to Wellington and that it was traversed by the Wellington to Whanganui road. [Hearn, op cit, p170]
\textsuperscript{105} 6 August 1858, Searancke to McLean, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.47, p.279
\textsuperscript{106} Searancke to McLean, 11 Oct 1858, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.49, p.281
\textsuperscript{107} Searancke to McLean, 27 Nov 1858, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.52, pp.283-284
within the Wainui block stating: "The Reserves appear to be large; but when the number of Natives resident within the boundaries is taken into consideration they could not in justice be made smaller." 108 The reserves included Wainui 'Township' (135 acres), Whareroa settlement (17 acres), cultivations at Paekakariki (280 acres), Te Rongo o te Wera (160 acres) and Te Ruka (60 acres located at Paekakariki). 109
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[Turton's Plans of the North Island]

108 Searancke to McLean, 6 July 1859, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.56, pp.285-286
109 Searancke to McLean, 8 July 1859, AJHR 1861 C1, Wellington District No.57, p.286
**Expression of Rights**

From the 1860s onwards, the two significant developments occurring within the Inquiry District were the increased Crown purchasing of Māori land and the introduction of the Native Land Court. The impact of Crown purchases and the Land Court within the Inquiry district is being considered within several district-wide overview reports as well as certain iwi-specific reports (see subsection below on Methodology and Sources). The following summary narrative focuses on Ngātiawa issues only.

For both Crown purchase and Land Court cases, as a prerequisite to either receiving payment or title, an iwi or hapū would have to prove that they had customary-based interests in the land being considered. Evidence is available which shows that despite the peace accord following Kuititanga supposedly creating an iwi boundary for Ngātiawa, during the 1860s and 1870s there are examples where Ngātiawa claimed rights to the north of that boundary - claims that were acknowledged by the Crown, endorsed by the Court and often acknowledged by other (but not all) iwi. Several significant examples are noted below. Within the timeframe for this scoping, however, the full participation of Ngātiawa in Land Court cases throughout the Inquiry District has not been ascertained. This will be noted below as a significant matter for research.

**The Āhuaturanga and Rangitikei-Manawatū purchases 1864-1866**

In the early 1860s, Dr Isaac Featherston, the Superintendent of Wellington, was given authority as a special commissioner to make land purchases. During 1864 the Āhuaturanga purchase was finalised. There is no record of Ngātiawa being present during negotiations and they did not sign the deed. Later evidence indicates, however, that Rangitane agreed that Ngātiawa should receive part of the purchase money.\(^{110}\) As Wi Tamihana te Neke explained: ‘Part of the money of Te Āhuo turanga was sent to me at Waikanae by Rangitane. I did not ask for it. It was a voluntary act of Rangitane, an acknowledgement.’\(^{111}\)

In addition, during the negotiations for the giant Rangitikei-Manawatū Block, the Crown recognised and paid for the extinguishment of the rights that Ngātiawa held over the land. There

\(^{110}\) Isaac Earl Featherstone, 11 Apr 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01E, p.646; see also Wi Tamihana te Neke (Ngati Awa and Taranaki), 31 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01D, pp.421-422

\(^{111}\) Wi Tamihana te Neke (Ngati Awa and Taranaki), 31 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01D, pp.421-422
was general support from several other iwi for these rights to be acknowledged and dealt with. The detailed and complex negotiations over the Rangitikei-Manawatū Block have been described by Anderson and Pickens and Hearn. For the purposes of this scoping, only a brief overview will be given with the focus being placed on references to Ngātiawa rights and interests.

The negotiations for the Rangitikei-Manawatū Block originated in the often tense relationship between Ngāti Raukawa and Rangitane and Ngāti Apa as the primary parties involved. Within this context, by the end of 1864, it was resolved that the often disputed land within the Rangitikei-Manawatū Block should be alienated to the Crown. As negotiations towards a sale continued, in late 1865 Ngāti Toa became involved in proceedings. The first specific reference to Ngātiawa involvement is recorded within the context of the inter- iwi hui at Takapau held in April 1866. Before the hui began, several Ngāti Toa rangatira and Wi Tamihana te Neke of Ngātiawa were part of a deputation that met with Crown agents to arrange a sale of their interests. Ngātiawa thereafter were present at the hui. When Ngāti Apa did not attend the beginning of the hui, Wi Tamihana te Neke was a member of the delegation sent to fetch the iwi.

At the Takapau hui, the purchase price for the block was fixed at £25,000. As negotiations continued, the sum of £10,000 was identified as being the amount of payment to satisfy Ngāti Raukawa, Ngātiawa and Ngāti Toa interests. The 1,647 signatures to the deed were collected by December 1866 after which a further inter- iwi hui, attended by 1,500 representatives including Ngātiawa, was held at Parewanui Pa. On 7 December around 60 chiefs gathered to present proposals as to the division of the sale money. This subject was debated for several days. Ngātiawa interests were represented by Wi Tamihana te Neke and Wi Parata. Agreement was eventually reached that 'the Ngāti Raukawa should take £10,000 and satisfy from there the demands of the Ngāti Toa and Ngātiawa claimants whom they had admitted'. It was subsequently recorded that Ngāti Toa and Ngātiawa received £1,000 out of the £10,000 received

---

112 Hohepa Tamaihengia to Edwards, 9 Sept 1865, MA 13 box 109 69[a] part 4, ANZ-W; 2 Dec 1965, Horomona Toremi, Hohepa Tamaihengia and others to Featherston, AJHR 1866 A4, pp.22-23: 9 Dec 1865, Tamihana te Rauparaha to Featherston, AJHR 1866 A4, p.21; 9 Dec 1865, Matene te Whiwhi and Ururoa Ripia to Featherston, AJHR 1866 A4, pp.21-22
113 Tamihana te Rauparaha to Mantell, 25 Apr 1866, AJHR 1866 A4, pp.6-7
114 Featherston, “Notes of various Meetings held with the several tribes engaged in the Rangitikei land dispute during Mar and Apr, 1866”, 30 June 1866, AJHR 1866 A4, pp.24-25
115 Ibid., p.27
116 Tamihana te Rauparaha to Featherston, July 1866, MA 13 box 109 69[a] part 5, ANZ-W: 14 Nov 1866, Featherston to Richmond, MA 13 box 110 69b part 1, ANZ-W
117 Undated, Featherston, “Further papers in reference to the Rangitikei land dispute: Notes of a native meeting at Parewanui, Rangitikei: Dec, 1866”, Council Paper, Province of Wellington, Session XV
by Ngāti Raukawa.\textsuperscript{118} In reaching these final arrangements, there is evidence that Wi Tako, residing at Waikanae, was sent for to attend the hui on 19 December 1866.\textsuperscript{119}

Despite deeds being signed and payments made, protests about the purchase remained. A discussion of rights in relation to the Rangitikei-Manawatū Block emerged during the Himatangi title investigation case held in March 1868. In relation to the rights of Ngātiawa, varying views were presented. Several witnesses suggested that Ngātiawa had departed from the area many years previously and therefore had no rights.\textsuperscript{120} Other evidence, from Ngāti Toa, Rangitane and Crown witnesses, indicated that Ngātiawa shared, with Ngāti Toa, rights based on being the first migrant group on the land prior to the arrival of Ngāti Raukawa. This meant that Ngātiawa needed to be consulted about the sale and to share in the purchase money.\textsuperscript{121} Opinion was varied, however, even within Ngātiawa. Wi Parata, for example, suggested that some Ngātiawa may have signed despite not having rights.\textsuperscript{122} Other Ngātiawa witnesses clearly considered they all had rights in this area.\textsuperscript{123}

\textbf{Title Investigation of the Manawatū-Kukutauaki Block 1872}

The arrival of the Native Land Court within the Inquiry District provided a new forum to debate the nature of customary rights in order to have these recognised through the granting of a title. The hearing for the Manawatū-Kukutauaki block took place during November 1872.\textsuperscript{124} This block originally extended from Pukehou, in the south, to Tokomaru in the north. When the claim began, Ihakara Tukumaru of Ngāti Raukawa set up the claim for Ngāti Raukawa.\textsuperscript{125} The following day Tamihana Rauparaha joined with the Ngāti Raukawa and Wi Parata stated: 'Ngātitoa and Ngātiawa claim jointly with Raukawa.'\textsuperscript{127}

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{118}] Anderson and Pickens, 1996, p.130
\item[\textsuperscript{119}] Undated, Buller, "Copy of memorandum by Mr. Buller", MA 13 box 111 70f, ANZ-W
\item[\textsuperscript{120}] Matene te Whiwhi, 11 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01C, pp.197-198: Hare Hemi Taharape (Ngati Raukawa), 12 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01C, p.209: Henare te Herekau (Ngati Raukawa, Ngati Whakatere), 12 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01C, pp.206-208: Hoani Meihana te Rangiotu (Rangitane), 14 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01C
\item[\textsuperscript{121}] Tamihana te Rauparaha, 28 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01D, p.388: Te Karira Tonoa (Ngati Toa), 31 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01D, pp.419-420: Isaac Earl Featherstone, 11 Apr 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01E, p.646: Peeti te Awe Awe (Rangitane), 4 Apr 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01D, p.494
\item[\textsuperscript{122}] Wi Parata, 13 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01C, pp.220-221
\item[\textsuperscript{123}] Wi Tamihana te Neke (Ngati Awa and Taranaki), 31 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01D, pp.421-422: Walter Bulter, 13 Mar 1868, Himatangi Title investigation, Ōtaki MBk01C, p.217-218
\item[\textsuperscript{124}] Anderson and Pickens, 1996, p.166
\item[\textsuperscript{125}] Ihakara Tukumaru (Ngati Raukawa), 13 Nov 1872, Ōtaki MBk1, p.12
\item[\textsuperscript{126}] Tamihana Rauparaha, 13 Nov 1872, Ōtaki MBk1, p.16
\item[\textsuperscript{127}] Wi Parata (Ngati Toa and Te Ati Awa), 13 Nov 1872, Ōtaki MBk1, p.16
\end{itemize}
As might be expected, the Kurahaupo counter-claimants opposed the now joint Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toa and Ngātiawa claim. On 3 December 1872, the case for these claimants began with Ihakara Whakamaru testifying that Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toa and Ngātiawa held the land through conquest.\(^{128}\) Although Matene te Whiwi of Ngāti Toa acknowledged the joint initial actions of the three iwi, he suggested that Ngātiawa subsequently agreed to leave all the land between Ōtaki & Whangaehu to Ngāti Raukawa.\(^{129}\) Henare te Herekau (Ngāti Raukawa), although initially appearing to agree with Whiwi, later noted: ‘Ngātitoa, Ngātiawa and Ngātiraukawa have mana over the land shown on the plan. I am not driving off the Ngātitoa & Ngātiawa from Tuwhakatupua to Kukutauaki we are in Court as co-claimants.’\(^{130}\) Subsequently, Wiremu Tamihana te Neke of Ngātiawa gave evidence stating: ‘The Ngātiawa and Ngātitoa have mana over this land from Kukutauaki to Tuwhakatupua [on the Manawatū River] and they have mana still over the land.’\(^{131}\)

The judgement for the Manawatū-Kukutauaki block was given on 4 March 1873. In relation to the claimants, the Court found:

That sections of the Ngātiraukawa tribe have acquired rights over the said block which according to Māori custom and usage constitute them owners thereof (with certain exceptions) together with Ngātitoa and Ngātiawa whose joint interest therein is admitted by the claimants.\(^{132}\)

The subsequent Court order recorded that resident Ngāti Raukawa were the owners of the block 'subject to such rights and interests therein as the Ngātiawa and Ngātitoa Tribes may hereafter establish.'\(^{133}\) Previously Wi Tamihana te Neke\(^{134}\) and Tamihana te Rauparaha\(^{135}\) had specifically agreed to the certificate being worded in that manner.

It does not appear that the intended further inquiry into Ngātiawa and Ngāti Toa interests was allowed for and instead the Manawatū-Kukutauaki block was partitioned and awarded to various Ngāti Raukawa occupants.

---

\(^{128}\) Evidence Ihakara Whakamaru (Ngati Raukawa), 3 Dec 1872, Ōtaki MBk1, pp.132-133
\(^{129}\) Matene te Whiwi (Ngati Toa, Ngati Raukawa), 3-5 Dec 1872, Ōtaki MBk1, pp.132-133
\(^{130}\) Henare te Herekau (Ngati Raukawa), 5 Dec 1872, Ōtaki MBk1, pp.132-133
\(^{131}\) Wiremu Tamihana te Neke (Ngati Awa), Dec 1872, Ōtaki MBk1, p.172
\(^{132}\) Judgment, 4 Mar 1873, Ōtaki MBk1, pp.176-178; see also Buick, 1903, op cit, p.276
\(^{133}\) Court Order, 12 Mar 1873, Ōtaki MBk1, p.193
\(^{134}\) Wi Tamihana te Neke (Ngati Awa), 12 Mar 1873, Ōtaki MBk1, p.193
\(^{135}\) Tamihana te Rauparaha, 12 Mar 1873, Ōtaki MBk1, p.193
Figure 5
Inquiry District Block map showing, in red outline, the Āhuaturanga Purchase, the Rangitīkei-Manawatū purchase and the external outline of the original Manawatū-Kukutauaki Block (ie several blocks (eg Horowhenua) within the outline were put through the Land Court separately)
[Adaptation of CFRT map]
Whitireia and Wi Parata

Whitireia is a block of land of approximately 500 acres situated at Porirua that was transferred to the Church of England in 1848 for the purposes of providing a school. Those chiefs who transferred the land included Te Rauparaha, Tamihana Te Rauparaha, Matene Te Whiwhi, Hoani Te Okoro, Wiremu Kanae, Watarauihi Nohorua, and Rawiri Hikihiki. The land was given by the chiefs to the Governor who, on 8 December 1850, granted it to Bishop Selwyn on trust for the purposes of providing a school. The passing of legislation in 1858 enabled the establishment of Trusts within the Church. A Trust was soon established for Whitireia. Under this legislation, the trustees were now the legal owners of the land.¹³⁶

Several trusts of this nature existed around the country at Motueka, Masterton and Te Aute. Although they all experienced difficulties in maintaining a full and continuing education service for their intended beneficiaries, in some cases, at least, schools had been built. No school was ever built on Whitireia. In 1876, therefore, Wi Parata and 18 others petitioned Parliament proposing that the terms of the transfer had not been fulfilled and the land should be returned to its owners. The Select Committee hearing the petition, however, was not prepared to make recommendations for the return of the land. As a result, Wi Parata brought declaratory proceedings in the Supreme Court seeking to have the Crown Grant to the Church of England set aside and the land returned.

The case, and the resulting judgment by Chief Justice Prendergast, are well known for remarks made about the Treaty of Waitangi and the non-existence of Māori customary law. Aside from this, it was held that in the case of Whitireia, the Crown Grant had effectively extinguished any native title that might have existed.

During the 1890s, petitions were presented to Parliament seeking the return of Whitireia. In addition, attempts were made to pass legislation to refer the matter to a Royal Commission. Eventually, in 1905, such a Commission was established. Although the inquiry found that

the terms of the grant and trust had not been fulfilled, this did not result in a recommendation for the land to be returned. Instead, in 1907, legislation was passed that joined the Whitieria Trust with a similar trust that had been operating at Ōtaki. From this point onwards, with a school being built at Ōtaki, any funds from the use of Whireia land went to support the educational work being done at Ōtaki.

In 1926, new certificates of title were issued to the Porirua College Trust Board for the approximately 500 acres. Over time, this estate has been reduced. Seventy four lots comprising almost 25 acres were transferred into private ownership presumably by sale. In 1935, 100 acres was transferred to the New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation. In December 1955, 89 acres was taken under the 'better utilisation' clauses of the Public Works Act. A further 2 acres were taken under the Act in January 1966. In 1977, the balance was transferred to the Crown for public reserve purposes.\(^{137}\)

The nature of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims of course focus on Whitireia itself, the grant and the history of efforts to have it cancelled and the land returned.\(^{138}\) In addition, however, there is another strong theme in Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims which relates to the negative impacts personally experienced by Wi Parata arising from his involvement in the efforts to have the land returned and particularly from his bringing a case in the Supreme Court.\(^{139}\) This matter was also brought up during the Ngā Kōrero Tuku Iho hearing held on 22 April 2015 as a point for further investigation.

Aside from this specific aspect of the life and career of Wi Parata, Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants, especially those descended from Parata, seek a full consideration of the role of Parata in iwi matters and his relationship with the Crown. Parata descendants note several significant actions taken by Parata that need to be researched. This includes the role of Parata in ensuring land was transferred to the North Island Main Trunk Railway in the early 1880s;\(^{140}\) his gifting of other lands as reserves to the community of Waikanae and the establishment of Te Whakarongotai marae on its current location.

\(^{137}\) Ford, op cit, pp.19-20

\(^{138}\) See statement of claim Wai 89 1.1, 27 July 1989

\(^{139}\) See statement of claim Wai 2361 1.1.1, 1 August 2012 paras38, 45 & 53

\(^{140}\) Anderson and Pickens, 1996, p.303
Taranaki Issues

Throughout the 19th century, a series of major events occurred in Taranaki which resulted in significant land loss and socio-economic impacts for the local iwi and hapū. As has been noted, the links between Ngātiawa within the Inquiry District and other areas, most notably Taranaki, is more than whakapapa. Available evidence considered to date has shown that the rohe of Ngātiawa extended from Te Tau Ihu, onto the Kāpiti Coast and through to Taranaki. Within that three-area rohe, iwi members adopted an extremely fluid expression of customary rights. The impact of events in areas other than the Inquiry District, therefore, are of relevance to fully understanding the situation of Ngātiawa on the Kāpiti Coast. Taranaki, especially, was a significant arena of Crown action during the nineteenth century and the impacts of the following series of events will need to be carefully considered:

- the Waitara 'purchase'
- the Taranaki wars
- land confiscation
- post-war 'compensation' and return of lands
- the role of the West Coast Commission
- the subsequent administration of reserves by the Public Trustee
- the rise of Te Whiti and Tohu, the establishment and attack of Parihaka community and ongoing links throughout through to 1900

Research Issues

After 1840 the coastal area from Waikanae southwards that was inhabited by Ngātiawa was soon brought into the orbit of the newly established Pākehā colony at Port Nicholson. From the date of the signing of the Treaty there was a comparatively frequent connection between settlers and Crown officials and Ngātiawa at Waikanae. In fact all iwi on the south-western coast of the North Island soon had much contact with Pākehā and Crown officials. Not surprisingly, the district was soon identified by Crown officials as an area suitable for acquisition. Within this context the rights, interests and relationships between iwi that had developed prior to 1840 were
soon tested. The above summary narrative has covered the period 1840 to 1880. A number of research issues arise:

- **Ahi Kaa, 1840-1870:** what was the nature of land tenure within the area occupied by Ngātiawa in the years after 1840? With Kuititanga having occurred in 1839, it would not be surprising to find a fair degree of flux and uncertainty. Certainly, as will be noted in the next section, the Native Land Court in 1890 found this to be the case. On the other hand, as years passed, the nature of customary rights would have developed. The reading of source material conducted for this scoping, particularly Native Land Court minutes (which are largely about documenting occupation), shows a very fluid situation. Spatially, many Ngātiawa variously occupied three rohe – Waikanae, Taranaki and Te Tau Ihu (especially Arapaoa and Waikawa). For some, movement between these three rohe changed frequently as people responded to personal circumstances in their lives or outside influences such as Crown actions, politics or warfare. This fluidity of movement shaped land tenure in the Waikanae area. From the reading conducted to date, land tenure and the rights and interests of hapū, whānau or individuals appeared to be ever-evolving. As these processes occurred there were challenges, competition and conflict. In a situation where native title remained in place, however, any such matters were settled in accordance with customary imperatives and under tikanga. The actions of the Native Land Court from the 1870s in awarding title would change this situation irrevocably. In order to be in a position to be able to assess the impact of the Court’s action, research needs to focus on the nature of Ngātiawa land tenure over time in all its complexities and variations.

- **Pre-Treaty land transactions and Old Land Claims:** as noted in the summary narrative, there are two series of pre-Treaty land transactions which nominally at least involve Ngātiawa land interests. As such, they should be examined. In both cases, care should be taken that not too much resource is expended in covering these complicated histories that at the end did not result in any land loss by Ngātiawa. The New Zealand Company purchases have been dealt with extensively in the Tribunal's Te Tau Ihu and Te Whanganui-a-Tara reports. The actual relevance of these purchases to Ngātiawa within the inquiry district will need to be ascertained. As for the Rhodes and partners' purchase,
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141 Some hapū also included Te Whanganui a Tara and the islands of Wharekauri as places they could occupy
the series of land transaction conducted by the partnership are generally regarded as being the prime example of exaggerated pre-1840 land transactions that claimed huge tracts of land but were not fully understood by those Māori claimed to have been involved. Nevertheless, the Rhodes et al claims resulted in a long, controversial and complicated investigation and settlement process. The end result was that the partners received a maximum scrip award, but the Crown never sought to follow this up by claiming the lands supposedly acquired. Therefore, no Ngātiawa land was acquired as a result of the Kāpiti/Ōtaki land transaction. On the other hand, the 6 November 1839 land transaction was specific to the Waikanae area and the chief Reretawhanga supported the transaction before the Old Land Claims Commission. This transaction should be closely researched.

- **The relationship of Ngātiawa with the Crown, 1840-1850**: from the signing of the Treaty at Waikanae in 1840 the interaction with Crown officials increased. As noted, from 1847 a Police Magistrate was present at Waikanae. Initially, the relationship between the Crown and Ngātiawa was close with Waikanae chiefs actively assisting the Crown in its campaign against Te Rangihaeata. Matters soon changed, however, when the Crown learnt of the intentions of Wiremu Kingi and many others to return to Taranaki as this potentially thwarted Crown land acquisition objectives to support the colony at New Plymouth. Former allies, therefore, were soon treated as a significant threat with Governor Grey taking strong action. Wi Kingi, nevertheless, left. The period leading up to the departure needs to be researched in some depth especially as it has a direct link with Crown land purchasing actions that occurred in the 1850s (see below). In the aftermath of the departure of Wi Kingi, the government laid out a model village by the coast named Kawewai. It also appears a similar village was created at Wainui despite a pā having been located there. Little detail has been found about these villages in the research undertaken for this report. In fact, the broad philosophy behind model villages and the Crown's policies associated with them has not really been a matter of close research within Tribunal historiography. From the Crown's perspective, was the establishment of Kawewai and Wainui a reward for those Ngātiawa who did not join Wi Kingi or a mechanism to physically contain Māori within a certain area? Certainly, the view held by some of the current claimants was that Kawewai was Governor's Grey attempt to impose control. Research needs to look closer into all matters surrounding the establishment of
Kawewai and Wainui. Aside from the reasons for their establishment, what did the model villages consist of (e.g. amenities, services) and what was the Crown's expenditure in setting up the villages? Did the Crown merely lay out sections and possibly public/communal reserves or were buildings erected too? The subsequent history of Kawewai and Wainui also should be researched. How long were they used? Did they have an impact on the way in which the surrounding land was occupied?

- **Tribal Boundary**: The announcement by Kingi of his intention to leave Waikanae had immediate land tenure implications. Aside from discussions within Ngātiawa over the ramifications of this, much of the debate also took the form of a strong challenge from Ngāti Toa over the nature of land tenure in the Waikanae area. Initially, this challenge was presented as a rejection of Ngātiawa rights in the area, a claim which, in turn, was totally rejected by Ngātiawa chiefs. Eventually, the debate focused around the northern boundary of Ngātiawa. Commentators often record that as a result of these negotiations a tribal boundary came into place at Kukutauaki Stream. The unlikelihood of this stream being a boundary has been pointed out by Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa (as part of iwi feedback to this scoping report), as this stream runs in a north to south direction. Therefore, the matter of the location of an iwi boundary needs to be closely considered by any commissioned research.

- **Whareroa and Wainui purchases**: these Crown purchases, occurring in 1858 and 1859 respectively, were linked to the departure of Wi Kingi ten years earlier. Research will need to closely study the land tenure discussions of this period as they provide an essential context to Crown actions in purchasing Whareroa and Wainui. Questions could include: what was the basis of the Ngāti Toa challenge? Was there a uniform Ngāti Toa perspective, or were there variations among those Ngāti Toa chiefs who were closely related to Ngātiawa? What was the basis of the Ngātiawa rejection of the Ngāti Toa challenge? In addition, a key focus should be the way in which the Crown handled representation issues during its attempts to purchase land in the area.

Although it appears that by 1854 the Waikanae negotiations were suspended for the moment, in 1854 the focus of Crown agents was on gaining acknowledgement from
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142 Personal Communication Mahina-a-rangi Baker, 17 November 2015
Ngātiawa of the North Island to a relinquishment of their interests in Te Tau Ihu. The three deeds signed should be considered and contextualised within the events occurring both in Taranaki and Waikanae. In addition, consideration should be given as to whether these land transactions really did represent a giving up of northern Ngātiawa interests in Te Tau Ihu. The Waitangi Tribunal, considering the 1853-1856 Waipounamu series of land transactions, which included these deeds, found a large number of Treaty breaches in relation to the deeds signed including varying understandings held by those who signed and the Crown negotiator.

The final negotiations over Whareroa and Wainui, as recorded in published contemporary source material, seem to begin in 1858 and were conducted through to and completed by 1859. Research is required to ascertain whether there were any developments in the period between the activities of McLean, Kemp and Grey from 1850 to 1853 and Searancke's negotiations. In addition, inquiry should be made into the context to the 1858/9 negotiations. Searancke, in his reports, was rather matter-of-fact as to the quality of land and somewhat underplayed the value of the two purchases he secured. It would be important to ascertain how this area of the south-western coast was viewed at this time. What had been the history of Pākehā occupation in the Waikanae area since 1840? Clearly this area provided a route north from Wellington as Searancke noted; did this have any influence in the securing of the land?

There also are several questions around the sale. It appears from Searancke's published reports that the original purchase was to include all of the land rights of Ngātiawa through to the agreed boundary point with Ngāti Toa. Is there further evidence on this first offer? Was it influenced by Ngāti Toa involvement? Was it influenced by the departure of Wi Kingi? Who were the persons who participated in the two purchases and what is known of their hapu affiliation and area of occupation? Finally, what were the understandings of the land that was actually included in these purchases?

The matter of reserves is also important. Would there have been reserves laid out if the whole of the lands of Ngātiawa had been included? Searancke writes of 2,500 acres of reserves. Is there any evidence on where these would have been located? As it turned out, when Whareroa was sold, there were no reserves allowed for. Is there any further
evidence available on the negotiations to ascertain how this may have come about? In the Wainui purchase, a number of reserves were promised and awarded - almost 700 acres. Is there any evidence available on the selection of these reserves and whether they met the requirements of those selling the land?

- **Customary Rights:** the overview narrative has presented three examples of evidence, located within the timeframe available to this scoping, where the rights of Ngātiawa beyond the supposed agreed tribal boundary were endorsed by others: either by the Crown through payment, by some (but not all) iwi and by the Native Land Court following a title investigation. The three examples - the 1864 Āhuaturanga purchase, the 1866 Rangitikei-Manawatū purchase and the 1872 title investigation of the Manawatū-Kukutauaki block - account for a significant proportion of the Inquiry District. The acknowledgements, therefore, are significant. There is, however, little detailed evidence recorded on the nature of the rights and interests being acknowledged. What is recorded shows that these rights and interests relate in some way to Ngātiawa being among the very first of the northern peoples who came into the area. This basis of right holding, therefore, is probably not operating at the same level as ahi kaa. Nevertheless, it is clear that a level of rightholding persisted and was, comparatively widely, if not uniformly, acknowledged. The ramifications of Ngātiawa rightholding are significant. Therefore, this is an important issue to be researched. To the forefront should be evidence from and by Ngātiawa describing their perspective of their rights. In addition, however, the perspectives of others should also be considered. This is not to prove or disprove the Ngātiawa perspective as their own perspective is immutable and stands on its own tikanga. Instead it is to gauge the views of various parties. To gain the widest picture possible, the events that occurred during the original heke need to be understood. This returns to the point made earlier of the need to ensure the pre-1840 history for Ngātiawa is fully researched and understood.

Furthermore, there is a need to research all participation by Ngātiawa in the Land Court within the Inquiry District. Not only will this produce more information on the Ngātiawa perception of their customary interests, it will also record the views of others.
- **Whitireia**: One of the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims [Wai 89] specifically relates to Whitireia and the issues associated with the land block. Although Wi Parata became associated with efforts from the late 1870s to have the land returned, research will have to ascertain the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa links to the land and the gift. In addition to this, an earlier exploratory report identified the need for focused research: to locate evidence given before the Native Affairs Committee in relation to the petitions of 1896, 1901 and 1904; whether there is any evidence of how those interested in the land responded to the Ōtaki and Porirua Empowering Act 1907; and whether there was any response to the various land transferences and takings that occurred throughout the twentieth century.143 Aside from this, however, there is the additional facet where it is claimed that the involvement of Wi Parata in protesting over Whitireia, and his involvement in bringing the Supreme Court case, brought significant personal impacts. A potentially difficult subject to research, an innovative methodology will have to be devised to investigate this matter.

- **Taranaki Issues**: The way in which to handle the link between Inquiry District and Taranaki issues presents a significant challenge to the researcher especially in the absence of knowing at this stage exactly how significant the impact of events in Taranaki has been in relation to Ngātiawa of the Inquiry District. Based on information considered during this scoping exercise it does appear that the links are of great significance. Despite a Waitangi Tribunal report being available that sets out, in comparatively broad terms, the sequence of events that occurred in Taranaki, there is potentially a major research component required to drill down and ascertain exactly how Taranaki events impacted on the Ngātiawa community within the Inquiry District. The researcher will be required to carefully develop a suitable methodology to manage the research and analysis needed to deal with Taranaki issues.

---

143 Ford, op cit. p.25
3. **Irrevocable Transmutation: Ngārara 1880-1900**

The Ngārara Block and its title and alienation history is a central and significant issue for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants as this block (along with the Muaūpoko and Kukutauaki No.1 block) effectively account for most of the occupation of Ngātiawa within the inquiry district after 1870. The finalisation of title for the Ngārara block, from customary title down to partitioned whānau interests, occurred over a twenty-year period amidst much debate and controversy.

**Initial Hearings and the 1887 Partition**

The Ngārara Title Investigation, involving approximately 45,000 acres, commenced on 19 May 1873. This title investigation occurred within the context of a boundary dispute between Ngātiawa and Tamihana Te Rauparaha. During this hearing, Wi Parata provided evidence of Ngātiawa heke into the area. He noted that some remained on the land while others returned to fetch the rest of the tribe. He described a number of Ngātiawa migrations with the last coinciding with the Haowhenua battle, after which some of the migrants dispersed (some to Arapaoa and some to Wharekauri) although others remained. Parata asked for a Certificate of Title for those Ngātiawa in possession of the land, not those located elsewhere. He also discussed boundaries between Ngātiawa and Ngāti Toa. Wiremu Tamihana te Neke of Ngātiawa supported the comments of Wi Parata. During the case an arrangement was reached in relation to the disputed boundary so that the names of 66 Ngātiawa could be registered with the Court and a Certificate of Title ordered. In accordance with the native land legislation of the time, which prevented more than ten owners being placed on a title, the land was to be vested in Wi Parata and seven other grantees.
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144 Ngārara Title Investigation, Ōtaki MBk02
145 Wi Parata, 19 May 1873, Ōtaki MBk02. pp.179-180
147 Wiremu Tamihana te Neke of Ngati Awa, 19 May 1973, Ōtaki MBk02. pp.180-181
148 2 June 1873, Ōtaki MBk02. pp.210-211
149 3 June 1873, Ōtaki MBk02. pp.211-213
Figure 6
Wiremu Te Kakakura Parata, c.1871
In the aftermath of this award, 19,600 acres of this land were purchased by the Crown on 14 January 1874. The block, named Maunganui, essentially consisted of the eastern portion of the Ngārara block that extended into the mountains. A price of £600 was paid. A significant feature of this purchase is the fact that despite only eight grantees being put on the title of the Ngārara block, a total of 54 signatories participated in the sale of Maunganui. The sale left 29,500 acres in Ngātiawa ownership. A subsequent payment in February 1874 of £200 to Parata, later became a focus of controversy.\textsuperscript{150}

In 1874 a further case came before the Court when Tamihana te Rauparaha claimed an 840 acre portion within the Ngārara block named Kukutauaki No.1. Wi Parata and his counter claimants were to be ultimately successful in this case as the Court accepted their proof of continuous occupation over a long time.\textsuperscript{151} Again, within the context of the ten-owner rule, on 16 April 1874, an order was made in favour of Wi Parata and five other persons.\textsuperscript{152}

On 6 May 1887 the hearing in relation to the partition of Ngārara West came before the Native Land Court. The hearing, therefore, was in relation to the remaining area of 29,500 acres left after the 1874 Maunganui purchase. It essentially involved the claims of various Ngātiawa hapū.\textsuperscript{153} Enoka Hohepa Taitea claimed land from Pukahu to the Waikanae River to Crown land on the east. Ngāti Puketapu, Ngāti Mitiwai and Ngāti Tuahu hapū had kainga on this part and lived on this part, having come from Taranaki, conquered the land and then continuously occupied it. Enoka gave a list of persons representing the hapū that he spoke for.\textsuperscript{154}

Ihakara te Ngārara claimed for Ngāti Puketapu hapū. The Ngāti Puketapu ancestral boundary line was said to go from Kenakena to Pukahu to Ngātoto.\textsuperscript{155} Regarding the Puketapu claim the Court indicated that the evidence in their favour was clear. However, the Court set a line from Kenakena to Ngātoto trig as the boundary rather than the fences erected by Ihakara.\textsuperscript{156}

\textsuperscript{150} Anderson and Pickens, 1996, p.283
\textsuperscript{151} Judgment, Mar 1874, Kukutauaki No.1, [Wellington, Ōtaki MBk2, p.256
\textsuperscript{152} Native Land Court Order, 16 Apr 1874, Kukutauaki No.1,]. Wellington, Ōtaki MBk2, p.395
\textsuperscript{153} 6 May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, pp. 214, 222, 224-227, 249-250, 253-258, 261
\textsuperscript{154} 11 May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p. 225
\textsuperscript{155} Piripi Tana of Puketapu hapū of Ngāti Awa), 13 May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, pp.246-247: Epiha te Ngārara (son of Ihakara), 11 May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.227: Enoka Hohepa Taitea, 11 May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.228: Rehere Tahuaroa of Puketapu, 11 May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, pp.228-229
\textsuperscript{156} Judgment, May 1887, Ngārara West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, pp.253-255
Ngāti Tuaho and Otaraua hapū also claimed part of Ngārarā. Ema Tini Taitea told the Court that these hapū had no ancestral boundaries but lived and cultivated on the land ‘…from old days down to the present.’ Despite some witnesses making reference to boundaries, others agree that these hapū had no boundaries within the block. In its judgment, the Court noted that most of Ngāti Puketapu land was in the Muaūpo block and that ‘all they have remaining in Ngārarā are their cultivations’.

A further hapū to claim interests within Ngārarā were Ngāti Mitiwai. Inia Tuhata described their boundary as going from Kenakena to the Waikanae Stream and up the stream. It was claimed the hapū owned the land south of this boundary except for the Puketapu portion. The Court found, however, the only rights Ngāti Mitiwai possessed were confined to the portion of the block which they had fenced and were currently in occupation of.

The Kaitangata hapū also were claimants in this case. Tamihana te Karu of Kaitangata hapū described a boundary that extended from Kenakena to Waikanae Stream to its source.

Having heard the evidence, the Court made orders as follows:

- Wi Parata awarded Ngārarā West A Railway Reserve
- Puketapu awarded Ngārarā West B
- Enoka Hohepa, Ema Tini Haerepuku and two others awarded Ngārarā West A No.1
- Inia Tuhata and Rangihanu Tuhata awarded Ngārarā West A No.2
- Eruini Te Marau awarded Ngārarā West A No.3
- Wi Parata and 43 others awarded Ngārarā West A
- Ihakara Te Ngārarā awarded Ngārarā West B No.1 Railway Reserve
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157 Ema Tini Taitea of Ngati Taraua, 11 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.229
158 Enoka Hohepa Taitea, 11 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.229
159 Watene te Nehu, 11 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.230; see also Parinia Rangi of Ngati Otaraua, 12 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.232: Mere Naera Pomare, 11 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.230: Watene te Nehu, 11 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, pp.230-231: Parinia Rangi of Ngati Oraraua, 12 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.232
159 Parinia Rangi of Ngati Oraraua, 12 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.232
159 Pinia Tuata, 12 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.234-235: Mere Naera Pomare, 12 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.235-236: Eruini te Marau (Ngati Rahiri and Otaraua), 12 May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, pp.236-237. NB. It is not indicated when his involvement with these cultivations began
163 Ibid.
164 Orders, May 1887, Ngārarā West Partition, Ōtaki MBk07, p.257-261
Protest and Investigation 1888-9

Following the partition case, the Tuhata whānau unsuccessfully applied for a rehearing. Inia Tuhata then petitioned Parliament on 12 June 1888 for a new hearing for the title of the Ngārara block.\textsuperscript{165} Over August 1888 the Native Affairs Committee of the Legislative Council heard evidence in relation to the petition. Witnesses included Heni te Rau, Bishop Octavius Hadfield, Chief Judge of the Native Land Court J.E. Macdonald, Commissioner of Crown Lands J.W.A Merchant, Wi Parata, Pirihira Te Tia and Wi Hape Pakau. Issues raised in evidence included the name of the block in question - that is, why the name 'Ngārara' had been used rather than 'Waikanae' and whether there had been deceit intended by the use of this name so as to disguise the actual location of the block being put through the Court. It also focused on the nature of the rights of Tuhata in the block with varying evidence given on the time and length of occupancy by Inia Tuhata or his father Hone Tuhata.\textsuperscript{166} On 27 August 1888 the committee reported that the evidence pointed to 'a serious miscarriage of justice in the subdivision of 1887' in respect of the rights and interests of the Tuhata whānau and possibly others.\textsuperscript{167} Having received the Committee's findings, on 31 August 1888 the Native Minister announced the establishment of a commission of inquiry to examine several matters relating to the awarding of various blocks including Ngārara.\textsuperscript{168}

This commission began hearing evidence relating to the Ngārara block on 15 November 1888. By the time the hearings concluded at the end of the month, approximately 700 pages of evidence had been recorded. There were two groupings of witnesses: the “petitioners” (the Inia Tuhata group) and “opponents” (the Wi Parata group). Most of the questions focused around establishing the movements and status of Hone Tuhata. Issues included whether Hone Tuhata was present at the battle of Kuititanga and whether he was viewed as a principal chief of Waikanae. In addition, the rights and interests of Mitiwai and the status of the hapū Ngāti Tupawhenua were closely examined by the Commission. Witnesses for the petitioners included William Jenkins, Tamati te Wera, Pirihira te Tia, Honi Taramena, Rangipo Taito, Eruini te Marau, Octavius Hadfield and Ihakara te Ngārara.\textsuperscript{169}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{165} Petition of Inia Tuhata, 12 June 1888, MA series 70/4, ANZ-Wgtn; cited in Anderson and Pickens, 1996, p. 286
\item \textsuperscript{166} Native Affairs Committee of the Legislative Council, MA series 70/3, ANZ-Wgtn
\item \textsuperscript{167} Richmond, JALC, 27 Aug 1888, p. 205; cited in Anderson and Pickens, 1996, p.291
\item \textsuperscript{168} Mitchelson, 29 Aug 1888, NZPD, vol. 63, p. 523; cited in Anderson and Pickens, 1996, p.291
\item \textsuperscript{169} 15-22 Nov 1888, Ngārara, Porangahua, Mangamaire, and Waipiro Commission, MA series 70/1, ANZ-Wgtn
\end{itemize}
On 19 and 21 November, Wi Parata provided testimony that produced over 102 pages of transcript. From 24-27 November, the 16 witnesses who provided evidence as opponents to the claims of Tuhata included Raniera Erihana, Enoka Tatairau, Pare Tawhera, Riria te Matata, Piripi Tana, Mita Rangikatatu, Tamihana te Karu and Heni te Rau. These witnesses questioned whether the Tuhata whānau were in continual occupation of the land and whether Hone Tuhata was a principal chief of Waikanae. They also rejected that Mitiwai had substantive landholdings in the Ngārara block.170

Not surprisingly, the Commission's findings included comment on the conflicting nature of the evidence that had been presented. Generally, however, it found in favour of the petitioners and the claim that the Tuhata whānau had continued to occupy land in the district. Although unable to determine the exact extent of the land interests of Hone Tuhata these were viewed as substantial and likely to be at least equal to those of the Kaitangata hapū. Nevertheless, the Commission did not uphold accusations against Wi Parata of improper behaviour. Given this result, it was recommended that the 1887 decision should be set aside and a rehearing ordered.171

Rehearing and Complaint 1890-1900

Eventually the rehearing of the Ngārara block came before the Land Court in January 1890. Proceedings commenced on 13 January and continued through to the end of April with judgment being given three months later on 24 July. By then, more than a thousand pages of evidence had been recorded. During this time the following, primarily hapū-based, cases proceeded:

- Eruini Te Marau, on behalf of Ngāti Rahiri hapū, commencing on 20 January, primarily focused on the northern part of the block
- Inia Tuhata, on behalf of the Ngāti Tupawhena or Mitiwai portion of Kaitangata hapū, commencing 20 February, focused on land south of the Waikanae River
- Commencing on 8 March a series of individual claims from those members of the Otaraua hapū whose interests lay outside of the Muaūpoko block
- The case of Wi Parata and others, from several hapū including Ngāti Kura, was heard between 31 January and 21 February resuming on 24 March, continuing till 11 April.

---

170 24 Nov – 1 Dec 1888, Ngārara, Porangahau, Mangamaire, and Waipiro Commission, MA series 70/1, ANZ-Wgtn
Ultimately, all parties were found to have interests but usually to a lesser area than had been claimed. Notably, the cases had been presented either as hapū claims or at least based on rights derived by hapū action. The Court, however, focusing on 1840 as the point of determination, found that at that particular point in time, less than a year after the turmoil of the battle of Kuititanga, the land within the block was held in common as a tribe, rather than on a hapū basis. Given this, the Court then focused on the claims of those persons who were included in the 1873 title. Effectively then, the Court was considering the nature of individual rights as at 1840.

Whatever rights then the individuals now in the Certificate of Title possess as against others in the same Certificate are such only as derived (first) from the individual acquisition of each separate member of the tribe who took part in the conquest and in the subsequent occupation of this transmitted right, and secondly the occupation exercised during the years from 1840 to the present time by the tacit consent of others.\textsuperscript{172}

The Court therefore allocated various interests to individuals. Under the legislation that had allowed the hearing to proceed - the Ngārara and Waipiro Further Investigation Act 1889 - the Court had the power, in addition to the allocation of shares, to actually position these shares on the ground and then map these awards. After giving owners an opportunity to undertake this task, the Court resumed in January 1891 to hear cases of objections to awards and to work through awards and the position of grants. Cases were heard through to the end of March. Over the next couple of months the awards were finalised. The awards created two blocks: Ngārara West A and C. The Ngārara West B block, awarded to Puketapu in 1887, had not been challenged and remained unchanged. Ngārara West A was a block of occupied land that extended from the sea to the hills while Ngārara West C consisted of inland hills and forest. Many, but not all, of those eligible for grants were given portions in both the A and C blocks. Ngārara West A was divided into 78 sections, and West C into 41 sections - a total of 119 subdivisions. Most of the Ngārara West A sections were less than 100 acres. Few were held individually. Most titles were given to a small collection of whānau members. The shares of individuals in these whānau blocks, especially those located near the coast, often were small, being only a few acres.\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{172} Ngārara Judgment, 24 July 1890, Ōtaki MBk12, p.16
\textsuperscript{173} Anderson and Pickens, 1996, p.295
In the aftermath of the rehearing, there were several complaints, petitions and applications for rehearing all of which were rejected. These came from people such as Tamihana Te Kura, who was considered to be part of the case of Wi Parata, but also from persons associated with the Tuhata claim. In addition, it included persons who had missed out on being included in the 1873 title or who had not participated in the 1887 or 1890 hearings.\footnote{Ibid, pp.296-9}

Also in the aftermath of the settling of title for Ngārara, in 1891 the Crown became involved in a short and sharp purchase programme acquiring 15 sections (Ngārara West C 24-39 and Ngārara West C, part section 41) totalling approximately 9,000 acres of primarily back-country hill land.\footnote{Anderson and Pickens, 1996, pp.296-9. See MA/MLP references in the bibliography.}

Research Issues

The way in which the customary interests held in the Ngārara block were awarded as a title will be of great importance to the claims of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa as this estate, and the title under which it was held, shaped the subsequent twentieth century experience for iwi members. There are a number of challenges in undertaking this research.

- **Volume of source material**: Although the final section will discuss in some detail the methodology and source material associated with the 1819-1900 period, it is important to indicate at this point that a researcher dealing with Ngārara will need to have the ability to effectively work through the approximately 2,000 pages of evidence generated by the series of Ngārara inquiries to gain a full understanding of the complex rights that are being discussed.

- **Variation of evidence on the nature of rights**: The evidence in the 1887 partition and 1890 rehearing reveals a wide degree of variation between witnesses in their views on the nature of rights. This is not just a matter of people from the various hapū cases challenging the extent of rights or interests held by other hapū, but there also is evidence
of variation of opinion between those who were participants in the same case. For example, some witnesses insisted that there were recognised boundaries between hapū while others just as strongly state that such boundaries did not exist. This variation of view resulted in the 1890 Court rejecting hapū rights and making awards instead to whānau or individual groupings despite the claimants of the 1887 and 1890 cases presenting their cases as hapū claims. It will be important for the research to assess this variation and try to account for it if possible. The variation may reflect the various personal histories of the witnesses, for example, their age at the time they arrived on the land, their age at the time of hearing, or their length and time of occupation on the land. There may be more variation in the case of one hapū compared with another. If, ultimately, there is no clear pattern to explain the variation, the researcher may form a view that the variation existed because the holding of rights had been an organic experience exercised as needs and wants arose. The difficulty for various persons to explain the rights may lay in the fact that the matter had not formerly been widely discussed within the community as there had been no need to do so before the arrival of the Land Court title process.

• **The Nature of Evidence:** As somewhat indicated in the brief overview narrative, the process of settling title to the Ngārara block was one shrouded in controversy as various parties involved accused the other of malfeasance and fraud. Strong views are stated and accusations freely made about persons and their actions. Some of the evidence presented was claimed by the offended party to be deliberately false. In the reading undertaken for the scoping exercise, at face value it appears that the varying views stated by parties were genuinely held as a viewpoint. Yet, this means that completely opposite information often was presented on matters that were factually verifiable: for example, the physical location of a person at any given point in time. Does the difference lie in genuine error or deliberate falsehood? In either case, what were the implications for the title that was awarded? More importantly, is there a need to inquire deeply into these sorts of issues? The Ngārara case and its title outcome are today viewed by Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants as being greatly unjust. The findings of the Court make it clear that in the face of strongly expressed varying and controversial information a decision was made to impose a solution - by awarding titles down to the level of individual rightholders instead of trying to reconcile the hapū cases presented to the Court. As to the variation of
evidence, it will be important for a researcher to gain a clear understanding of the
dynamics of the case as a pre-requisite to evaluating the Court's actions. Nevertheless, it
will be a matter in which the researcher will need to exercise great care and sensitivity in
handling the issue - finding that right level where the existing situation is described
without matters turning into an exercise that does not serve any purpose.

- **The extent and impact of tenure difference**: As noted above, the Court imposed a
tenure onto the owners of Ngārara that was contrary to the way in which they presented
their rights even allowing for all the variations of viewpoint. Hapū-based rights were
reduced to whānau and individual rights. The relationship of this to subsequent land
alienations will be considered in the next part of this scoping report. The Court, faced
with the complex way in which Ngātiawa expressed their continually evolving land
rights, snap froze these rights and imposed them as title onto Ngātiawa through the 1890
awards. These awards used three dates to 'snap freeze' rights:

  - First, in accordance with the Court's modus operandi, 1840 was used as the
    lens through which the Court evaluated hapū rights. It found that the turmoil of
    the aftermath of Kuititanga undermined hapū rights as all groups resided on
    and used the land collectively in the face of the insecure environment in
    operation at the time. The Court did not allow for the possibility that over the
    next several decades a hapū-based rights system may have evolved.

  - The second date used to 'snap freeze' customary rights to Ngārara was 1872 -
    the date that title was awarded. This meant that despite occupation of the land
    being an ever-changing possibility, only those admitted to the title in 1872 (or
    their successors) could be included in the awards.

  - The third date was 1890 with the Court using existing locations and size of
    areas of occupation as a basis for the awards that were made.

As a result, judging by some of the post-hearing complaints, it appears that some persons
with interests may well have not even made it on to any title. Clearly, as noted
previously, Ngātiawa utilised their landholdings at Waikanae as parts of a rohe that
included Taranaki and Te Tau Ihu lands (as well, possibly, as others such as Wharekauri and Te Whanganui a Tara). Before 1870, this land utilisation was super flexible with interest holders moving between their lands as required and desired. From the preliminary reading of the evidence it even appears that after title was awarded in 1872, those who were not in the award still had the freedom to come onto the land at a later date and occupy on the basis of whakapapa rather than the Court's award. It was therefore only the 1890 action of the Court that finally awarded the land down to the specific level of placing small numbers of people on specific pieces of land which, in the case of lands by the coast, were often comparatively small.

The Ngārara hearing was the last of a series of events and processes that closed down the opportunity for Ngātiawa to exercise land rights in the customary manner they had since the 1820s. Following war and confiscation in Taranaki and the awarding of title to post-purchase reserves in Te Tau Ihu, Ngārara was the third and final stage of locking Ngātiawa interest holders down to specific amounts of lands in specific places. The full impact of this would be seen over the next century. Without diverting too much into the history of other areas such as Taranaki and Te Tau Ihu, research will need to be mindful of developments in these regions and assess how they impacted on Ngātiawa on the Kāpiti coast.

- **Land Purchases:** As noted above, following the initial award of title the Crown acquired 19,000 acres of the Ngārara block in a single purchase in 1874. Then again, in 1891, following the settling on partitioned titles, the Crown acquired a further 9,000 acres of land. The few sources that have been found within the context of this scoping report have been included in the bibliography. A deep research effort should be conducted to try and locate further source material of these purchases. It is important to find as much as possible about these two series of purchases, the Crown motivations, the impact on the block and how each set of owners was affected.
4. **Methodology and Sources**

Having identified a number of research issues needing to be addressed to ensure full coverage for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims for the 19th Century, it is important to ascertain whether existing research, on the record of inquiry or elsewhere, has dealt with all or any of these issues in sufficient depth. In summary, the evaluation completed for this scoping has found that although several reports have dealt with certain aspects of the identified research issues they are not sufficiently detailed to provide Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants with a comprehensive coverage of claim issues. The commissioning of an overview 19th century report is therefore recommended. To ascertain the resources required for such a report, an assessment is made below of the type and volume of source material that would contribute to a 19th century overview report.

*Other Reports*

A key requirement of the Research Commission for this scoping is to take into account already completed research on the Tribunal record before making research recommendations. An assessment of this material follows.

**The Gaining of Customary Rights: 1819-1840**

As indicated in the 'Research Issues' section of this scoping report, it is important to gain as full an understanding as possible of the nature of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa customary rights within the Inquiry District not only to ensure that a clear and accurate record is produced of the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa tribal history but also because it is a necessary prerequisite for evaluating the post-1840 period when the Crown took actions reflecting its perception of the customary rights of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa, especially in the northern areas of the Inquiry District. There are several reports which refer to and summarise the events considered in this section of the scoping report but these reports do not really come close to providing the depth of discussion and analysis of the customary rights of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa that are needed to address the research issues raised in this report.
**Rangahaua Whanui**\(^{176}\) Essentially this series of reports was intended as introductory summaries of events and issues. The Anderson and Pickens report therefore provides a helpful introduction to pre-1840 events. The 16-page chapter dealing with ‘Traditional History’, with only a few exceptions, is based on secondary source material as would be expected for such an introductory report. Whilst useful, this does not take into account the large amount of source material available in the Land Court minutes and other inquiries.

**19th Century Overview Report:**\(^{177}\) This report presents a 50-page chapter on the pre-1840 period. This primarily consists of a 16-page (and therefore brief) chronological narrative setting out the events that occurred, which is primarily based on secondary source material with some selective use of Land Court minutes. The remainder of the chapter consists of a 34-page discussion of the nature of historical narratives that were produced by Pākehā and iwi followed by an assessment of the historical literature produced in relation to pre-1840 events. Although primary source material features in the subsection on iwi perspectives, again the discussion primarily is based on secondary sources. The report therefore provides more of a commentary about perspectives in relation to customary rights rather than an attempt to describe the rights themselves. Furthermore, the focus of analysis is on the dynamics between Kurahaupo iwi and the northern iwi (primarily Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Toa). The dynamics between the northern iwi who came into the Inquiry District in the pre-1840 environment is not really a focus of the Hearn report.

**Te Tau Ihu Inquiry:** There are several reports on the record of the Te Tau Ihu o te Waka a Maui (Northern South Island) Inquiry District which deal with the pre-1840 period. Although these naturally focus on the arrival of Taranaki and Kawhia iwi into Te Tau Ihu, they also all deal with the first part of the migration which brought all groups through the Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District. The most comprehensive of these, from a Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa perspective, is a report by Alan Riwaka.\(^{178}\) Although the

---


\(^{177}\) T.J.Hearn, ‘One past, many histories: tribal land and politics in the nineteenth century’ June 2015, Wai 2200 #A152

\(^{178}\) Alan Riwaka, ‘Nga Hekenga o Te Atiawa’ 4 Jul 2000, Wai 607
bulk of the report focuses on customary rights in Te Tau Ihu, Riwaka uses secondary and primary source material in relation to events occurring before 1840 both in Taranaki and the Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District. Whilst this provides a very good coverage, it is not sufficiently comprehensive to address the research issues raised in this scoping report. In addition, it is focused on the events that occurred and deals less with the resulting occupation that followed battles or heke. The very good evidence in the Riwaka report, therefore, needs to be supplemented with the additional information that is available from the sources discussed below.

Customary Rights and Crown Actions: 1840-1880

As indicated in the discussion of research issues, this is a key period for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa. First, it represents a period when iwi customary rights within the Inquiry District, especially in the areas they directly occupied, continued to evolve in the aftermath of the Kuititanga battle. Secondly, it represents the first decades when Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa interacted with the Crown, both at the political level during the 1840s, and over their land rights in the south of their rohe in the 1850s. Thirdly, from the 1860s, there are questions of the way that events in Taranaki impacted on Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa on the Kāpiti coast. Finally, during the 1860s and 1870s, the period in which the involvement of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa in the northern purchases and title hearings occur, several reports do have some content on these events but, as noted below, they do not present comprehensive coverage. For a number of areas, such as the nature of customary rights in the 1840s and the interaction with the Crown (other than land purchases) and the return of Wiremu Kingi, there is no coverage at all. The areas on which there is some information include the Whareroa and Wainui purchases, the expression of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa interests north of their 'tribal' boundary and the initial awarding of title to Ngārara:

- **Rangahaua Whanui**: As an introductory report, the Anderson and Pickens report provides a helpful introduction to the Whareroa/Wainui purchases and a useful summary of the awarding of Ngārara. The depth of inquiry required for the sequence of Ngārara title investigations, however, is not sufficient. The role of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa in the 1866 Rangitikei-Manawatū purchase and the 1872 hearing of the Manawatū-Kukutauaki block is covered to the extent of the available source material.

179 For example, while the 1890 Ngārara rehearing is noted as a source, the 1887 partition is not
- **19th Century Overview Report:** While this report does report on the Whareroa/Wainui purchases, it does not cover all research issues identified in this scoping report. The subsequent history of the reserves from these purchases, for example, is not covered at all. There is a one-page summary of the initial 1872 Ngārara hearing. The role of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa in the 1866 Rangitikei-Manawatū purchase and the 1872 hearing of the Manawatū-Kukutauaki block is covered to the extent of the available source material. The development of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa customary rights on the Ngārara block and events of the 1840s (such as the interaction of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa with the resident Police Magistrate) are not covered at all.

Therefore, given the large amount of source material that has not been fully addressed in these reports (see below) and the wide range of research issues identified in this scoping report, it is felt that these two reports do not provide full coverage for events occurring between 1840 and 1880.

**Ngārara: 1880-1900**

Both the Anderson and Pickens' Rangahaua Whanui report and Hearn's 19th Century Overview Report deal to some extent with the post-1880 issues associated with the title of the Ngārara block.

- **Rangahaua Whanui:** For an introductory overview, Anderson and Pickens’ report provides a good narrative providing some detail of assessment with 17 pages covering the various developments. Although a clear chronology of events is given, an analysis of the many hundreds of pages of available evidence does not occur.

- **19th Century Overview Report:** The subsequent events relating to Ngārara from 1887 are not covered at all in this report despite the report's purpose being to represent all claimants in the inquiry district. Instead, Hearn refers readers to the Anderson and Pickens' report to gain an account of developments of Ngārara. As indicated above, Anderson and Pickens provide an overview introduction to Ngārara only.
Sources

Given the above assessment of currently available reports, and compared with the research issues that need to be addressed to fully present Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims to the Tribunal, a recommendation of this scoping report will be for the commissioning of a 19th century Land Issues and Crown Relationship report. To assist with the scoping of resources for such a report, an assessment of source material follows.

NLC and Inquiry Minutes

As indicated previously, from 1887 to 1890 the finalisation of title for the Ngārara West block proceeded through several stages at each process, generating a large number of pages of evidence:

- 1887 NLC partition case 30 pages
- 1888 Native Affairs Committee hearing 86 pages
- 1888 Ngārara Commission 700 pages
- 1890 Ngārar Rehearing 999 pages

The minutes from this series of hearings would contribute to all three components of the 19th century Land Issues and Crown Relationship report.

- The Gaining of Customary Rights: 1819-1840:
  - The 1887 partition case and 1890 rehearing particularly contain a great deal of evidence of the movements and pre-1840 history of Ngātiawa.

- Customary Rights and Crown Actions: 1840-1880:
  - All of the above hearings provide great detail about the occupation of Ngātiawa hapū, whānau and individuals on the Ngārara block from 1840 to 1880.
  - All hearings also provide information on the movement of Ngātiawa hapū, whānau and individuals from 1840 to 1880 to and from other places such as Taranaki or Te Tau Ihu. This includes evidence around the 1848 return of Wiremu Kingi and others to Taranaki.
- There is a certain amount of evidence produced on the 1850s Crown purchases of Wainui and Whareroa.
- There is some evidence on the first hearing of Ngārara in 1873.

- Ngārara: 1880-1900:
  - All of the above hearings provide great detail about the occupation of Ngātiawa hapū, whānau and individuals on the Ngārara block from 1880 to 1890.
  - The minutes, of course, produce evidence about the hearings themselves and how they were conducted.

Other Land Court cases [see bibliography] provide further information on the above components, particularly the gaining of customary rights before 1840 (e.g. the Himatangi hearings), although the Muaūpoko title investigation and Whareroa partition cases provide evidence of occupation as well.

With more than 2,000 pages, the minutes from the Land Court and other investigations therefore would provide the bulk of evidence for the 19th century Land Issues and Crown Relationship report. There are certain cautions to be observed, however, when the use of Land Court minutes are being contemplated on this scale. It is generally recognised within the Treaty research sector that the use of Land Court minutes means dealing with several inherent limitations associated with the source material:

- only a partial narrative may be presented from the minutes as there is a tendency arising from the Court system for expert witnesses providing testimony to place emphasis on the more recent take or narratives associated with the specific piece of land being considered. This may occur at the expense of the older, more important narratives which relate to the mana whenua of the iwi or hapū or the more overriding spiritual associations with land.

- limitations or distortions in tribal histories may arise from the fact the evidence presented before the Court is, by its very nature, very subjective to the witness concerned.

- over time the Court developed its own jurisprudence and views on Māori land tenure that often was out of step with the reality on the ground. Some judges developed an unspoken hierarchy of take which was used to select between different basis of claims. This has subsequently drawn criticism from commentators. One example frequently noted is the emphasis placed on land rights won or held through might or force. This distorts narrative towards the
recording of conflict rather than the more important aspects of relationships and ahi kaa

- the need to tell a coherent narrative within an environment that is competitive between claimants and which will be judged by an outside adjudicator tends to mean the narratives which feature in testimony are potentially more selective towards strong argument and more exclusionary of information dealing with nuanced areas of customs and interactions between groups.

- the Court system, and the implications arising from the failure to be recognised on a title, created incentives to distort or even fabricate information.¹⁸⁰

Despite this, nevertheless, there are also a number of advantages and benefits associated with utilising the information recorded in Land Court minutes:

- as noted above, the Land Court minutes are a significant source, in terms of volume, providing thousands of pages of information.

- much of the information provided in the Land Court minutes is, on its face, narrative presented by leading, respected and knowledgeable tupuna of the current claimant groups.

- the information was presented in a public forum with the opportunity for other parties to the hearing to question witnesses and supply information in response. This provides an inherent vetting and audit process as well as some disincentive to witnesses to present false information.

- as a source, much of the material within the minutes, especially that material related to ahi kaa and resource use, is unique and unavailable in any other source material.

To ensure that the benefits of using Land Court minutes come to the fore, while mitigating the inherent problems, limitations and risks arising from a reliance on Land Court source material, the following research methodology could be adopted:

- rather than adopting a selective approach of sampling testimony, a detailed and thorough investigation across all available minute book material needs to be conducted. The large amount of material available, presented within a comparatively short timeframe (c.1880-1900) and featuring many repeat appearances by the same leading witnesses, provides a researcher with the opportunity to check information between and within individual witnesses and iwi/hapū groups. Close analysis reveals any differences between narratives as well as the basis of the differences.

¹⁸⁰ Excerpted from Tony Walzl "Tribal Landscape Overview" WAI 2180 #A12, pp.29-31
where possible, the minute book material needs to be used alongside available written source material from other primary and published sources.

Other Sources

Aside from minutebooks, several other source types are available to support and extend the minutebook material. These are all listed in the bibliography but source groups will be noted:

- **Secondary sources**: a number of secondary sources deal particularly with the pre-1840 period. (These have been utilised in the preparation of the scoping of the 19th century issues). There are fewer secondary sources contemporary to the events located although some of those noted in the bibliography have relevant excerpts that deal with travels to and through the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa rohe (e.g. William Wakefield, Ernst Dieffenbach, Tyrone Power, Henry Williams).

- **Primary sources**: a variety of these are identified in the bibliography. Old Land Claims files relate to the various claims made in the area during the 1840s. Correspondence in government archives (particularly the series for New Munster and for the Superintendent of the Southern Division) document Crown-Māori relationships on the Kāpiti Coast from the period 1847-1852 especially focusing on the role played by Police Magistrate Durie. During the Crown purchase of the 1850s, the McLean papers contain evidence relating to 1850s purchases.

- **Government published**: the *Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives* (AJHRs) and the *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates* (NZPDs) will have material relevant to events occurring within the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa rohe. Some AJHR material has been cited in this report and included in the bibliography (e.g. relating to the Wainui/Whareroa purchase and the Ngārara Commission), but a further search of the online archives should be conducted by the commissioned researcher. Similarly, a search of NZPDs has not been conducted for the scoping but would be a comparatively straightforward research task.
• **Newspapers:** A newspaper research assistance project has been completed for the Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District [see bibliography]. The authors of the research project record that resource allocation meant that they had to use a selective approach in the use of key words and time periods. Given this, and the fact that further newspapers have been put onto the Papers Past site, it is recommended that the commissioned researcher conduct targeted research to improve the coverage for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa issues.
Section II: Alienation and Loss (1900-2015)

At the time of writing this scoping report there is very little on the Wai 2200 Record of Inquiry dealing with Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims for the period after 1900. With the intended commissioning by the Crown Forestry Rental Trust (CFRT) of several inquiry-wide overview reports, this situation will change and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa issues will be dealt with to some extent. These reports have been commissioned and the appointed researchers are underway with the projects to be completed over the course of the coming year. This part of the scoping, therefore, is intended to assist the CFRT-commissioned researchers by identifying 20th and 21st century issues for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa that should be taken into account as part of their work. The scoping will also, however, anticipate the possible coverage of the CFRT overview reports, and consider the extent that further research may be required.

An understanding of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa issues for the post-1900 period has arisen from discussions with the various claimant groups as well as a review of file evidence. Compared with the previous section, however, there has been little written in published work about this period that focuses on telling the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa story. There are, however, a range of general published local histories which have been utilised for this scoping report. The district Rangahaua Whanui report did note a few Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa issues for the twentieth century (taking land for Paraparaumu airport, the administration of Kāpiti Island, Crown purchases and land takings for roadways) but the coverage is brief and the scoping of issues not comprehensive. Finally, two research scoping reports have been produced for the Inquiry District. 181

Based on claimant consultation, the above scoping reports, available CFRT project briefs and the author's own knowledge of 20th century issues, five significant (and overlapping) research areas have been identified for consideration. Compared with the previous section, there will be less of a focus on presenting a narrative of events for these research areas as such a narrative will only be known once research is undertaken. Having noted this, some narrative is provided from general secondary sources. In addition, for some local, specific issues (e.g. Paraparaumu airport) there is sufficient information readily available upon which to base a narrative.

Following a summary narrative an identification of claims and research issues is provided for each subject area. The section will then end with a discussion on methodology including an assessment of the role that CFRT commissioned reports are expected to play in addressing claims issues for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa.

I. Land Alienation and Utilisation

By 1900, Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa land interests were concentrated in just a few blocks the most significant of which were Ngārara West and Muaūpoko. To assess the impact of the transmutation of title noted in Section I of this report, a title and alienation history is required detailing what became of the various land interests Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa people had over the century after 1900.

Figure 9
Māori ploughing at Kaitawa, Waikanae, c.1908
Generic Research Issues

There are several generic issues that usually apply to 20th century land analysis and these would equally apply in the analysis of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa land issues:

- the purchasing of land by the Crown
- whether administration processes that came into effect under the 1900 Māori Lands Administration Act affected Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa land
- impact of land alienation (sales and leases) allowed under the Native Land Act 1909
- landlessness protection mechanisms and their effectiveness
- the establishment of native townships
- the impact of survey liens
- the nature of title fragmentation
- establishment of trusts under the Māori Affairs Act 1953
- the role of the Māori Trustee
- uneconomic shares – the impact of the compulsory alienation provisions in the 1953 Act
- the impact of the ‘Europeanisation’ of title provisions of the Māori Affairs Amendment Act 1967
- reserves – the retention (or otherwise) and management of existing reserves
- issues associated with urupā, wāhi tapu, papakāinga and marae

Specific Research Issues

In addition to generic research issues on land, there are two significant local land issues that will require research: Kāpiti Island and Parata Native Township. In addition, there are possibly numerous other examples that will come to light only once research proceeds. One matter already known of relates to Kārewarewa urupā. Others which are known of, but require further research to develop more of an understanding of the related issues include:

- the extent and impact of 1000-year leases such as those applying to Section 58 Block X of the Kaitara Survey District and the Maungakotokotoko
- the impact of trust arrangements and the administration of wills such as that of Hemi Matenga and the way that this contributed to land loss
Kārewarewa

Kārewarewa urupā is part of a cultural landscape, located at the eastern confluence of the Waimeha and Waikanae rivers.\textsuperscript{182} In this area stood several pa, including Kuititanga. This then was the site of the 1839 Kuititanga battle which was fought at the pa, but also as a running battle in the surrounding dunes. After the battle, it is believed that the dead from the fighting were brought together in one place and interred in the Kārewarewa urupā. From this time, burials continued in this urupā through into the early twentieth century. Most burial sites remained unmarked.

Within the context of the title to the Ngārara West block being finalised by 1890, Kārewarewa urupā came to be situated within the 260-acre block Ngārara West A14 which was awarded to 13 owners. In 1896, application was made by the owners of the block to have the urupā separately partitioned and designated as an urupā. It was proposed that a subdivision designated Ngārara West A14A of ten acres be created with a title that was absolutely inalienable.

A survey was required to formalise the Court's order. It appears that this did not happen, however, as in 1905 another partition was applied for. The Court informed the owners that the 1896 order still stood and that only a survey was needed to bring the title into effect. It appears, however, that a repartitioning did occur with the result that Kārewarewa came to be included in a 20-acre block with the title designation Ngārara West A14B1.

In the mid-1960s, the Waikanae Land Company was established to develop land at Waikanae beach. It was proposed that within the area formerly occupied by Kuititanga, a marina and residential area would be established. As part of these plans, the Company sought to buy Ngārara West A14B1. In 1968, the Company approached the Māori Trustee who subsequently assumed management and administration of Ngārara West A14B1 on behalf of the owners. The Māori Trustee then sold the block to the Company.

\textsuperscript{182} The following brief account associated with Karewarewa urupā is based on research undertaken by Mahina-a-rangi Baker which has been personally communicated to the author at a hui on 26 August 2015
After purchasing the land, the Waikanae Land Company applied in October 1969 to local authorities to have the land's designation as a cemetery lifted. Instead of this being a title matter, it appears to have been a matter of changing a designation to the existing District Plan. Within the context of what is argued by the claimants to be a confused consultation process, the cemetery designation was revoked.

Development began in the early 1970s with a dredging of 350,000 cubic metres of sand from the swamp and estuary. Sandhills were cut and filled to create a flat area for house building sites. The area has been developed with a final development currently focusing on establishing further housing at Tamati Place. In 1990 and 1999 there was further recontouring of land; Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claim that during this ongoing development process koiwi have been uncovered, crushed and redistributed around the whole area. This claim is disputed by the developers. Nevertheless, in 2000, the digging of two utility trenches certainly uncovered koiwi and this was documented.

With development continuing, the developers work with Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa in accordance with current administrative requirements. The viewpoints between parties, however, differ on the way the site and Kuititanga area are viewed, on the cultural impacts of past development work and on current approaches to protecting this culturally sensitive area.

Kāpiti Island

The following is a brief chronology relating to the island and some of the arising claims issues:

- In 1897 the Kāpiti Island Public Reserve Act (the Act) was passed making it unlawful for any person or persons without the written authority of the Crown to acquire any estate or interest in any lands on Kāpiti Island. The Act presumed that the island was 'not in beneficial use or occupation' by its Māori owners. The Act declared that the island should be acquired by the Crown as a public reserve. All non-Māori estates were vested in the Crown with the former owners to receive compensation.

---

From 1900, the Crown began to acquire the interests of Māori owners. By 1904, through a combination of compensation and purchase, the Crown had acquired almost 3,000 acres leaving 1,621 acres in Māori ownership. By 1911, this had reduced further to just 1,087 acres.

Despite the 1897 Act's declared conservation ideals, much of the land acquired by the Crown was then leased out. In 1906, a caretaker was appointed. Over the next few decades, however, comparatively little was done towards designing and implementing a conservation agenda.
• One ownership group who held out against purchase was the children of Wi Parata - Utauta and Hira. In 1909, Utauta moved onto the island and began farming with her husband Hona Webber and their six children, living in the house built by her uncle Hemi Matenga. They remained there for 40 years until the homestead was destroyed by fire. The son of Utauta wished to continue farming, but could not secure a suitable house caretaker were often strained.

• On the death of Utauta in 1954, the Crown again actively sought to purchase the remaining Māori land on the island. Although they encountered great resistance from a number of owners, over time shares were gradually acquired. By 1970, only a 30-acre section remained in the hands of the Webber whānau.

• From the 1970s, Crown agencies solidified the island's role as a bird sanctuary. Increasingly the occupation by the remaining Māori landholders was seen as being out of step with the Crown's conservation ethics.

• The Kāpiti Marine Reserve was established in 1992. In 1998, a significant conservation plan for the Island was released. Further problems were encountered from the Department of Conservation when owners began to explore the possibilities of eco-tourism ventures on the island.

• The Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991 imposed restrictions on the people and land use. Zoning of the Waiorua Kāpiti lands was done without consultation with the iwi of Kāpiti Island. Restrictions place limitations on buildings and land use. The Minister of Conservation and the Kāpiti Coast District Council are the two authorities responsible. The limitations on land-use extend to activities like lighting fires and growing gardens and utility species of plants.
Parata Native Township

The Liberal Party came into government in 1891 and remained in power until 1912. A major platform for this Government was to make land available particularly to small-scale settlers. A number of mechanisms were used. One of these was through the establishment of Native Townships. In 1895, the Native Townships Act was passed. The object of the Act was to promote settlement by forming townships on Māori land. A township would be laid out and sections leased to European settlers. The land would remain in Māori ownership, but the leases would be administered by the Commissioner of Crown Lands.184

In September 1896, a petition sent into Parliament by 61 mainly Pākehā signatories claimed that there was a shortage of land at Waikanae for building sites. A request was made, therefore, for the establishment of a Native Township to be created under legislation passed the previous year.

---

In August 1897, Wi Parata advised the government that he was prepared to have an area of his land cut up for a township. Rather than this proceeding under the Native Townships Act, however, it appears that Wi Parata envisaged a private arrangement. Parata asked the government for a list of the petitioners so he could approach those who wanted a section. In the absence of any further action, in June 1898 a deputation from Waikanae visited Premier Seddon asking that the Government acquire the land occupied by Wi Parata and sell it as allotments for small homestead purposes. There was some discussion as to whether the township should be a native township, a private township, or houses built on land purchased by the Crown. Subsequently, Wi Parata agreed that the township would be laid off on his land pursuant to the Act. The township was surveyed and an area of 49 acres 18 perches proclaimed in August 1899. Not all had been in favour of setting land aside for the township. Hemi Matenga, the brother of Wi Parata, who had an interest in the land that had not yet been legally recognised, had objected to the proposal but officials had ignored the objection.\footnote{185}

The files relating to the Parata Township are recorded in the bibliography of this report. These files cover a period through to the mid-1970s. From these it appears that a large number of sections were sold by the Crown into private ownership in the first years of the 1920s. Of the estimated 42 lots, the following appear to have been sold at the time: 2-7, 10-13, 22, 24-27, 32-4, 39-40, 42 [See map below].

Several inquiry districts (such as Taihape, Rohe Potae and Whanganui) have previously dealt with the matter of Native Townships. Generic research issues that apply to Native townships, are as follows:

- Who were the owners of the land on which the township was situated, and what was their customary relationship with the land?
- How and why was a Native Township established? What was the nature of consultation with the owners of the land? What was the background to the establishment, particularly with consideration of the development of the main trunk line?

\footnote{Ibid, pp.15-16}
• To what extent were Māori already using the land that was proclaimed?

• Were any undertakings given to the owners about the establishment of the township? If so, were these conditions addressed?

• What was the extent of land set aside for Native allotments within the township?

• What was the extent and nature of consultation with the owners regarding the size and location of these allotments? Were they subject to alienation restrictions? Were they subject to rates?

• What costs did the owners have to bear for the establishment of the township, including surveys and land transferred to the Crown without payment?

• What land was set aside as public reserves? Were these reserves used for the proclaimed purpose? When the reserved land was no longer required, was it revested in the owners?

• How was the township managed and administered? What legislation affected changes to the management and administration of Native Townships? What consultation with the owners took place over the management and administration of the Native Township?

• What were the renewal terms of the original leases of the township sections?

• How did the Crown deal with unleased sections?

• To what extent, if any, were ‘peppercorn’ leases applicable in the township?

• What restrictions were there on the sale of township sections and native allotments? Did these restrictions change?

• How much Māori land within Native Townships was sold under Crown administration?

• Did the Crown negotiate to acquire the freehold of the township?

• What were Māori expectations about the benefits arising from the native township scheme? Did the owners and/or local iwi/hapū receive any economic benefit from the township?

• What was the impact of the township land being brought under the jurisdiction of the Māori Reserved Land Act 1955? Were prescribed perpetual leases issued under that
Act? What has been the impact of the leases on the economic return to the owners and the ability of the owners to resume control and/or occupation of their land?

- What is the status of the township land today?

Figure 12
Parata Township
[Wellington, N.Z.: Department of Lands and Survey, 1900]
Generic Sources

It is noted that among the CFRT-commissioned inquiry-wide research projects there will be a Block Narratives project. The likely coverage of this report is discussed later in this Section. It is important to note, however, that outside the sources gathered together for the Māori Land Court Records Research Assistance project, and probably beyond the sources that might be addressed by the Block Narratives Project, there are a number of land related sources that have not been collected that would be of relevance to provide complete coverage of land title development as well as alienation and utilisation issues.

- **Alienation Files**: The Māori Land Court (MLC) Alienation files (series 3/-) are a primary research source to provide material on the 1909-1930 period and, to a lesser extent, 1930 to 1970. Although many of these files contain pro-forma content, alienation files can also contain detailed data indicating where owners lived, whether they were directly occupying their lands, the details of leases and sales, the quality of land and an indication of other lands held by those who were selling or leasing; as such, the files are invaluable for in-depth analysis. In addition, files occasionally may have correspondence on significant issues indicating poor Land Board action or processes or the motivations or context for land sales. Archives New Zealand does not hold the 3/- series and Court Applications series for Ōtaki or Wellington which are still with the Whanganui Land Court, but stored off site at a records holding centre. Unfortunately, there is no electronic listing or a digital file list of their files. Therefore, the number of twentieth century alienation and correspondence files held by the Court could not yet be ascertained with any degree of accuracy.

- **Māori Affairs Correspondence 1900-30**: The Māori Affairs Correspondence files complement the MLC Alienation files, especially for the period from 1900 to 1915 when the correspondence files provide some of the necessary context lacking in the MLC alienation files. It also appears that for the period 1900-1909, a time when there are comparatively few MLC Alienation files, the Māori Affairs Correspondence files were the forerunners of the MLC Alienation series with details on leases, mortgages and offers of sale. A preliminary analysis has been undertaken of the Māori Affairs Correspondence
files included in the Crown and Private Purchasing and Petitions research assistance project. It appears that the Crown and Private Purchasing and Petitions Research Assistance Project authors may have been selective in their approach to these files possibly collecting only those files with significant correspondence content. Other files exist and these have been listed in the bibliography.

- **Certificates of Title (CT):** As a source, CTs are often overlooked. Land Court Block Order files can be incomplete in relation to the exact date a block is sold. CTs always record this date. MLC alienation files are also incomplete for the pre-1909 period and do not exist for the 19th century. CTs are the most readily accessible source to provide definitive evidence on the sale date of a block for these early periods.

- **Valuation Books:** Valuation books, a source that primarily dates from the early years of the twentieth century, provide confirmatory information, when used with other sources, on matters such as leases and land occupancy. In addition they provide unique information on how the land is being used: whether there is a dwelling on the land, whether there are other buildings (woolsheds, sheds, etc), how much land is cleared, how much is grassed, how much is fenced and the value of all these improvements. Furthermore, the source provides longitudinal data with new valuations being completed every few years and with special valuations being produced when required (i.e. when land is leased or sold). The books are readily available at Archives New Zealand Wellington Office but are too numerous to individually list in the bibliography.

- **Post-1900 MLC minute books:** the MLC Minutebooks Research Assistance Project gathered together the minutes of cases through to 1910. Although the bulk of 20th century partition, succession or alienation cases produce little substantive evidence, there will always be a small collection of significant cases dealing with significant issues.

- **Other post-1930 files:** block focused files from a range of agencies including Māori Affairs still need to be collected. These include: Native Reserves files (the MA1 5/5/-series); several Lands and Survey surveying files for the late 19th and early 20th centuries and block-specific forestry files. Some examples of these are listed in the bibliography.
2. Whānau

Today, Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa have very little land left in their ownership. As Pākehā settlement increased over the course of the twentieth century, the land was either sold, often to relieve a rates burden, or taken for public works. This raises a significant question of how this alienation has impacted on the people of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa. Following discussions with claimant groups, a methodology has been identified that will address this question.

Research for Treaty claims often focuses on the land loss or on Crown policies and practices in order to assess the cumulative effect of Crown action or inaction on claimant groups. Whānau or individuals often are only mentioned within the context of case studies or through their involvement as part of a narrative being considered in relation to land or policy. The impact on the wider group is gleaned by statistics of socio-economic indicators. Researchers rarely attempt to construct a comprehensive picture of impact on all whānau and individuals as the relevant population group is usually too large and the micro-research techniques required to achieve this are too time-consuming.

This is not the case for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa. At the time of the granting of Ngārara West in 1890, the land was awarded to less than 150 persons. Today, Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa view themselves as being made up of less than two dozen key whānau. These numbers suggest a compact grouping which could be studied in whānau cohorts to record their experience throughout the twentieth century. Using this approach, any impacts of land loss or Crown policies can be immediately related to those who were affected by them. The knowledge of the situation that was occurring within whānau will provide a key context to the various issues and events being considered and will demonstrate impact.
Research Approach

Basically speaking, the proposed approach is to collect as much information as possible about each of the identified Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa whānau. The first step, of course, is to identify the whānau. Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants will be able to assist with this process. From this point, the following questions for each whānau cohort would be considered over the period of the twentieth century.
• Who are the members of the whānau?
• What land is held by the whānau over time? What is the landholding of each whānau member? Which members of the whānau directly occupy the land? Are they living on it?
• How is the land used? Is it for subsistence living? Does the whānau (or any particular whānau member) derive any income from the land? Is it from their own efforts, or is the land leased? If the latter, what amounts are paid to each whānau member?
• Was whānau land ever sold or taken? If so, what amounts of the purchase payment or compensation were paid to the whānau and to each whānau member?
• For whānau not living on their land, where do they reside? Are they still within their rohe or in other districts? Do they own or rent the place at which they are living? What has been the standard of housing for whānau members either within their rohe or in other districts? Have they ever received assistance with housing from the government?
• What is the knowledge of whānau members and mahinga kai in their rohe? What has been the experience with the use of resources and has this changed over time?
• What have been the occupations of whānau members over time? What has been the nature of employment? Have there been instances of unemployment?
• What has been the level of educational attainment for whānau members? Has it changed over the generations?
• What is known of the health profile of whānau members? Were there impacts, particularly in the early part of the 20th century, from infectious diseases such as influenza or tuberculosis?

These questions are presented to provide some idea of the areas of interest that need to be explored to build up a longitudinal profile for whānau. There are likely to be a number of additional lines of inquiry.
Cultural Impacts

A significant focus of undertaking whānau-focused research will be to build a cumulative and inter-generational understanding of cultural impacts as experienced by whānau members. There are a large number of areas to be considered:

- The link between declining landholding over time and ahi kaa, and with it iwi, hapū and whānau identity.
- The way in which declining landholding, followed by declining whānau numbers within the rohe, exacerbated by increasing numbers of tauiwi, have challenged the mana whenua of the iwi and the ability to exercise rangatiratanga in relation to iwi matters.
- The way in which the trends noted above have undermined the ability of the iwi to maintain and exercise a full Treaty relationship with the Crown over the course of the twentieth century.
- The way in which Crown-appointed or Crown-delegated agencies have increasingly exercised governance over lands and resources thereby undermining the ability of iwi, hapū and whānau to exercise their kaitiakitanga responsibilities over forests, fisheries, waterways and wahi tāpu. The effect of assumed management and control by other agencies over forests, fisheries, waterways and wahi tāpu and its impact on the ability of the whānau to provide for themselves and to manaaki others.
- The impacts of land loss and increasing socio-economic impacts (including the moving out of the rohe) on whānau cohesion including mental, physical and spiritual health.
- Do whānau members still have links with the marae? How has the marae been impacted by the spread of urbanisation around its precincts?
- Who within the whānau has maintained proficiency in te reo? What have been the effects of language loss for others?
Sources

Although the numbers of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa at the turn of the century are suitable for a cohort study of this nature, as whānau numbers grow over time, it might be more difficult to follow the life stories of all individuals. Past experience with this type of approach indicate that up to 1930 and, possibly 1950, the life stories of whānau at the individual level can be managed. Thereafter, it is more a case of using selected individuals as a way to continue with information on the themes being considered.

The period from 1900 to 1950, is largely beyond living memory for many people. For this period, however, there are a number of examples of written source materials that will provide information on whānau structure, landholdings, land use, place of residence and type of employment. These include:

- Street directories
- Electoral Rolls
- School Rolls
- MLC Ownership & Succession lists
- MLC Application files
- Valuation Rolls
- Employment Records of Railways Department and Ministry of Works

These written sources would be supplemented by recollections and the knowledge of whānau. Oral sources would also provide much of the information for the post-1950 period both for individuals and the whānau as a whole. The possible structure of research to collect this type of information will be discussed in Section 3: the Oral and Traditional Project.
3. Public Works

The occurrence of land takings for public works is present as a Treaty issue in every inquiry district. For Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa, however, public works takings have a special significance. First, a number of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa landowners were affected by the largest single area of land taken for public works in the Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District - the Paraparaumu airport. Aside from this, the rapidly increasing suburbanisation of the Kāpiti District has meant a commensurate increase in works undertaken associated with the district's infrastructure. This process began in the 1970s with the expansion of the Waikanae and Paraparaumu town centres and has continued through to current times with the Kāpiti Expressway.

Figure 14
A crowd of people watching the last spike being driven in the Wellington Manawatū railway at Otaihanga, Waikanae, 3 November 1886
Generic Research Issues

At their heart, public works always generate a core set of generic issues and questions associated with the Public Works Act and the taking of Māori land. These include:

- what is the range of public works for which land was taken? Did any of these include gifts of lands by Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa? Were the mechanisms of public works legislation were used to effect the transfer? Did the lands in question need to be taken or were there any instances of public works targeting Māori land?

- when consideration was being given to the taking of land, were any alternatives other than compulsory acquisition (such as leasing the land) considered? If so, why were these alternatives not pursued or adopted?

- what are the details of the notification and objections processes for each of the public works takings? Did they include reasonable consultation or were they administratively conducted (e.g. by written notice only)? Did they allow for an adequate timeframe for objection? Was the objection process fair? Were objections made and what was the result of these objections?

- what was the nature of the compensation process for each of the public works takings? What was the basis for assessing value and did this include anything other than rateable valuation? Did the right persons receive compensation? Was the process timely? Was the compensation fair?

- what was the nature of the impact on those affected by a public works land taking? Did any takings include wāhi tapu? Did they include land being lived on? Did they include land from which the owners were deriving an income? Did the taking of the lands physically affect other lands (e.g. severance) or affect the economic or occupational viability of other land held by the owners?

- did the carrying out of the public works have any impact on the former owners or any other of their lands (e.g. spoilation, altering waterways, erosion)?
was more land taken than that necessary for the public work and, if so, was there any discussion of returning the excess land? If not, was the excess land retained or alienated? Where the excess land was retained, how was it utilised?

- are there any examples of taken lands not being needed for the purposes for which they were taken? If so, was any consideration given to returning these lands to the original owners and what was the result? What were the processes and conditions associated with any returned land? If not, what became of the lands that were no longer required?

It is noted that among the CFRT-commissioned inquiry-wide research projects there will be a Public Works project. The likely coverage of this report is discussed later in this section. It will be noted, however, that this report will hopefully address many of the research issues identified above. Therefore, there is no need here to discuss possible sources for research as this will be the responsibility of the CFRT-commissioned researchers.

Figure 15
Waikanae, with railway bridge and train in the foreground, c.1890s
Specific Research Issues

In addition to generic issues that relate to all public works claim issues, there are several significant local issues for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa in relation to public works takings. Some are known of, but require further research to develop more of an understanding of the related issues:

- In 1906, following the recommendation of the Scenery Preservation Commission, 185 acres was taken from Ngārara West C7 to establish the Paraparaumu Scenic Reserve.\textsuperscript{186}

- Associated with the establishment of Queen Elizabeth Park at Paekakariki, the 17-acre Whareroa Māori Reserve was taken under the 'better utilisation' clauses of public works legislation.\textsuperscript{187}

- The taking of land within the Whitireia Block under the Public Works Act. (See previous section on Whitireia).

The two most significant local issues, however, relate to the Paraparaumu airport and the Kāpiti Expressway.

Paraparaumu Airport

The most significant of these is the taking of the Paraparaumu airport which has a number of areas that require close investigation.\textsuperscript{188} A very brief summary of only the most salient developments follows:

- **1939**: taking of several Ngārara West blocks under the Public Works Act 1928 for an aerodrome within the context of wartime requirements. The original reasons for the taking were for defence purposes and to provide an emergency landing ground

---

\textsuperscript{186} Anderson/Pickens, op cit, p.308

\textsuperscript{187} Greater Wellington Regional Council, *Queen Elizabeth Park: Resource Statement*, Nov 2009, p.17

\textsuperscript{188} The following summary narrative is based on a correspondence, reports and newspaper articles provided for review by the claimant and counsel for WAI 609
alternative for Wellington Airport. By the end of the 1950s both of those purposes had lapsed. Instead, the aerodrome was increasingly used for recreational flying.

- **1945-1990**: since the end of the Second World War, there has been a consistent history of commercial, non-airport related activities on the land that had been taken. This raises the question of whether excess land was taken and why it was not returned. A housing area, named Avion Terrace, was established initially for those public servants operating the aerodrome. Eventually, however, this requirement lapsed and the ten houses in the street were made available for public tenancy.

![Crowd watching construction of airfield at Paraparaumu, 1939](http://natlib.govt.nz/records/22901005)

**Figure 16**

*Crowd watching construction of airfield at Paraparaumu, 1939*

[Ref: PAColl-5927-59, Alexander Turnbull Library, Wellington](http://natlib.govt.nz/records/22901005)

- **1991-1992**: as part of a review of the Ministry of Transport and a Government direction to devolve its operation of six aerodromes around the country, the Ministry
announced its intention to privatise Paraparaumu airport. In 1992, the Airport Authorities Act 1966 was amended to enable the Crown to transfer compulsorily acquired land to an airport company formed under that Act, and sell the Crown’s interest in the company, without affecting the Public Works Act rights of former owners of the land. The land was transferred to an Airport SOE company known as Paraparaumu Airport Limited

- **1993-1999**: Te Whānau a Te Ngārara was formed to consult with Crown agencies in relation to the proposed sale. Over 1993 and 1994, the Ministry conducted a consultation process that was fraught with difficulties. In 1995, the Ministry advertised that it was accepting tenders for the sale of the airport company. Te Whānau a Te Ngārara unsuccessfully sought an injunction to prevent the sale of the airport to private interests. A closed tender was offered to users of the airport. Efforts by Te Whānau a Te Ngārara to be given dispensation to be allowed to tender were rejected. As a result, the airport company was sold to a private party (Kāpiti Avion Holdings) for a price that was half that of a Ministry of Transport valuation. Te Whānau a Te Ngārara were assured their s.40 rights were still guaranteed. In December 1995, the new owner secured a rezoning of airport land for residential and commercial purposes. Parts of the airport property were then progressively sold. Claims were lodged with the Waitangi Tribunal in 1996. The sale of houses in Avion Terrace resulted in a land occupation by local Māori in 1999.

- **2000-2001**: Paraparaumu Airport Limited applied to the Kāpiti District Council to further rezone the airport into recreation, residential, industrial and services areas. Despite numerous submissions against the plan change, appointed environmental commissioners found in favour of the application. Five cases were then lodged in the Environment Court two of which came from Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa groups. The Court found sufficient cause to instruct the company to enter into mediation with the Council. As a result, in 2003 mediation proceeded between the company and the Council to establish conditions under which the plan change would be allowed.
- **2002-2004**: following a petition signed by 584 individuals, an inquiry by the Transport and Industrial Relations Select Committee into the 1995 sale found that the airport had been sold under its value, that the processes adopted by Crown agencies appeared flawed and that the interests of Te Whānau a Te Ngārara were not adequately protected.

- **2005**: as a result of the findings of the select committee, the Auditor General was asked to investigate the 1995 sale. Although finding several problems with the sale process, the Auditor General did not find against the sale. The report was also somewhat ambivalent in relation to Treaty issues noting only the following: "The Ministry could have done more to consider whether the concerns raised by Māori during the consultation could have been accommodated by making an arrangement – either within the sale process or otherwise – as regards land that may have been surplus to operations." Otherwise, the findings focused solely on consultation with Māori concluding that a genuine effort had been made.
• **2008-2009**: Kāpiti District Council approved a further change in the district plan to allow a $450 million redevelopment of the airport and its landholdings which included the establishment of a business park. The decision was unsuccessfully appealed in the Environment Court by Te Whānau a Te Ngārara and others.

• **2010-2012**: negotiations proceeded between Te Whānau a Te Ngārara and Paraparaumu Airport Limited. A settlement was reached. Under law, however, several descendants of former owners were not entitled to join the negotiations.

Kāpiti Expressway (Takamore and other Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa land)

Another recent development of public works taking has occurred around the Kāpiti Expressway.189 Plans for developing a bypass route to ease increasing traffic congestion on the Kāpiti Coast date back more than 50 years. After much discussion over several decades, a Western Link Road, running between Raumati and Pekapeka was chosen as a solution to the problem. A centre line proclamation for this was made as early as 1954. This option had the support of several local community groups such as the District Council and the Chamber of Commerce. As the option was developed over time, properties were acquired for the Link Road's land requirements. Nevertheless, the proposal met resistance. From 1998 through to 2004, the required resource consent was heard by appointed commissioners, two Environment Court hearings and two High Court appeals. The designation was finally given in July 2006.

This initial process came to effect the Takamore urupā trustees. An area, known as the Takamore wāhi tapu area, had first been registered under the Historic Places Act 1993 in August 1995. A total of 19.2 hectares were included comprising of Ngārara West A24C (on which the urupā was located) and Ngārara West A24B Lot1 DP23875. The application had also sought inclusion of a Maketu Burial Tree, which marked the site of several gravesites. Although this had been granted, the tree and the area around it, which was located on private land, inadvertently was not included in the registered designation. The wāhi tapu was registered by the Kāpiti Coast District

---

Council. In 1999, the Kāpiti Coast District Council included Takamore on a heritage register. The area of the wāhi tapu registered by the Council was more extensive than that registered by the Historic Places Trust.

In 1998, as part of the process to further progress towards the Western Link Road, the Kāpiti Coast District Council issued a notice of requirement under the RMA over lands needed for the Western Link Road. This included the area around Takamore. The Takamore trustees, along with a neighbouring private owner, unsuccessfully appealed the notice in the Environment Court in 2002. On appeal to the High Court, the Environment Court's decision was quashed. The appeal against the notice was therefore sent again back to that Court. In June 2003, the Environment Court again upheld the Council's notice of requirement. A subsequent appeal to the High Court in 2004 was unsuccessful.

By 2010, however, the proposal for the Link Road had been radically changed. Under the government's Roads of National Significance policy, the Link Road project was added to with several significant changes. The road was to become a four lane expressway for SH1 linking up with the roading plans bringing a road from Wellington through Transmission Gully. The more ambitious project brought greater impact on the community; as part of the proposal 63 properties with houses would be acquired. The route of the Expressway also passed through residential areas. By one estimate, it was said that 1,350 homes would be located within 200m of the roadway. The confirmation of the route also brought impact for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa. Originally, the route would encroach on a part of the Takamore wāhi tapu area as well as run through Ngārara West A25B2B (held by 28 owners under an Ahu Whenua trust) and Ngārara West A25B2A (held by sole owner Patricia Grace). By running through Ngārara West A25B2B, the land would be physically severed from the Takamore urupā.

When the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) proposed the Expressway, it provided a route option which avoided the registered Takamore wāhi tapu area. It was at this time, however, that the Takamore trustees became aware that the registered area of the wāhi tapu did not include the Maketu Burial Tree. This land had since been acquired by the Kāpiti Coast District Council in 2008. Within the context of these developments, in 2011, the Takamore trustees applied to the Māori Heritage Council requesting a review of the boundaries of the Takamore wāhi tapu area. This was agreed and the review process notified. On 14 December 2011, the Council confirmed
an extension to the boundaries of the wāhi tapu area and amended the sites register. In January 2012, the NZTA signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Takamore trustees on how to operate within the registered wāhi tapu area. The extended boundary of the wāhi tapu area came to completely include a neighbouring property the owner of which appealed the Māori Heritage Council. The matter was heard in the High Court in March 2013 with judgment given in September that dismissed the plaintiff's grounds for seeking review. The extended Takamore wāhi tapu area remained in place. Subsequently, the Takamore Trustees negotiated a compensation package with the Transport Agency.
In the meantime, the NZTA's April 2012 application to the Environmental Protection Authority for resource consents for the expanded scheme was heard by a specially appointed Board of Inquiry from November 2012. Submissions against the proposal were presented from the affected Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa landholders and others. Nevertheless, on 12 April, the Board granted the resource consents with conditions. The decision was appealed by local community groups and heard in the High Court in July 2013. The appeal was dismissed on all grounds. Further appeals to the High Court and Supreme Court were also dismissed.

While legal action continued, Notices of Intention to take land were served on owners in June 2013. Having received a Notice of Intention to take land, Patricia Grace, owner of Ngārara West A25B2A, sent a Notice of Objection to the Environment Court. In addition, she applied to the Māori Land Court for her land to be set apart as a Māori Reservation under s.338 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act. The Land Court case was heard first with the Court reaching a finding granting the request to establish a Māori Reservation held under Trust. On 8 April 2014, the Environment Court gave its decision. The Court noted that the Land Court's recent decision created a title that was inalienable. The Court also considered the details of the planned land taking ultimately concluding that it was not reasonably necessary to take this land to achieve the Minister's objectives. The Court held that the proposed taking of land should not proceed. Subsequently, an arrangement was reached where the expressway's route was shifted a little westwards which completely avoided Ngārara West A25B2A.

In the meantime, in December 2013, land from Ngārara West A25B2B had been taken through the Public Works Act. It was subsequently acknowledged by the NZ Transport Agency that its consulting with a sole representative trustee did not represent meaningful engagement with all of the lands owners. Thereafter, the three sets of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa landowners (i.e. Takamore Trustees, Ngārara West A25B2B Trust and Ngārara West A25B2A Trust) have worked with the NZTA to bring cultural mitigation arrangements into place. This has included an exchange of land and appropriate landscaping features.
Figure 19
Ngārara West land affected by the Kāpiti Expressway
4. **Local Government**

From discussions with claimant groups on twentieth century issues, the impact of local government processes and practices is often noted as a source of complaint. While the presence of rating pressures has been a matter of difficulty for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa landowners to deal with throughout the twentieth century, the increase of suburbanisation and the rise in property value has exacerbated this problem over the past forty years. In addition, the increasing role of local government in town and district planning has brought pressures on those Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa who have continued to live in the area on their lands. Finally, the nature and form of iwi representative participation in local government has been an ongoing issue from the perspective of several of those claimants spoken to during this scoping project.

**Research Issues**

As with public works takings, further research is needed to fully identify the specific issues that demonstrate how Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa have been impacted by local government. Nevertheless, local government often features as an issue within Treaty claims and therefore, as with public works, a number of generic research issues have been identified:

**Rating**

- What has been the range of different types of rates charged by local government agencies over the years?
- What has been the experience of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa landowners in meeting rating demands? Has it altered the way in which land has been occupied or utilised (e.g. leasing out to Pākehā)?
- What role has land valuation played in the levying of rates? Is there any issue of the lack of service provision making rates demands inequitable?
- How has local government approached the collection of rates over the years?
- How has local government approached rates arrears over time? What has been the notification process? Do the correct sets of owners receive rates arrears notices? Has
there been any tendency by councils to focus on those owners only where the address is known?

- Have there ever been arrangements to exempt any Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa-owned land from rating? What have been the circumstances to this having arisen? Has the exemption been maintained? What effect have any exemptions had on land retention or local government service provision?

- What has been the nature of engagement after rates arrears have been notified? Has there been negotiations or arrangements reached to assist the payment of rates or reduce arrears or write arrears off?

- Have there been examples of receivers appointed to collect outstanding rates? What has been the result where receivers have been appointed?

- Has there been any land loss from direct actions taken over rates arrears? Have rates arrears played a role in a decision of whānau to sell land?

*Participation/Representation*

- Has Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa been active in their engagement with local government? What has been the response of local government? Has there been a Treaty-based relationship with local government and, if so, what has been the nature of the relationship?

- What has been the experience of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa groups in consulting with local government either in a kanohi-ki-kanohi situation or as part of a broader public consultation process?

- Have members of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa ever worked within local government? Has this been a position where being tangata whenua has been a component of the work? If so, what has been the overall experience of holding this position? If not, has the fact of being tangata whenua assisted or detracted from the experience of generally working within local government?

- Have members of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa ever served on general local government representative bodies? What has been the experience? How have tangata whenua issues been dealt with?
• Has local government ever enabled Māori to have a distinct representative body with whom it has worked on local issues? If so, has this body been representative of all Māori or particularly local tangata whenua?

• Has local government ever provided specific expenditure to support tangata whenua groups or to promote or enable the achievement of local Māori projects or issues?

**District Planning**

• Has town or district planning development affected Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa either as landowners or as residents within their rohe?

• Has land use designations restricted or affected the way in which Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa have utilised their lands either for commercial use or domestic (housing) use?

• What has been the relationship between Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa and local government in relation to wāhi tapu and sites of significance? Has direct local government action resulted in loss of access, degradation of a site or even destruction or total acquisition of a site? Has Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa ever worked with or tried to work with local government to have sites of significance protected, listed or promoted?

It is noted that among the CFRT-commissioned inquiry-wide research projects there will be a Local Government project. The likely coverage of this report is discussed later in this section. It will be noted, however, that this report will hopefully address many of the research issues identified above. Therefore, there is no need here to discuss possible sources for research as this will be the responsibility of the CFRT-commissioned researchers who have already been appointed and have begun their research work. In addition, previous summaries of issues relating to Kāpiti Island, Paraparaumu Airport and the Kāpiti Expressway have all demonstrated the significant role played by local government in these matters as facilitator, regulator or decision-maker. In relation to the question of representation and participation, the role and functions of the Whakameininga iwi liaison committee within the structure of the Kāpiti District Council needs to be considered. In relation to the question of rates, there are known to be examples of land and houses taken for non-payment of rates. The claim of the Baker whānau is that a parcel of land held in the Ngārara Block was taken by the local authority for the non-payment of rates.¹⁹⁰

¹⁹⁰ Statement of claim, c.1 Sept 2008, Wai 1628 #1.1.1, p.1
5. **Environment**

In discussion with claimant groups, the environment is a 20th century issue that greatly comes to the fore. Although environmental change has been a feature over the whole of the 20th century, the rapid development of suburbanisation over the last 40 years has meant that many of the changes and the impacts that have occurred have been observed in living memory. Of particular note are the impacts on waterways. Much of the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa rohe originally consisting of wetland areas. This complex natural waterway system shaped the environment and the way that Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa interacted with it. The history of Pākehā settlement on the Kāpiti Coast has been one where ongoing change has been taking place in relation to this environment.

![Figure 20: View of Waikanae hills, c.1886](http://natlib.govt.nz/records/23067167)
Research Issues

Again, Treaty issues in relation to the environment have long featured as a significant part of claims brought before the Waitangi Tribunal. There has therefore been a long process of identifying core generic environmental issues all of which would apply to Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa. In addition, the Tribunal’s Discussion Paper for the Inquiry District has identified several generic issues applying across the Inquiry District.191

- The nature and extent (in broad terms) of Pākehā settlement and economic development, in particular the impact of pastoral and agricultural development on mahinga kai and resource areas.
- The actions of local bodies and the impact on Māori resource use and mahinga kai, including the acclimatisation of exotic species, swamp drainage, bush clearance, deforestation and river diversion or protection works.
- The nature of Māori protest or complaint concerning natural resource/environmental issues.
- The Crown’s policies in promoting the felling of indigenous forests and its attempts to conserve forest and how this impacted on Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa. To what extent was deforestation an important economic objective in itself and also a precursor to the establishment of pastoralism?
- The impact of deforestation and 'bush clearance', especially the impact on rivers and flooding. When was the Crown put on notice that large-scale deforestation in the river catchments, bush clearance and pastoral farming was likely to exacerbate erosion and flooding problems (for Māori and Pākehā), and what, if any, remedial action was taken?
- The impacts of environmental changes on Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa, including settlement patterns, customary food gathering and the gathering of rongoā and other resources, as well as the preservation of urupā and wāhi tapu and other sites of significance.

---

191 Waitangi Tribunal “Discussion Paper on Research…”, WAI-2200 #6.2.4, pp.44-5
• The extent to which twentieth century legislation (including the Resource Management Act) required local bodies to have regard for Māori values and/or the principles of the Treaty, and the effectiveness of these provisions.

• The extent to which the Crown, at any time but particularly in the twentieth century, recognized, acknowledged or provided for a Māori conservation ethic or a Māori role in conservation and environmental issues.

• The involvement of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa in freshwater fisheries management and in the management of hazardous substances. The Crown’s involvement in the management of indigenous fish species and other indigenous wildlife whose habitat requirements include the inland waterways.

• The establishment and empowerment of acclimatisation societies, the role of those societies and government agencies in the introduction and management of exotic species (including pests, pest control and noxious plants), the impact of these species on customary resources, and the extent to which Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa resource use was recognised and accommodated.

• Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa relationships with the Crown, local government, SOEs, and private companies and individuals as a consequence of the Crown’s developing new regimes for resource management and environmental protection (including the protection of wāhi tapu) from the 1970s.

• The extent to which the Crown or its agencies recognised and accommodated Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa environmental practices – kaitiakitanga – in relation to sustainable use of natural environment, the management of mahinga kai, and the protection (or otherwise) of wāhi tapu and other sites of significance, including maunga.

• The impact of Crown policies on conservation and increased intervention in environmental management from the late twentieth century, and the relationship between Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa and the Department of Conservation.

• The impact of the RMA (and related legislation) on the ability of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa to participate in local government planning and decision making. The extent to which central and local government have observed and implemented the provisions of the Resource Management Act regarding the Treaty partnership and consultation.

• Issues of ownership in relation to waterways.
• Issues of water use such as abstraction of water for township, rural and industrial water supplies and other ‘water-take’ issues, such as any water diversion for hydro schemes or irrigation schemes. Questions over water use date back to the arrangement that Wi Parata made with the Railways Department over the supply of water for railway engines at Waikanae.

• The work of Catchment Boards, Drainage Boards: the nature and extent of flood control activities and the impact of these on Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa.

Figure 21
Waikanae River, 1932
In addition to the above generic issues, consultation with claimants has revealed a number of issues associated with waterways in the district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waterway</th>
<th>Description/Use</th>
<th>Problems/Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenaway Road Springs</td>
<td>Tapu</td>
<td>access, desecration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitawa Reserve Wetland</td>
<td>watercress, nga tuna, nga manu,</td>
<td>used for town water supply, ownership issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapapapanui</td>
<td>flows through whānau whenua,</td>
<td>stock pollution, agriculture run-offs, ownership and access issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawakahia</td>
<td>kai tuna, pā site, cultivation, patiki, tidal influences</td>
<td>nearby housing subdivision creates pollution and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kowhai stream</td>
<td>nga tuna, nga manu</td>
<td>pollution, farmlets - run-off, access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukutauaki</td>
<td>kai tuna, pā site, cultivation, patiki, tidal influences</td>
<td>subdivision, housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangakotukutukuku</td>
<td>nga tuna, nga manu</td>
<td>town water supply, ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangaone</td>
<td></td>
<td>farming impact, reduced water, access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazengarb</td>
<td></td>
<td>pollution, run-off,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngā Manu</td>
<td></td>
<td>loss of mahingakai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngārara stream &amp; Wetlands</td>
<td>nga tuna, nga manu, pā sites, cultivations, mauri kohatu</td>
<td>pollution (sewage closed down), expressway, middens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngārara Swamp</td>
<td>kai tuna</td>
<td>pollution, access,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāti Awa</td>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>farming impact, reduce water, stock run-off, access issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paetawa</td>
<td>pa harakeke</td>
<td>pollution, farmlets, access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraparaumu Airport Wetlands</td>
<td>nga manu</td>
<td>ownership (pw taking), encroachment from airport, future development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pekapeka wetlands</td>
<td>nga tuna, nga manu,</td>
<td>subdivisions beginning, species decline (pukeko)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangiora</td>
<td>Feeder</td>
<td>farming impact, access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratanui</td>
<td>Feeder</td>
<td>flooding, pollution, run-off</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratanui Wetland</td>
<td>nga tuna, nga manu</td>
<td>pollution, drained, reclaimed, carp, duckweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reikorangi</td>
<td>Feeder</td>
<td>farming impact, reduce water, stock run-off, access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikotu</td>
<td>Te Uruhi pā water use, cultivations, flows out to sea</td>
<td>pollution, suburban runoff, roading, desecration of wāhi tapu (pā)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totara Lagoon</td>
<td>kai tuna, cultivation, patiki, nohoanga, mahingakai, seasonal camping (modern), tidal influences</td>
<td>black drain pollution, stock run-off, access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikanae</td>
<td>Nohoanga mahingakai rongoaa, huarahi</td>
<td>pollution, water use (KCDC), housing, farmlets, mouth diversion, extinct species-kanae, kokupu, patiki, kotuku, nga manu, decline species-tuna, inanga, mussels, lost of river flora and natural filtering system, hydrology, eco-system impact, kaitiaki? acclimatisation (trout)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimea</td>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>diversion for subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimeha Stream</td>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian rights have been contested. Shifting waterways have compromised rights and boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waimeha Lagoon</td>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>man-made, acclimatisation (swans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waipunahau</td>
<td>from the top of Hemi Matenga, feeds reservoir</td>
<td>ownership, water right (railway)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharemauku</td>
<td>flows to sea at Raumati, through Coastlands; mahinga kai, pā site at beach</td>
<td>town water supply?, runoff pollution, reduced hydrology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is noted that among the CFRT-commissioned inquiry-wide research projects there is an Environment and two Waterways projects. The likely coverage of these reports is discussed later in this section. It will be noted, however, that they hopefully will address many of the research issues identified above. Researchers for these projects have already been appointed and have begun their research work. Therefore, there is no need here to discuss possible sources for research as this will be the responsibility of the CFRT-commissioned researchers.
6. Methodology

Having identified a set of claim areas for the post-1900 period and their associated research issues, this section of the report will evaluate research options. As noted previously, CFRT will soon commission a series of inquiry district-wide reports that will deal with several of these claim areas. Under the Commission for this scoping exercise, a key component is to assess other research and make recommendations having taken into account other research. In this subsection, therefore, likely coverage of the CFRT reports will be assessed and an evaluation will be made as to whether there is a need for a 20th century Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa report.

CFRT Commissioned Research

With the CFRT-commissioned reports due to commence shortly, there can be no certainty as to exactly how they will cover the significant claim issues of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa. Nevertheless, some indication of this can be gleaned from available project briefs.

Block Research Narratives

The project brief for the Block Narratives report identifies the project purpose as:

The Contractor will identify, index and collate key historical records relating to land blocks in the Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District. The Block Research Narratives will provide a description of significant legal or historical events and/or issues for each parent block in the district (and key subdivisions and reserves). Appendix 2 provides a list and map of these parent blocks.

The Block Research Narratives will provide comprehensive coverage of the district, detailing all major legal and historical events relating to Crown policy, practices and legislation concerning Māori owned land. This would include (but not be limited to) documentation relating to:

- Pre-1865 Crown and private leases and purchases;
- Native Land Court title investigations and appeal hearings;
- Native/Māori Land Court partitions and alienations;
- Māori Land Board (1909-c1930) acquisitions;
- Title consolidations, amalgamations, developments schemes and Native Township proclamations;
- Public works acquisitions, including scenery preservation takings and any gifts of land for racing clubs, hospitals, reserves or any other public utility works;
- Conservancy and resource-based acquisitions;
- Land gifted by iwi/hapū within the inquiry district; and
- Any other major events, partitions and alienations.

The coverage suggested by the project brief is comprehensive and therefore the project should go some way to providing information for the land issues outlined previously in this scoping report. One concern is that within a 48-week timeframe, the project may not be able to provide full coverage for all of the several hundred blocks within the Inquiry District. In this case the researchers may have to select blocks to analyse in depth. If this is the situation, then it is strongly recommended that the Ngārara West and Muaūpoko blocks be among the selected case studies.

Furthermore, as the project brief suggests, block narratives are regarded as being a research assistance project focusing on documenting the title and alienation history of blocks of land. They are not overview reports on land. This is confirmed by the fact that, in addition to the Block Narrative report, Ngāti Raukawa have distinct overview projects to cover land issues of the 20th century. Whilst the block narratives, therefore, will supply a great deal of information on the Ngārara West and Muaūpoko blocks, it will be geared more towards providing the data associated with each block. There will still be a need to analyse and contextualise this data into a more encompassing overview land issues narrative.

**Public Works Issues**

The project brief for the Public Works Issues report identifies the project purpose as:

The Public Works Issues report will examine the nature, extent, and impact of the compulsory acquisition of Māori land in the Porirua ki Manawatū district. It will consider all forms of acquisition under public works and related legislation, including land taken for roads. The report will analyse all public works takings in the inquiry district providing an overview of the scale of land loss, the nature of the acquisitions, and an in-depth coverage of a selection of case studies. Particular consideration will be given to the Paraparaumu Airport and North Island Main Trunk railway takings.
The themes and topics included in the project brief (for a full list see Appendix C) appear to be sufficiently comprehensive to capture all claims issues that Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa would have in relation to public works as previously discussed in this report.

Although the project purpose appears to be comprehensive in its coverage there are some questions. On the one hand, the project brief requires the researchers to 'analyse all public works takings in the inquiry district providing an overview of the scale of land loss', on the other hand there also will be an in-depth coverage of case studies only. It appears, then, that the project brief requires identification and documentation, at least, of all public works takings in the inquiry district in order for the researchers to fulfil the requirement of presenting a full overview of the scale of land loss through public works takings. Although all will be identified, not all of these public works takings will be deeply researched. Instead a case study approach will be adopted. Two case studies that have been singled out — Paraparaumu Airport and the North Island Main Trunk — relate to Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa (in the case of the airport, exclusively). Having noted that, there are other case studies that Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa would expect to see researched (e.g. the Kāpiti Expressway). In addition, it is clear that the role of public works in the rohe of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa has been significant especially over the last 50 years as increasingly intensive suburbanisation has rolled over the landscape. Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa are unique in the Inquiry District in that they face a situation where most, if not all of their rohe, faces the possibility in the comparatively near future of being completely turned into a built up area. On this basis, it is proposed that the whole Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa experience of suburbanisation be a case study for the public works project.

**Local Government**

The project brief for the Local Government report expresses the project purpose in broad terms only:

The Local Government Issues report will address claims issues relating to local government in Porirua ki Manawatū. It will consider iwi/hapū engagement with the various forms of local government and will have a particular focus on the impact of rating on Māori land.

The project brief (as with all project briefs for the overview reports) anticipates case studies being identified by claimant groups. No specific examples are mentioned in the Brief. The
themes and topics for the project are reproduced in Appendix C. The first set is broadly entitled 'Local Government Themes and Issues'. By way of summary, these deal with the following issues:

- tracing the history of various forms of local government within the Inquiry District
- iwi/hapū participation in the legislative and regulatory framework
- iwi/hapū engagement with, and representation on, local government structures
- iwi/hapū engagement with local government decision-making
- evidence of iwi/hapū concern or complaints about local government
- provision of services

These generic issues will all relate to the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa experience. To assess this, the researchers will need to include the history, structure and processes of the Hutt County Council, Horowhenua County Council, Kāpiti Borough Council, Kāpiti Coast District Council and Wellington Regional Council within this brief. Several of these local authorities are unique in their relationship with Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa.

There are also two topics/themes listed in the project brief that are of particular interest for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa:

- Impacts on iwi/hapū of town and country planning legislation in Porirua ki Manawatū, with particular reference to housing
- The impact of local government legislation and regulatory framework/s on the ability of Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū to utilise their off-shore islands

Both topics relate to the role of local authorities in planning.

The first topic broadly relates to the increasing and ongoing suburbanisation of the whole area within Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa rohe. Beginning in the 1970s, in the north, the Horowhenua County Council played a significant town planning role in establishing the Waikanae town centre. In the south, the Kāpiti Borough Council similarly was particularly active in the Paraparaumu area supporting the development of the Coastlands mall. The subsequent attaching onto the mall development of civic developments around the growing town centre saw this
council being particularly active in the purchasing of Māori land in the 1970s and 1980s. Subsequently, the post-1989 Kāpiti Coast District Council has played a major role in planning decisions that have supported the suburbanisation of the Kāpiti Coast. Whether this has meant the acquisition of more Māori land is a question for research even in the absence of direct purchase (or taking) of Māori land, the Council's planning role in actively extending settlement across the landscape should be examined for its impact on Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa.

In relation to the topics of offshore islands, it would be expected that Kāpiti and its satellite islands will be essential case studies to fulfil this topic. From consultations with claimants, it appears that despite the ownership of Kāpiti primarily being held by the Department of Conservation and tangata whenua, the Kāpiti Coast District Council is increasingly becoming involved with Kāpiti Island through its district planning and other roles.

Returning to the CFRT project brief, the second identified theme relates to rates. The listed topics comprehensively mirror those generic rating issues previously discussed in this report. The rating of Māori land was a significant issue for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa over the twentieth century particularly during the latter half of the century. In fact, one claim (Wai 1628) is entirely focused on the taking of whānau lands for rates arrears. Consultation with claimants has revealed that the pressures of rating have been a constant factor in their decision-making over the retention, utilisation and alienation of their lands. It would be expected, therefore, that the local government researchers would particularly examine the impact of rating within the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa rohe.

Inland Waterways

The significance of waterways within the Inquiry District has been recognised by the commissioning of two companion reports:

- **Inland Waterways**: described as a technical report to examine claims issues relevant to inland waterways in the Porirua ki Manawatū inquiry district.

- **Inland Waterways Cultural Perspectives**: this report will address the customary use and significance of the inland waterways; the impact of European settlement on this customary use; and efforts by iwi/hapū to ensure central and local government recognition of the cultural significance of the inland waterways.
Under 'Geographic Scope' the project briefs for both reports list a series of waterways. (see Appendix C for a full list.) Among these, the following are situated within the rohe of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa:

- Waikanae River
- Wharemaku Stream
- Whareroa Stream
- Waiorongomai Stream and Lake

In the project briefs, the relationship of these listed waterways to each project is worded slightly differently:

- **Inland Waterways:**
  
  "The Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways report will examine claims issues relevant to inland waterways in the Porirua ki Manawatū inquiry district. The following rivers, streams, lakes and swamps lie within the inquiry district and are noted in Statements of Claim [ftnt: The Contractor may be required to examine claims issues related to other rivers, streams, lakes and swamps in the Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry district if identified by claimants.]

- **Inland Waterways Cultural Perspectives:**
  
  "This technical report will address the following Rivers, Streams, Lakes and Swamps (in addition to any key waterways identified by claimants)"

The Cultural Perspectives project brief, therefore, is more directive in noting that work has to be done on all the listed waterways. This inference is there for the other report too, but it is not stated as clearly.

As indicated above, the briefs for both reports allow for further waterways to be added although again the wording varies. Again, the Cultural Perspectives project brief is directive noting that any waterway identified by claimants will be addressed. The other Inland Waterways project brief notes only that the researchers may be required to examine claims issues for additional waterways identified by claimants. While this variation is potentially of concern, it is noted that the recently announced provider is the same for both waterways projects therefore supposedly ensuring that a high level of synergy will operate between the projects.
For Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa, as noted previously, there are a number of additional waterways not covered in the project brief. Several of these would be covered if the Waikanae and Waimea Rivers included their tributaries (as has been done in the project briefs for the Manawatū River). Nevertheless, the other waterways should be included if possible.

As noted previously, claimant information is that the whole area from Kukutauaki to Paekakariki was a navigable wetland at the time that Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa first settled in the district. The all-encompassing story of waterways for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa, therefore, is how the wetland was gradually reduced by Pākehā settlement practices leaving increasingly disjointed waterways that were continually modified especially as suburbanisation proceeded.

As for the themes and topics included in the two project briefs (see Appendix C) these appear to be sufficiently comprehensive to capture all claims issues that Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa would have in relation to their waterways.

Environmental and Natural Resource Issues

The project brief for the Environmental and Natural Resource Issues report identifies the project purpose as:

"The Environmental and Natural Resource Issues report will examine claims issues relevant to the environment and natural resources in the Porirua ki Manawatū inquiry district. It will consider:

- The impacts on iwi/hapū of changes to the environment since 1840
- The Crown’s role in these changes to the environment (both in facilitating change and in more recent efforts to mitigate the effects of environmental damage)
- The Crown-Māori relationship with respect to the environment and natural resources."

Unlike some of the other project briefs, there is less direction on how the project might be approached. Although themes and topics are listed, there are only generic references in the project brief that claimants identify case studies with the researchers.
The themes and topics listed in the project brief are:

- Hapū and Iwi Customary Use and Crown Policy
- Environmental Transformation
- Resource Management Act
- Wāhi Tapu
- Mana Wāhine and Impacts on Cultural Practices

These theme headings and the topics identified under them (see Appendix C) are sufficiently comprehensive to cover the claims issues associated with the environment as identified previously in this scoping report. In addition to capturing the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa experience in relation to all of the above themes (and the topics listed under these themes), the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants will presumably propose several case studies.

**Overview and Gap-Filling Report**

Despite the commissioning of several significant overview reports, all dealing with research areas that are germane to issues having been identified as being of relevance to the presentation of Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa claims, it is envisaged that there will be a need for a Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa overview report for the post-1900 period. There are two important roles that this report would provide:

- **Overview**: As indicated by the above analysis, the CFRT-commissioned reports will go a long way towards providing research and analysis on a range of issues of central relevance to the presentation of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims. Nevertheless, the end result will be several reports each containing a part of the information required to present these claims. It will be an important function of the overview report to bring the generated information together into one report. More than being merely an editorial exercise, however, the bringing together of research material into one report will enable an analysis to be undertaken to assess the cumulative impact on Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa of the findings associated with each of the reports. Further discussion of the nature of that analysis is noted below.
• **Gap-filling:** Regardless of the best efforts of the CFRT-commissioned report writers, they will not be able to cover all issues of relevance for the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants in the various subject areas. As noted in the previous evaluation of project briefs, several of the reports require a selection of case studies to evaluate the report’s themes. Based on analysis conducted for this scoping, several of these have been suggested and further case studies might be identified when the Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa claimants consult with the various researchers. Due to resource limitations for each project and the fact they must represent the entire Inquiry District, it is likely that aside from the selected case studies, there will be further examples from each subject of relevance to Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa and important for their claims.

The following analysis will evaluate the coverage of the overview report. Subsequently in this scoping, there will be an assessment of the likely required resource.

Judging from the Project Briefs, and in accordance with usual practice of inquiry district-wide overview reports, it can be expected that the national legislative and administrative context for each of the research themes will be fully dealt with by the CFRT-commissioned reports. This will particularly apply to the regulatory framework that has been and is in place for Public Works, Local Government and the Environment (including Waterways). Therefore any overview report for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa would not have to research these matters and should be able to rely and draw on the CFRT-commissioned reports for coverage.

The gaps that will arise from the CFRT-commissioned reports will not be fully known until these projects are completed or at least advanced. Ideally there may not be any. Realistically, given resource constraints and the inquiry-district wide coverage, there will probably be some. Aside from these, when examining the claims issues previously identified in the report, it appears that there also might be the followings gaps to be addressed in the overview report:

• **Land:** as noted previously, the Block Narratives project, while it is expected to provide a great deal of data on Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa land blocks such as Muaūpoko and Ngārara West, is nevertheless a research assistance project focusing on providing
title and alienation data. There will be a need to analyse the data produced by this project to develop an interpretative framework in relation to Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa land. Furthermore, it is possible the Block Narratives project may not provide detail on land utilisation (beyond leasing) as different sources (some of which have been discussed previously) are required to form a view on the nature of utilisation. Finally, the Block Narratives project will not ascertain the context in which land is held, the location of owners, the advance of Pākehā settlement around Māori land blocks and the change within ownership groups. It is envisaged, therefore, that supplementary work will be required to cover all land issues as identified previously in this report.

- **People**: previously, when discussing issues in relation to Ngātiawa ki Kāpiti Coast and Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa claims, the favoured approach identified by several claimants was to follow the experience of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa whānau over the course of the 20th century. This has been identified as providing a way to clearly identify the impacts of Crown action and inaction. It will also provide an essential context to evaluate the impacts of several of the themes that will be covered by the CFRT-commissioned reports. As discussed previously in this report, the following of whānau cohorts requires a certain research methodology that utilises details and information about individuals that overview reports would not collect or necessarily present as the focus of their work. This then would be a gap that would be dealt with in the overview report.

- **Oral and Traditional**: Finally, it is proposed that the overview report will be the best vehicle to make use of much of the information generated by the Oral and Traditional project. This will be discussed further in the following section of this report.
In addition to the proposed 20th century report fulfilling the role of providing an overview and filling research gaps, there has been some discussion with claimant groups on one particular presentation format that they would wish to see in an overview report. Aside from presenting narrative, there has been support for producing a series of rohe maps to encapsulate the findings of this and the earlier 19th Century Land Issues and Crown Relationship report.

Although this matter will be finalised by further discussion and will also be guided by the research findings from the CFRT-commissioned projects, it is envisaged that the rohe maps will be produced to provide a series of snapshots that will show the changing realities for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa over time as the impacts of various claim issues are experienced by iwi members. Possible provisional dates for the map series would be:

- 1840 showing the situation at the signing of the Treaty
- 1860 after Crown purchases and before the Land Court
- 1890 after the completion of Land Court Titles
- 1910 reflecting the first two decades after Ngārara title had been awarded
- 1930 reflecting the impact on the 1909 free market legislation
- 1960 the situation just before the rapid expansion of Pākehā settlement
- 1980 after the first wave of suburbanisation
- 2015 current situation

To provide a preliminary indication only, the following map gives some idea of the area being considered:
Each map would contain the following features:

- a representative collection of place names (Māori and Pākehā)
- the location of sites of significance (and their status over time)
- natural environment (vegetation, topography, waterways)
- mahinga kai resources on the landscape (and their status over time)
- Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa occupation areas and land ownership
- Pākehā ownership and occupation
- the development of infrastructure (town centres, streets, rail/roads/airport)
- instances of public works takings

(NB: This is an initial list only that will be further developed by claimants and the overview report researcher)
Some of these features can be graphically depicted, others will be explained by textboxes. The final format of the map will be ascertained over the course of the research project. To provide sufficient detail, a series of district sub-maps may be opted for.
Section III: Oral and Traditional Project

The possibility of recommending an oral and traditional project has been discussed with all of those Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants with whom the author has met over the course of this project. Several observations can be made:

- the various Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants have not come together as a working group in relation to presenting an overall Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa collective. While this, of course, is their prerogative, its affect for the design of an oral and traditional project is that there is an expectation from each claimant group that several members from their claimant community would participate as interviewees. With at least half a dozen claims likely to participate at this stage (there could be more if further contact is made), this pushes interviewee numbers to a much higher level than would normally be the case thereby potentially inflating funding requirements beyond the usual level.

- over the years, oral and traditional projects have taken a wide variation of forms. Often, in addition to information collected through oral interviews, they have included supplementary information from written source material such as secondary sources or Native Land Court minutes. Given that a 19th century report has been recommended in this scoping report based on written sources, the core of which is an assessment of Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa customary rights over time, focusing an oral and traditional project on anything other than oral interviews or documentation held by whānau would risk duplication.

- often in oral and traditional projects, once the oral, traditional information has been collected, the vehicle adopted to present this information is a written report. These reports, however, are often effectively a compilation of the oral information into certain themes (whakapapa, mahinga kai, tikanga). As such, these stand-alone reports sometimes do not serve to utilise the collected information to the best effect. Often, they are unable to contextualise the collected information as their funding level is such that the report authors cannot do extra research or even have the resources to compare collected oral information against the written technical research record.
Sometimes, this is simply because the technical reports are being produced on a different timeframe. For the same reason, technical reports often do not get the opportunity to utilise the unique information arising from an oral and traditional project because of timing mismatches. To produce an oral and traditional report that is not contextualised or is isolated from the technical workstream can be a waste of resource, especially when usually one third to one half of a project's resources are needed to produce the report.

- many of the CFRT-commissioned report researchers either require or will benefit from input from claimants on the issues they are dealing with. Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants will have information on how they have been affected by rates and other actions of local government; by public works takings and by changes in the environment (in particular changes in waterways).

Taking these considerations into account, it is proposed that an oral and traditional project to support the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims would need to have the following features:

- that it is based, not on claim numbers, but in a way to ensure representation of the wider claimant community

- that it focuses on the collection of oral information or documentation held by whānau

- that given the likely resourcing constraints facing Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants, unnecessary report writing is dispensed with and that instead the output of the project is the collected information itself produced in a format that is most useful for the claimants, counsel and the researchers of the recommended 19th and 20th century research reports

- that information is not collected by this project that would more likely be collected for the commissioned technical research projects

While the last three features are self-explanatory, consideration has been given as to how best to achieve a devolved methodology to ensure representation and participation of the wider claimant community.
It is at this point that the whānau-focused research and analysis first raised in Section II can be returned to. As noted, the objective of this research is to collect as much information as possible about each of the identified Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa whānau to provide a whānau-focused assessment of the impacts of Crown actions and processes and the effects of continuing Pākehā settlement within the Kāpiti area. The questions identified for this whānau-focused research can be answered for the first decades after 1900 by written source materials, and this is one of the objectives of the recommended 20th century overview report. For information over the past 65 years, however, a more efficient method of collecting information is to collect it from the whānau themselves. In addition, different whānau would be able to produce evidence on issues that were of specific importance to them. Whānau information on whakapapa and actions of their tupuna during the times of the great heke and in the events thereafter would ensure a Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa perspective was gained on the matters. Other issues raised in this scoping would also benefit from whānau-focused research. For example, the questions around the Whitireia block and the subsequent impacts on Wi Parata would be matters on which his descendants would have a unique perspective.

Given the above features which would shape the oral and traditional report, it is proposed that whānau-focused research (i.e. about whānau rather than the subjects that will be covered by the CFRT-commissioned technical reports) be the objective of the project. Once this approach is taken, a suitable methodology is immediately suggested: the devolving of information collection to those whānau who wish to participate as it will be the whānau who will best know who should be spoken to, how information should be collected (interviews, wananga, facilitated hui) and the issues that have affected them.

The way in which this proposed oral and traditional project would be resourced, is discussed in the following section of this report.
Section IV: Recommendations

The previous three sections of the report have each recommended that a research project be created to meet the requirements of the Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants in the presentation of their cases before the Tribunal:

- A 19th century Land Issues and Crown Relationship report to fill the large gap that exists on the Inquiry District record of any research material that deals meaningfully with the significant pre-1900 issues that Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa experienced.
- A 20th century Overview and Gap-Filling report to enhance the planned CFRT-commissioned research and to ensure that all significant local issues are addressed.
- An Oral and Traditional Project that produces unique information held by Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa whānau to enhance the two reports noted above.

The commission for this scoping report requires that where research projects are recommended, further detail is provided on timeframes and resource estimates as well as report structures such as chapter outlines.¹⁹²

I. 19th century Land Issues and Crown Relationship

As noted in Section I, a report is required to cover 19th century issues for Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claimants as there are a number of significant matters that have not yet been dealt with by any report on the Wai 2200 Record of Inquiry. Based on the analysis in Section I, the structure for this report has been identified in the following chapter headings:

- The Gaining of Customary Rights: 1819-1840
- Customary Rights and Crown Actions: 1840-1880
- Ngārara: 1880-1900

¹⁹² Wai 2200, #2.3.9, 1 April 2015.
Outlines for these chapters have already been fully presented in Section I, both in relation to chapter narratives and the research issues that need to be addressed.

- **Timeframes**: It is proposed that the project would require a minimum 52-week timeframe. The amount of source material to be worked through and the range of issues, as noted in Section I, would preclude the project being done in any shorter timeframe. In addition, as this project does not depend on the completion of any other commissioned work, the project could begin as soon as it could be commissioned.

- **Resourcing**: It is proposed that the main resource would be for one historian for a minimum of 52 weeks with the support of a researcher for 26 weeks. The historian selected for this work would need to have a great deal of experience in Treaty issues to be able to complete a report dealing with complex issues within the proposed timeframe. That experience would have to include significant experience in working with a large volume of Native Land Court minutes and knowledge of how to work through these in a timely manner, yet thoroughly extricating all relevant information to be able to answer the range of research issues identified in Section I. Rather than selecting pieces of the most accessible information to build a narrative, this project will only succeed if all the minutes are dealt with effectively, as a body, with all contradictions and varying opinions accounted for and utilised.

The Land Court minutes have already been collected and are digitally available. Other collections are also available digitally from research assistance projects completed for the inquiry district (newspapers, petitions). A number of other sources are available online (AJHR, Papers Past, McLean papers). For this particular project, archival sources are primarily held in Wellington at Archives NZ and the National Library.

2. **20th century Overview and Gap-Filling**

Unlike the 19th century Land Issues and Crown Relationship report, it is not possible at this stage to fully identify a report structure through chapter outlines or even chapter headings. In Section II, a full presentation was provided on likely claim issues, but this was done as subject areas. Much of this proposed research report will be based on a series of soon-to-be
commissioned reports. The structure of the 20th century overview and gap-filling report, therefore, will only be apparent when other research has first been completed. It is strongly recommended, therefore, that one of the first phases of any commissioned project to complete a 20th century Overview and Gap-Filling report, would be the production of a short scoping exercise on what work related to Ngātiawa/Te Āti Awa claims had been completed by the CFRT-commissioned reports, what gaps require to be addressed and how the completed overview and gap-filling report would look.

Despite not knowing the structure of the overview and gap-filling report at this time, it is nevertheless possible to identify some likely timeframes and resources.

- **Timeframes:** It is proposed that the project would also require a minimum 26-week timeframe. This is required to sufficiently analyse and interpret the breadth and volume of source material generated by the CFRT-commissioned report. In addition, the identification and researching of gaps would have to be completed within this timeframe. Research is also required to contextualise land block data and conduct whānau-orientated written source research. Aside from timeframes, work on issues being covered by other technical reports should not commence until after the last of the CFRT-commissioned reports was completed: the longest of which has a 65-week timeframe. On the other hand, certain aspects of the report, for example, the whānau-focused research of written source material, could commence as soon as the project was commissioned.

- **Resourcing:** It is proposed that the minimum personnel resource for this project ideally would consist of:
  - 26 weeks full-time historian/report writer: half of this time would be required for the analysis and writing of the overview arising from the CFRT-commissioned reports, with the other half required to analyse and write up gap-filling research as well as research conducted to contextualise land block data and whānau-orientated written source research.
  - 26 weeks full-time researcher to provide research on gaps, to contextualise land block data and conduct whānau-orientated written source research.

The timeframe for this report is demanding. Therefore, the historian and researcher would need to have broad experience in Treaty issues to complete the work in a timely
manner. The researcher would need to have broad experience in the various source material that would be accessed to gap-fill and also the socio-demographic sources required to complete the whānau-orientated research. In the latter case there is also a requirement for speed to work through large volumes of material in a timely manner.

In relation to research, however, there are some identifiable costs. Even without knowing the exact nature of gap-filling requirements, it can be assumed that most source material is located in Wellington at Archives NZ or the National Library. It is envisaged that to conduct whānau-orientated written source research several of the sources named in Section II will have to be collected from the Whanganui Land Court. In addition, the local government Archives Central repository in Feilding may well require a visit. For the project researcher, then, six weeks research out of Wellington could be required.

3. *Oral and Traditional Project*

As noted in the previous section, an oral and traditional project is proposed with the following features:

- that it focuses on the collection of oral information or documentation held by whānau
- that the output of the project is the collected information produced in a format that is most useful for the claimants, counsel and the researchers of the recommended 19th and 20th century research reports
- that the project does not collect information that would more properly be collected for the commissioned technical research projects
- that the aim of the project is to collected whānau-focused information as identified by those whānau who participate

With this proposed methodology, the following comments can be made in relation to the resourcing and timing of the project:
• **Timeframes:** It is proposed that the project would require a minimum 52-week timeframe. This is to ensure enough time is allowed to identify those whānau who wish to participate; for the whānau to best decide their own methodology for the collection of information; for the whānau to organise the collection of the information; for the information to be collated into a format agreed with the whānau. As this project does not depend on the completion of any other commissioned work, the project could begin as soon as it was commissioned.

• **Resourcing:** It is proposed that the personnel resource for this project would be a half-time commissionee for a minimum of 52 weeks:
  - Half-time commissioned coordinator. The coordinator would need to have the ability to work across all whānau. On the other hand, the coordinator would also have a high level of knowledge of Treaty issues and an ability to understand and promote required research objectives. The coordinator could design research questions. The coordinator would have a principal role in bringing the collected information together.

4. **Summary**

Having completed the above analysis, the minimum resourcing and timeframe of the three recommended projects is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Minimum Timeframe</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Minimum Resource Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19th century Land Issues and Crown Relationship | 52 weeks          | Could commence once it has been commissioned | - 1 full-time historian  
- 1 half-time researcher |
| 20th century Overview and Gap-Filling       | 26 weeks          | Should commence after CFRT projects were completed | - 1 full-time historian  
- 1 full-time researcher |
| Oral and Traditional Project               | 52 weeks          | Could commence once it has been commissioned | - 1 half-time coordinator |
The following diagram depicts how the three recommended projects would interrelate:

- ORAL & TRADITIONAL HISTORY PROJECT (52 weeks)
- 19TH CENTURY LAND ISSUES & CROWN RELATIONSHIP REPORT (52 weeks)
- 20TH CENTURY OVERVIEW & GAP-FILLING REPORT (26 weeks)

CFRT Commissioned reports
- Block Narratives
- Public Works
- Local Government
- Environment and Natural Issues
- Waterways reports
Appendix A: Research Commission

OFFICIAL

WAITANGI TRIBUNAL

Wai 2200

CONCERNING

the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975

AND

the Porirua ki Manawatū District Inquiry

DIRECTION COMMISSIONING RESEARCH

1. Pursuant to clause 5A of the second schedule of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975, the Tribunal commissions Tony Walzl, historian, to prepare a Te Ātiawa/Ngātiawa ki Whakarongotai research needs scoping report for the Porirua ki Manawatū District Inquiry.

2. In particular, the scoping report should:

   a) identify the issues likely to require research in claims registered on behalf of Te Ātiawa/Ngātiawa ki Whakarongotai, consulting with the claimants to assist in clarifying their research issues;

   b) ascertain to what extent Te Ātiawa/Ngātiawa ki Whakarongotai tribal history and claim issues are covered in Tribunal reports and evidential material on records of inquiry and identify any gaps specific to Te Ātiawa/Ngātiawa ki Whakarongotai;

   c) assess the extent to which existing evidential and published research on specific Te Ātiawa/Ngātiawa ki Whakarongotai claim issues is sufficient to address the claim issues identified so far, and ascertain any other issues which appear to arise from consultation with the claimants and appraisal of the sources;

   d) recommend a research project or projects that would best cover outstanding Te Ātiawa/Ngātiawa ki Whakarongotai land and politics issues, local issues, and oral and traditional history for the inquiry casebook research programme, including proposed chapter outlines, any oral history proposals, and time and resource estimates; and

   e) provide a detailed bibliography of relevant sources and their locations.

3. The researcher will consult with affected claimant groups to determine what issues they consider to be of particular significance to their claims in respect of the above matters and to access such relevant oral and documentary information as they wish to make available.
4. The commission commenced on 16 March 2015. A complete draft of the report is to be submitted by 28 October 2015 and will be circulated to claimants and the Crown for comment.

5. The commission ends on 18 January 2015, at which time one copy of the final report must be submitted for filing in unbound form, together with indexed copies of any supporting documents or transcripts. An electronic copy of the report should also be provided in Word or Adobe Acrobat PDF format. The report and any subsequent evidential material based on it must be filed through the Registrar.

6. The report may be received as evidence and the author may be cross-examined on it.

7. The Registrar is to send copies of this direction to: Tony Walzl
   Claimant counsel and unrepresented claimants in the Porirua ki Manawatū district inquiry
   Chief Historian, Waitangi Tribunal Unit
   Principal Research Analyst, Waitangi Tribunal Unit
   Manager Research and Inquiry Facilitation, Waitangi Tribunal Unit Inquiry Facilitator, Waitangi Tribunal Unit
   Solicitor General, Crown Law Office
   Director, Office of Treaty Settlements
   Chief Executive, Crown Forestry Rental Trust
   Chief Executive, Te Puni Kōkiri

Dated at Gisborne this 1st day of April 2015

[Signature]
Deputy Chief Judge C. L. Fox
Presiding Officer WAITANGI TRIBUNAL
### Appendix B: List of Claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wai No</th>
<th>Claim name</th>
<th>Named claimant</th>
<th>On behalf of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>88 Kāpiti Island Claim</td>
<td>Te Pēhi Parata (deceased) and Ani Parata, Darrin Parata, Damian Parata</td>
<td>Descendants of Ngātiawa/Te Ati Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>89 Whitreia Block Claim</td>
<td>Te Pēhi Parata (deceased) and Ani Parata, Darrin Parata</td>
<td>Descendants of Ngātiawa/Te Ati Awa mai i Kukutauaki ki Whareroa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>609 Paraparaumu Airport Claim</td>
<td>Ann Colgate and others</td>
<td>Te Whānau a Te Ngārara Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>612 Paraparaumu Airport (No 2) Claim</td>
<td>Kaye Tini Korehe Rowe</td>
<td>Te Atiawa ki Whakarongotai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>648 George Hori Toms and Colonial Laws of Succession Claim</td>
<td>Grace Kerenapu Saxton</td>
<td>Descendants of George Hori Toms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>875 Paraparaumu Airport (No 3) Claim</td>
<td>Kura Marie Taylor and others</td>
<td>Ngapera Taupiri Taylor, Irihapiti Isherwood and others, Te Ati Awa ki Whakarongotai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>876 Paraparaumu Airport (No 4) Claim</td>
<td>Phillip Reeves, Kevin Kemp, Christina Keenan and Jean Casserley</td>
<td>Kaiherau Whānau Trust (previously Ngā Uri o Kaiherau Takurua), Te Atiawa ki Whakarongotai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>877 Paraparaumu Airport (No 5) Claim</td>
<td>Tahu Wiki Taylor, Carol Capon, Tamati Reeves, Makiterangi Matthews</td>
<td>Ngā Uri o Hoani Ihakara, Te Atiawa ki Whakarongotai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1018 Otaraua and Rahiri Hapū ki Waikanae Lands Claim</td>
<td>Aphiaka Irene Mullen-Mack, Marama Pale, Rawiri Evans</td>
<td>Herself and all women of Ngāti Kura, Hinetuhi, Uenuku, Rahiri and Otaraua hapū of Te Ati Awa (Ngātikaia ki Kāpiti te tau tai).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1620 Paraparaumu Airport (No 6) Claim</td>
<td>Doreen Sheerin, Colleen Walker and Ronald Lake</td>
<td>Themelves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1799 Parata Township Claim</td>
<td>Hyrum Parata</td>
<td>The descendants of Te Kakakura Wi Parata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2361 The Kāpiti and MotuNgārara Islands (Webber) Claim</td>
<td>Christian Webber</td>
<td>Descendants of Wi Parata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2390 Takamore Trust claim</td>
<td>Benjamin Rameka Ngaia</td>
<td>Takamore Trust and the descendants of those who lie in the Takamore wāhi tapu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Themes and Topics of Overview Reports

The following themes and topics for the CFRT-commissioned inquiry-wide overview reports have been excerpted from the respective project briefs.

Block Narratives

[See main text for a full discussion of the purpose of this Project]

Public Works Issues

General

- For what purposes were Māori lands taken – river management works, drainage, roads, railways, airports, racing clubs, schools, hospitals, domains, public utilities, housing, takings for defence purposes, township sites, and/or scenery preservation?
- Did the Crown acquire more land than was necessary for public works or explore alternatives other than compulsory acquisition?
- Were lands no longer required for the purpose for which they were taken returned to the former owners? If they were retained, for what purpose were they subsequently used?

The Impact of Public Works Takings on Relationships Between Iwi, and Between Māori and the Crown

- When, and in what circumstances, were public works first introduced into Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District? What was the nature of this initial implementation?
- Did the process of public works takings change over time? How did takings from the early period compare with takings in the twentieth century?
- What impact did public works takings in Porirua ki Manawatū have on the relations between iwi/hapū i in the district and the Crown?
- What impact did public works takings have, if any, on inter-iwi relationships in Porirua ki Manawatū?
- To what extent were iwi/hapū in Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District aware of the legislation under which their lands were being taken? Were they made aware of the provisions for taking and their entitlements to compensation?
- Was the sufficiency of land remaining in iwi/hapū ownership considered during the taking of Māori land for public works purposes?
- What role did the Māori Land Board and Māori Trustee play in later public works takings? Did this system disadvantage Māori owners?
Gifting of Lands

- To what extent did iwi/hapū in Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District gift lands for the purposes of Native Schools and other sites?
- How were gifted lands processed? Was public works legislation used?
- Were these lands used for their intended purpose, and were sites such as Native Schools established in a timely manner?
- Were these lands offered back when no longer required?

Notice, Consultation and Compensation

- What were the legal provisions and practices providing for notification, objection and compensation for Public Works and related takings?
- Were these provisions and practices adequate, and did they ensure that Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū were not disadvantaged regarding their rights to object and be compensated?
- How were affected iwi/hapū landowners and other affected parties consulted during the taking of land for public works purposes? Was there a consent or negotiation process? How was this process implemented?
- What was the extent of consultation, discussion and agreement with respect to public works concepts such as use or underlying transfer of land?
- Were iwi/hapū in Porirua ki Manawatū District realistically able to participate in the objection process? Where objections were made, were these seriously considered?
- Did provisions for compensation place iwi/hapū in Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District at a disadvantage compared with other landowners?
- Was fair compensation determined, and was it paid to those entitled to it?
- Did the compensation process recognise non-commercial use or whakapapa connections with the land?
- Were proposed alternatives to compensation, such as reduced survey costs, adequately considered by the Crown?

Protections for Important Sites, Including Wāhi Tapu

- Were urupa and other sites of significance destroyed or damaged as a result of public works, and/or access severed? If so, under what circumstances?
- What considerations were applied to wāhi tapu in the process of identifying potential lands to be taken? Were objections lodged by iwi/hapū over the taking of such sites adequately investigated by the Crown?
- The general implication of any compulsory takings for public works on sites of significance and wāhi tapu, and whether the Crown was aware of these sites.
Offer Back of Surplus Lands
- What were the circumstances of the disposal of lands compulsorily acquired for public works when the purpose for those acquisitions was unfulfilled or expired?
- Were lands no longer required for the purpose for which they were taken returned to the former owners in the years before the Public Works Act 1981? If they were retained, for what purpose were they subsequently used?
- What was the condition of returned land, if there was any, and were there any conditions of return?

Public Works and Local Authorities in Porirua ki Manawatū
- Was it appropriate for the Crown to delegate to local authorities the power to take Māori land within Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District compulsorily?
- Did the Crown sufficiently monitor and address any problems that arose from this delegation?

Scenic Reserves and Scenery Preservation
- What obligations did the Crown have toward iwi/hapū in Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District in acquiring land compulsorily for scenic reserve purposes? To what extent were these obligations fulfilled?
- To what extent were iwi/hapū consulted over the taking of lands for scenic reserves and scenery preservation?
- Were alternatives to takings, such as voluntary sales, exchanges and leasing, adequately considered?
- For how long was the Crown able to compulsorily acquire Māori land for scenic reserves? Why was this practice discontinued?
- On what basis did Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District iwi/hapū object to land takings for scenic purposes? How did the Crown respond to such objections?
- By what means was compensation assessed? Was compensation paid adequate, and did it take into account the value of land for Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District iwi/hapū? Are there examples where compensation was not paid?
Local Government

Local Government Themes and Issues:

- The extent to which the Crown provided for iwi/hapū participation in the legislative and regulatory framework established and maintained for local government in the district
- The establishment of various forms of local government in Porirua ki Manawatū
- The impacts and difficulties for iwi/hapū in dealing with the large number of different local government bodies in the Porirua ki Manawatū district
- The extent to which the Crown provided for separate forms of Māori local self-government, such as Native Committees and Māori Councils, tribal kōmiti/committees and rūnanga
- The nature and extent of local iwi/hapū engagement with, and representation on, local government structures and decision-making (and overall consultation with Māori by local government) including:
  - Any limiting factors on iwi/hapū involvement or engagement with local government;
  - Crown resourcing to ensure adequate participation in local government decision making;
  - Any demands by iwi/hapū to participate more effectively in local government;
  - Any benefits from local governance structures;
  - Any concerns, complaints or issues with the exercise of local authority powers;
  - Local initiatives by Māori and how any such initiatives fared;
  - Provisions for iwi/hapū representatives on local authorities and participation in local body elections; and
  - Consultation with iwi/hapū in local body decision making.
- Patterns of expenditure and the provision of services to iwi/hapū, including roads, water and drainage
- Impacts on iwi/hapū of town and country planning legislation in Porirua ki Manawatū, with particular reference to housing
- The impact of legislative changes such as the Town and Country Planning Act 1953, Resource Management Act 1991 and the Local Government Acts 1974 and 2002 on iwi/hapū participation in local government planning and decision-making in Porirua ki Manawatū
- The impact of local government legislation and regulatory framework/s on the ability of Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū to utilise their off-shore islands
- Any evidence of iwi/hapū concern or complaints to the Crown about the system of local government in the district, and Crown responses to such complaints
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the local political forms of organisation on offer to iwi/hapū in the inquiry district (excluding environmental management regimes, which are being considered in a separate report)
Ratings Themes and Issues:

- A summary of the general development and implementation of rating policy over the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, including how and when rating liabilities extended to Māori land (based on existing secondary research and reviews)
- The extent to which rating and valuation legislation, policy and practice recognised the particular nature of Māori land title
- Whether classes of Māori land were exempted from rates in the district, and whether this changed over time?
- What role did local government, the Māori Land Court, District Māori Land Boards and the Māori Trustee have regarding the levying and collection of rates on iwi/hapū land in the Porirua ki Manawatū district?
- The impact of title fragmentation, multiple ownership and land-locked land on the ability of Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū to meet rates liabilities
- The extent to which Māori land owners were consulted about the rating of their land, if any
- The reaction of iwi/hapū in the district to the imposition of rates and the possibility of compulsory acquisition for non-payment
- The extent and impact of local body charges (including those of district council, pest control boards, catchment boards and other agencies) on Māori land holdings in the Porirua ki Manawatū district
- The extent to which local bodies sought the appointment of a receiver for blocks with outstanding rates charges
- The extent to which such receiverships resulted in compulsory long-term leasing or sales of the land. The Contractor will, as far as possible, quantify the amount of Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū land loss through this avenue
- Case studies of blocks where the County Council, the Māori Land Board and/or the Māori Trustee were appointed receiver
- The impact of pressure for rates payments on Māori land alienation in the district, including detailed case studies outlining any compulsory takings of Māori land for non-payment of rates
- To what extent did rating affect iwi/hapū aspirations for utilising their land?
- Any evidence of iwi/hapū paying rates on lands where significant use/access restrictions were enforced by the relevant local government authority
- Any evidence related to local authority actions or decisions that had the effect of limiting iwi/hapū exercise of kaitiakitanga in the district
- The impact of any local government actions or omissions on wāhi tapu or other sites of significance, any complaints made related to this, and Crown responses to such complaints
Inland Waterways

The Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways report will examine claims issues relevant to inland waterways in the Porirua ki Manawatū inquiry district. The following rivers, streams, lakes and swamps lie within the inquiry district and are noted in Statements of Claim:

- Manawatū River, and its tributaries, within the Porirua ki Manawatū inquiry district, i.e. west of the Ruahine and Tararu Ranges to its outlet into Tasman Bay at Foxton Beach. Tributaries of the Manawatū include the Oroua River, Pohangina River;
- Lake Horowhenua;
- Lake Waiwiri/Papaitonga;
- Hokio Stream;
- Koputara Lake;
- Ohau River;
- Ōtaki River;
- Waikanae River;
- Wharemakatu Stream;
- Whareroa Stream;
- Waikawa Stream;
- Waiauti / Waiaute Stream;
- Manakau Stream;
- Mangahua Stream;
- Hakari Lake;
- Forest Lakes;
- Waimarie Lake;
- Te Puna a te Ora Lake;
- Waiorongomai Stream and Lake;
- Kiwitea Stream;
- Makino Stream;
- Taonui Stream;
- That portion of Akatarawa River that falls within the inquiry district;
- Turakina River;
- Kairanga Swamp; and
- Rongotea Swamp.

The following themes and topics are listed:

The Customary Use and Significance of Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways

- What Crown records reveal about the Crown’s perceptions and understandings of the customary use/s and significance of inland waterways to hapū and iwi

---

193 The Contractor may be required to examine claims issues related to other rivers, streams, lakes and swamps in the Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry district if identified by claimants
Impacts of Colonisation on the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways

- European settlement and the expansion of the economic and farming frontier, including the impact of extractive industries, as these affected the waterways listed above
- Post-colonisation impacts on the lake and river systems and tributaries (aggradation, erosion, water quality, wetlands drainage, physical changes in river beds, gravel extraction, and so forth), and the impact of any changes on Māori communities in the district

Title & Ownership: Legal Issues and the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways

- Issues of ownership of the bed of the river/s – the ad medium filum rule – and the impact, if any, of the Coalmines Amendment Act as they impact on the rivers listed above
- Issues of ownership of the Porirua ki Manawatū lakes, particularly Lake Horowhenua

Water Power Developments and Water Uses of the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways

- Abstraction of water for township, rural and industrial water supplies
- ‘Water-take’ issues, such as any water diversion for hydro schemes and any irrigation schemes identified in the district

Resource Management and the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways

- The impact of local government management and control of the inland waterways listed above including water quality issues (general pollution, industrial and urban waste discharges, dairy farm run-off, swamp drainage impact on water quality, and so forth.) This includes considering the following issues:
  - The work of Catchment Boards, Drainage Boards (and their successors)
  - What representation have iwi/hapū had on local agencies responsible for the control and management of Porirua ki Manawatū waterways?
  - Have iwi/hapū views on management of the Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways been heard?
  - Have there been any limiting factors on iwi/hapū involvement or engagement with local government agencies responsible for the Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways?
  - What was the impact of the Resource Management Act 1991 on iwi/hapū ability to engage meaningfully with local government agencies responsible for the Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways?
  - What is the current situation between iwi/hapū and the regional councils, and what is the extent to which regional councils are an effective vehicle for the recognition of iwi/hapū interests regarding the Porirua ki Manawatū waterways?
• Resource management regimes for the waterways, including consultation with and involvement by Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū, and incorporation of Māori perspectives in waterways management regimes

• An overall focus on the recognition by central or local government, if any, of Māori environmental cultural practices involving the waterways listed above

**Flood Control and Protection Works and the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways**

• The nature and extent of flood control activities and the impact of these on Māori land owners and iwi/hapū

**Fisheries and the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways**

• The Crown’s involvement in the management of indigenous fish species and other indigenous wildlife whose habitat requirements include the inland waterways

• The impact of acclimatisation activities and the introduction of exotic species of fish into the inland waterways in the district, including iwi/hapū consultation and involvement with this, as well as identifying the exotic fish management regimes in place

**Water Quality Issues and the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways**

• The present health or condition of the district’s inland waterways(Note that it is not anticipated that this study will include water-testing, but would summarise and comment on source material in relation to water quality)

• Historical trends and issues in relation to pollution and water quality testing on the Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways

• Were iwi/hapū consulted about polluting discharges? How did iwi/hapū raise concerns about water quality and pollution issues, and how have any concerns been responded to by the Crown and local authorities?

**Gravel Extraction Issues**

• The relationship between gravel extraction and flood control issues in the Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways

• The relationship between gravel extraction and Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways ownership issues

• The application of royalty regimes

• Historical and contemporary evidence relating to amounts and value of gravel and shingle extracted from Porirua ki Manawatū waterways
**Inland Waterways: Cultural Perspective**

[For waterway that have already been identified see previous Project Brief]

**The Customary Use and Significance of the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways**
- The ancestral relationship of iwi and hapū to the waterways listed above
- The traditional ways that these waterways were used and relied upon prior to the arrival of Europeans

**Impacts of Colonisation on the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways**
- The impact that changes incurred from 1840 onwards had on the customary uses of the inland waterways in Porirua ki Manawatū
- The loss of essential inland waterways resources through drainage and other means, and the impacts of this on iwi/hapū
- Efforts by iwi/hapū to retain control of, and access to, the inland waterways in the district

**Ownership Issues and the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways**
- What are iwi/hapū perspectives on issues relating to ownership and title of the Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways?
- Have iwi/hapū sought to engage with the Crown on the issue of ownership of the Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways?

**Resource Management and the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways**
- The relationship of Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū with the Crown and local government with respect to management of the inland waterways
- An overall focus on the recognition by central or local government, if any, of Māori environmental cultural practices involving the waterways listed above
- Iwi/hapū involvement in efforts to restore the health and wellbeing of these inland waterways

**Hapū and Iwi Perspectives on Species and Habitat Loss**
- The experiences of Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū in terms of species loss and habitat destruction in the Porirua ki Manawatū inland waterways. Suggested case studies for species loss include, but are not limited to:
  i. Huia
  ii. Pātiki
  iii. Tuna
  iv. Kōura
  v. Kererū
vi. Tūī
vii. Harakeke
viii. Ngutu Kākā
ix. Rimu
x. Mātai
xi. Hīnau
xii. Rewarewa
xiii. Kahikatea
xiv. Any others identified by claimants

- Porirua ki Manawatū iwi/hapū experiences of the impact on species and habitat of the following developments, as they relate to inland waterways:
  
  i. Deforestation
  ii. Gravel extraction
  iii. Localised pollution
  iv. Drainage of wetlands
  v. Fertiliser use
  vi. Insecticide and herbicide use
  vii. Introduction of exotic species
  viii. Pastoral farming
  ix. Damming of rivers and reductions in river flows
Environmental and Natural Resource Issues

Hapū and Iwi Customary Use and Crown Policy

- An outline of customary iwi/hapū use of the natural environment, settlement patterns, resource use and environmental change (including kaimoana gathering locations, tuna weirs, and the customary rights and use of beached whales)
- Did the Crown deny the ability of iwi/hapū in Porirua ki Manawatū to exercise tino rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga over the environmental resources?
- Did the Crown recognise the cultural and spiritual significance of the environmental resources to hapū and iwi?
- To what extent did the Crown involve hapū and iwi in remediation efforts in respect of environmental impacts within their district?

The Contractor will liaise closely with the author of the Porirua ki Manawatū Inland Waterways Cultural Perspectives Report in relation to the issues above.

Environmental Transformation

- A brief description of the biophysical character of the Porirua ki Manawatū Inquiry District
- An outline of the progress of Pākehā settlement through the Porirua ki Manawatū district, changing land uses, timber milling, the development of townships, the expansion of farming and the impact on Porirua ki Manawatū hapū and iwi
- The scope and character of post-1840 regional environmental change and modification, including bush clearance, accelerated erosion and flooding, sand dune ‘stabilisation’ and/or accretion, and exotic forest planting
- The Crown’s role in promoting the pastoral economy, deforestation and extractive industries and the extent to which iwi/hapū perspectives were taken into account in relevant Crown policies and practices
- The Crown’s policies in promoting the felling of indigenous forests and its attempts to conserve forest and how this impacted Porirua ki Manawatū hapū and iwi. To what extent was deforestation was an important economic objective in itself and also a precursor to the establishment of pastoralism?
- An analysis of the nature and extent of environmental change following settlement, notably the impact of bush clearance, drainage of wetlands, the transformation of land into pasture, and erosion on Porirua ki Manawatū hapū and iwi
- Forest use, control of timber extraction, and moves towards forest preservation and conservation, and the extent to which Porirua ki Manawatū hapū and iwi interests and resource use were recognised, accommodated or compensated
- The impactsof environmental changes on Porirua ki Manawatū hapū and iwi, including settlement patterns, customary food gathering and the gathering of rongoā
and other resources, and the preservation of urupā and wāhi tapu and other sites of significance

- Management of steep mountain areas and the conservation of indigenous forests in the district, and the implications for traditional harvesting rights, management and use of materials
- Issues with respect to wetlands in Porirua ki Manawatū, including management, ownership and access
- The Crown’s management of flora and fauna and the consequences of species and habitat loss for Porirua ki Manawatū hapū and iwi
- Issues with respect to whaling (including from Kāpiti Island), including the control and management of whaling and the extent to which iwi/hapū interests and resource use were undermined, recognised, accommodated and/or compensated
- The scope and content of legislation governing the environment and management of natural resources
- The establishment and empowerment of acclimatisation societies, the role of those societies and government agencies in the introduction and management of exotic species (including pests, pest control and noxious plants), the impact of these species on customary resources, and the extent to which hapū and iwi resource use was recognised and accommodated
- Attempts from the 1970s to protect wetlands, forests and tussock lands. What level of consultation, if any, was there with hapū and iwi in the district and what was the impact if any, on Māori landholding?
- Identify and describe the environmental impacts ascribed to the introduction of the road and rail through the Porirua ki Manawatū district
- Examine urban impacts on the environment in the district including the off-shore islands and surrounding moana. These impacts may include, but are not restricted to:
  - Sewage or other contaminants
  - Water supplies
  - Manufacturing
  - Pollution

Resource Management Act
- The impact of Resource Management Act 1991 (and related legislation) on the ability of hapū and iwi in the Porirua ki Manawatū district to participate in local government planning and decision making
- Whether there was any assistance or any limitations on the ability of hapū and iwi to exercise kaitiakitanga in the district
- Were there any hapū and iwi concerns, complaints or issues with the exercise of local government powers under the Resource Management Act? The Contractor will identify and include any case studies relevant to this issue
- The extent to which central and local government have observed and implemented the provisions of the Resource Management Act regarding the Treaty partnership and consultation with hapū and iwi

- The impact of Crown policies on conservation and increased intervention in environmental management from the late twentieth century, and the relationship between Porirua ki Manawatū hapū and iwi and the Department of Conservation

- An overall focus on the recognition by central or local government, if any, of Māori environmental cultural practices

**Wāhi Tapu**

- The extent to which the Crown or its agencies recognised and accommodated Māori environmental practices – kaitiakitanga – in relation to sustainable use of natural environment, the management of mahinga kai, and the protection (or otherwise) of wāhi tapu and other sites of significance, including maunga

- The effectiveness of regimes established to cater for and protect wāhi tapu in the Porirua ki Manawatū inquiry district, including but not restricted to the following legislative provisions:
  - The Māori Councils Act 1900 (and the 1903 amendment)
  - The Māori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1975

**Mana Wāhine and Impacts on Cultural Practices**

- What was the impact of environmental transformation and management practices on karanga, birthing, and weaving practices of wāhine Māori within the Porirua ki Manawatū district?
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General Files

Old Land Claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACFC 16153 OLC1/5</th>
<th>OLC 130</th>
<th>Case files [Daniel Cooper, James Holt and William Barnard Rhodes, Ōtaki and Waikanae]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

New Munster Colonial Secretary 1846-52

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACFP 8217 NM8/7</th>
<th>1846/5</th>
<th>From: W B Rhodes, Wellington Date: 13 January 1846 Subject: Respecting Land Claims at Kāpiti and Waikanae</th>
<th>1846</th>
<th>1846</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/11</td>
<td>1846/433</td>
<td>From: Edward Stanley, Captain H.M.S &quot;Calliope&quot; Date: 18 August 1846 Subject: Reporting the arrival of the Government Brig &quot;Victoria&quot; at the anchorage off &quot;Mana&quot; and the Calliope's sailing to Waikanae to remove the rebel prisoners</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/11</td>
<td>1846/434</td>
<td>From: Edward Stanley, Captain H.M.S &quot;Calliope&quot; Date: 18 August 1846 Subject: Giving an account of his return to Waikanae - a skirmish between the Rebel and Friendly Natives, with [?] on their part, aided by a party from H.M.S &quot;Calliope&quot;, for a general attack [Friendly Natives Killed - Eramera Te Uku, Mohi, Koraro, Nihirhi]</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/11</td>
<td>1846/439</td>
<td>From: A Chetham Strode, Deputy Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 29 August 1846 Subject: Reporting an account of the march from the Camp, &quot;Boulcott's Farm&quot; to Pa Pauatahanui</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/14</td>
<td>1846/462A</td>
<td>From: A Christian Strode, Deputy Inspector of Police, Porirua Date: 16 October 1846 Subject: Giving charge of the Native Boy &quot;Te Korohunga&quot; to the Chief &quot;William King&quot; Waikanae</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/12</td>
<td>1846/472</td>
<td>From: Edward Last, Major 99th Regiment, Porirua Date: 3 September 1846 Subject: Reporting that some of the Rebels had again made their appearance at Waikanae</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Reference</td>
<td>Date Ranged</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/12</td>
<td>1846/487</td>
<td>Edward Last, Major 99th Regiment, Commanding the Troops, and Edward Stanley, Captain and Senior Naval Officer, Porirua</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/12</td>
<td>1846/488</td>
<td>D S Durie, Waikanae</td>
<td>Reporting the arrival at Waikanae agreeably to instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/16</td>
<td>1847/174</td>
<td>His Honor the Superintendent</td>
<td>Waikanae opened as a “Port of Entry” for live stock only, and appointed D S Durie Customs Officer for said port</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/17</td>
<td>1847/260</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Enclosing Mr Devenish’s statement about the detention of his cattle in proceeding to Taranaki; From: William Devenish, Hurui, Waikanae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/17</td>
<td>1847/265</td>
<td>Henry St Hill, Resident Magistrate, Wellington</td>
<td>Enclosing Mr Devenish’s statement about the detention of his cattle in proceeding to Taranaki</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/17</td>
<td>1847/266</td>
<td>D S Durie, Wellington</td>
<td>Arrangement entered into for ground selected at Waikanae for building on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/17</td>
<td>1847/269</td>
<td>His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, Auckland</td>
<td>Police Stations not to be established beyond Waikanae without further instructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/18</td>
<td>1847/270</td>
<td>His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, Auckland</td>
<td>Directing that every facility be given to Capt Stanley RN for speedy communication with Wellington from Waikanae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/18</td>
<td>1847/279</td>
<td>D S Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanai</td>
<td>Relative to Rhode’s claim to Land District of Waikanai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/18</td>
<td>1847/307</td>
<td>Andrew Sinclair, Colonial Secretary, Auckland</td>
<td>Sanctioning the purchase of a piece of land at Waikanae to build upon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/19</td>
<td>1847/374</td>
<td>Chauncy Henry Townsend, Wellington</td>
<td>Application for an appointment as Teacher at Waikanae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/19</td>
<td>1847/386</td>
<td>D S Durie, Resident Magistrate and Inspector of Police, Wellington</td>
<td>Relative to the payment of his salary as Officer of Customs Waikanae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/20</td>
<td>1847/595</td>
<td>Edward John Eye] Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Relative to building the Police Barracks at Waikanae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/20</td>
<td>1847/599</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police Date: 6 September 1847</td>
<td>Estimate of the amount required for payment of persons employed building the Police Barrack Waikanae for the fortnight ending 18th September 1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/21</td>
<td>1847/703</td>
<td>D S Durie, Wellington</td>
<td>Enclosing the conveyance of a piece of land purchased from the Chiefs at Waikanae on account of Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/21</td>
<td>1847/705</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Wellington</td>
<td>Enclosing accounts for labour and timber furnished at Waikanae Police Barracks etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/22</td>
<td>1847/808</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police Date: 20 October 1847</td>
<td>Estimate of amount required for payment of persons employed in erecting buildings at Waikanae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/22</td>
<td>1847/809</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 16 October 1847</td>
<td>Reporting arrival of overland mail from Wanganui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1847/863</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police Date: 2 November 1847</td>
<td>Estimate of amount required for payment of persons employed in erecting buildings at Waikanae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Estimate of amount required for payment of Labor performed at Waikanae</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Resident Magistrate, Wellington</td>
<td>Enclosing correspondence respecting the claim of Captain Rhodes to land at Waikanae and Kāpiti</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Estimate of amount required to pay persons employed on barracks at Waikanae</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Reporting the estimated amount required to complete the barracks at Waikanae</td>
<td>1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Estimate of amount required for payment of parties employed on barracks at Waikanae from 13th to 21st December 1847</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Estimate of the probable amount required to pay labour performed by Armed Police at Waikanae for the fortnight ending 15th January 1848</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Andrew Sinclair, Colonial Secretary, Auckland</td>
<td>Respecting Major Durie’s pay as Customs Officer Waikanae</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Henry St Hill, Resident Magistrate, Wellington</td>
<td>Forwarding William Jenkins application for renewal of license at Hurutu near Waikanae</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Henry Ngawaraki, Waikanae</td>
<td>Respecting damage done to his [potatoes] crops by Captain Rhode’s cattle</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Captain Sotherby, HMS Racehorse</td>
<td>Stating that he has given orders to receive the boat for Waikanae on board the &quot;Racehorse&quot;</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Major Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Relative to the Transfer of Native Property to others at Waikanae</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>P. D. Hogg, Collector of Customs</td>
<td>Payment of Salary to Mr Durie as Collector of Customs at Waikanae</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Colonial Surgeon Dr FitzGerald</td>
<td>Enclosing list of medicines required for Natives at Waikanae</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Reporting Kororo of Rauaraha with Natives of Waikanae</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Licence for the removal of arms etc to be issued to the Waikanae Natives</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>[Edward John Eyre] Lieutenant Governor</td>
<td>Major Durie to enforce provisions of notice in gazette respecting squatters between Waikanae and Wangaehu</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae</td>
<td>Enclosing deposition of Policeman respecting disturbances by Rangihaeta</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>William Wright, Waikanae</td>
<td>Memorial complaint against 'Scott' a policeman being permitted to keep a store at Waikanae</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Referring to William Wright's complaint against a policeman for opening a store at Waikanae</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM 1154/14/2</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Suggesting an alteration as to the time when the Wanganui mail should leave that place</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: D S Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 12 July 1848 Subject: Relative to proceeding against Mr Skipworth under Native Lands Purchase Ordinance

From: D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 18 December 1848 Subject: Applying on behalf of Mr Strode for leave of absence

From: D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 18 December 1848 Subject: Armed Police Force - relative to the removal of men from one station to another etc

From: D [David] S [Stark] Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 21 December 1848 Subject: Enclosing estimate of expense of repairs required for lock-up and police station at Wanganui

From: D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 31 December 1848 Subject: Stating that he has paid into the Treasury the Balance of the "Good Conduct Fund"

From: William Jenkins, Waikanae Date: 10 February 1849 Subject: Requesting a free license and allowance for keeping a ferry

From: Mr Sydney Scrogg, Assistant Surveyor, Wellington Date: 13 February 1849 Subject: Transmitting plans of work done at Waikanae

From: John Nicol, Waikanae Date: 20 February 1849 Subject: Application for renewal of bush license

From: D S Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 11 July 1849 Subject: Application for Bush License in favour of Barnard McCullum

From: William Jenkins, Waikanae Date: 18 July 1849 Subject: Application for renewal of Bush License
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACFP 8217 NM8/37/[67]</th>
<th>1849/860</th>
<th>From: Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 17 August 1849 Subject: Stating that the vacancy in the Force has been filled up</th>
<th>1849</th>
<th>1849</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/37/[99]</td>
<td>1849/917</td>
<td>From: Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 31 August 1849 Subject: Soliciting authority for paying Native Assessors</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/37/[131]</td>
<td>1849/995</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 13 August 1849 Subject: Enclosing copy of letter from Captain King Taranaki and relative to arrival and departure of overland mail</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/38/[6]</td>
<td>1849/1023</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 21 September 1849 Subject: Requesting authority for the payment of eight shillings to four natives</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/38/[19]</td>
<td>1849/1044</td>
<td>From: Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 28 September 1849 Subject: Relative to overland mail</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[44]</td>
<td>1849/1171</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 19 November 1849 Subject: Application from Paora te Awa Mate for mitigation of fine [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/48/[91]</td>
<td>1849/1300</td>
<td>From: D. Durie, Resident Magistrate Date: 21 December 1849 Subject: Relating to the ferry at Waikanae [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[7]</td>
<td>1850/14</td>
<td>From: Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 4 January 1850 Subject: Forwarding Abstract of all cases disposed of in his court for half year ending 31 December 1849</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[44]</td>
<td>1850/92</td>
<td>From: Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 26 January 1850 Subject: Relating to the case of Puoha v Te Ahuru</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[68]</td>
<td>1850/133</td>
<td>From: Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 15 February 1850 Subject: Requesting authority for incurring an expense of £2.10 in clearing away landslips</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[92]</td>
<td>1850/164</td>
<td>From: The Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 5 March 1850 Subject: Relative to the Office Furniture lately in the possession of Captain Russell</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[93]</td>
<td>1850/165</td>
<td>From: The Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 5 March 1850 Subject: Recommending that B McCullums ferry license be transferred to Frederick Nikair [or NeKain]</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[105]</td>
<td>1850/189</td>
<td>From: The Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 11 March 1850 Subject: Enclosing application from Edward Thomas Fox for free Bush License at Wangahu</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[111]</td>
<td>1850/205</td>
<td>From: Samuel Bell, Waikanae Date: 16 March 1850 Subject: Soliciting Bush License for Mr Jenkins house and upon the same terms</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/39/[127]</td>
<td>1850/233</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae Date: 30 March 1850 Subject: Enclosing estimate for 1850, 1851</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/40/[33]</td>
<td>1850/327</td>
<td>From: The Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 11 May 1850 Subject: Requesting directions for the payment of the salary of Samuel Maddens at Port Victoria</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/40/[34]</td>
<td>1850/328</td>
<td>From: The Inspector of Police, Waikanae Date: 11 May 1850 Subject: Requesting His Excellency's sanction to the appointment of William Corner to the Force</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/40/[92]</td>
<td>1850/453</td>
<td>From: Resident Magistrate (Durie), Waikanae Date: 18 June 1850 Subject: Reporting proceedings of his journey up the coast</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/41/[3]</td>
<td>1850/483</td>
<td>From: Samuel Bell [or Bele?], Waikanae Date: 15 June 1850 Subject: Application for removal of publican's special license [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Number</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/41/[4]</td>
<td>1850/544</td>
<td>From: Major Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 29 June 1850 Subject: Stating balance in his lands in reply to Circular 50/4</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/41/[18]</td>
<td>1850/585</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 13 July 1850 Subject: Return of cases for half year ending 30 June 1850</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/41/[26]</td>
<td>1850/610</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 20 July 1850 Subject: Relative to paying the men with notes of Colonial Bank of Issue</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/41/[38]</td>
<td>1850/641</td>
<td>From: The Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 27 July 1850 Subject: Suggesting that Postmaster procure coverings for overland mails</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/41/[71]</td>
<td>1850/711</td>
<td>From: Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 18 August 1850 Subject: Reporting destruction of Police station at Pahramatta and suggesting removal to Pauhatanui</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/41/[102]</td>
<td>1850/781</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 24 August 1850 Subject: Relative to the removal of the men and suggesting alterations to present system</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/42/[20]</td>
<td>1850/849</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 12 September 1850 Subject: Relative to the dismissal of Selwyn from Police Force [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/42/[87]</td>
<td>1850/973</td>
<td>From: Resident Magistrate, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 18 October 1850 Subject: Enclosing application from William Jenkins for transfer of Bush License</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/43/[41]</td>
<td>1850/1061</td>
<td>From: Resident Magistrate, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 29 November 1850 Subject: Requesting that William Hamilton's license be transferred to John Hervey</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/48/[91]</td>
<td>1851/33</td>
<td>From: D. Durie, The Resident Magistrate, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 8 January 1851 Subject: Requesting authority for monthly payment of 10/- [shillings] to the Chief Abraham for keeping ferry at Waitotara [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/46/[99]</td>
<td>1851/135</td>
<td>From: William Jenkins</td>
<td>Date: 16 May 1851 Subject: Requesting renewal of his [bush] license for house at Waikanae [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/45/[92]</td>
<td>1851/385</td>
<td>From: Governor-in-Chief</td>
<td>Date: 25 March 1851 Subject: Directing certain articles to be sent as a present to the Native Chiefs who assembled at Waikanae</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/46/[88]</td>
<td>1851/596</td>
<td>From: Henry Moreing</td>
<td>Date: 12 May 1851 Subject: Selection of Land at Waimea near Waikanae</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/48/[21]</td>
<td>1851/934</td>
<td>From: H. [Henry] King, Resident Magistrate, Taranaki</td>
<td>Date: 18 July 1851 Subject: Reporting that a body of 400 Natives intended leaving that place for Waikanae</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/48/[23]</td>
<td>1851/936</td>
<td>From: D. S. Durie, Resident Magistrate, Wanganui</td>
<td>Date: 19 July 1851 Subject: Enclosing copy of letter from Resident Magistrate at Taranaki respecting the intended involvement of a large body of Natives from that place to Waikanae</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/32</td>
<td>1848/945</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 28 August 1848 Subject: Soliciting authority for payment of expenses received by the police in taking census</td>
<td>1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/48/[91]</td>
<td>1849/35</td>
<td>From: D. S. Durie, Resident Magistrate, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 13 January 1849 Subject: Relation to the Salary of W. [William] Hamilton Ferryman [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/36/[12]</td>
<td>1849/531</td>
<td>From: D S Durie, Waikanae</td>
<td>Date: 24 May 1849 Subject: Relative to obstruction to Mr Scroggs met with whilst employed in [?] Waikanae [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1849/41</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police</td>
<td>Requesting authority for drawing lamp oil etc for Police Barracks Wellington</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/37/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1849/57</td>
<td>D S Durie, Resident Magistrate</td>
<td>Transmitting returns of cases disposed of at Waikanae and Porirua for year ending 30 June 1849</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/37/115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1849/102</td>
<td>D S Durie, Resident Magistrate</td>
<td>Reporting particulars of case Raupenhai v Tupeka [or Tapeka?] - adjudicated in his court</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/38/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1849/1099</td>
<td>Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>17 October 1849 Subject: Relative to certain letters which had not been received</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/38/50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1849/1283</td>
<td>D S Durie, The Inspector of Police</td>
<td>14 December 1849 Subject: Recommending Thomas Florence to be a private in Armed Police</td>
<td>1849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/38/124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1850/143</td>
<td>Major Durie, Resident Magistrate</td>
<td>20 February 1850 Subject: Enclosing copy of deposition taken before him on outrage committed by Rangihauete? and others</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/39/75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1850/738</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>16 August 1850 Subject: Reporting application of Private Selwyn and recommending Wiremu Kohita to replace him [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/42/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1850/909</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>30 September 1850 Subject: Requesting sanction for payment of £2.10 for hire of a horse</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/42/49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1850/1019</td>
<td>Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>9 November 1850 Subject: Recommending Michael Finucane [or Finnimore?] to be a private in the force vice Duncan discharged</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/43/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1850/1084</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>2 December 1850 Subject: Relative to payment of fines into Treasury</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/43/53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1850/1117</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>10 December 1850 Subject: Requesting sanction to the appointment of John Dunbany and T Burridge vice George Crocker and John Cail, discharged</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/43/69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1850/1192</td>
<td>Na te Wiremu Tuainane, Waikanae</td>
<td>31 December 1850 Subject: Refusing to dispose of land at Waikanae [letter written in Māori with translation]</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/44/31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1851/588</td>
<td>Na Erewini te Tupe</td>
<td>10 May 1851 Subject: Relative to land at Waikanae [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/46/89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1851/598</td>
<td>Thomas Wilson</td>
<td>12 May 1851 Subject: Relating to 100 acres of land at Waikanae [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/46/89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1851/682</td>
<td>A. E. McDonogh, The Sub Inspector of Police, Wellington</td>
<td>26 May 1851 Subject: Suggesting the propriety of his visiting Waikanae</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/46/113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1851/960</td>
<td>D. McLean, Land Commissioner</td>
<td>21 July 1851 Subject: Enclosing a requisition for a sum of £150 to payAbsentee Natives at Wellington, Waikanae etc. for their claims to a Block of 1,500 acres land at Pakitapu [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/48/900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1851/1744</td>
<td>M. Fitzgerald, Waikanae</td>
<td>2 December 1851 Subject: Relative to survey of piece of land [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/52/113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217</td>
<td>1852/93</td>
<td>Henry T. Kemp, Native Secretary</td>
<td>19 January 1852 Subject: Relating to claim of the wife of John Nicol the land near Waikanae</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NM8/52/113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document Code</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/53/[26]</td>
<td>1852/140</td>
<td>From: Na te Pa Tipi, Waikanae</td>
<td>29 January 1852 Subject: Soliciting assistance to make a road at Waikanae</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/54/[96]</td>
<td>1852/473</td>
<td>From: Michael Fitzgerald, Otaki</td>
<td>16 April 1852 Subject: Forwarding plan of land at Waikanae portioned off for the children of John Nicol</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/55/[59]</td>
<td>1852/635</td>
<td>From: John Knocks</td>
<td>15 May 1852 Subject: Application for bush license at Waikanae</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/56/[16]</td>
<td>1852/831</td>
<td>From: Mr MacDonogh, Sub Inspector, Wellington</td>
<td>23 June 1852 Subject: Reporting enquiry made concerning the drowning of William Brown at Waikanae</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFP 8217 NM8/56/[42]</td>
<td>1852/890</td>
<td>From: The Inspector of Police, Wellington</td>
<td>2 July 1852 Subject: Recommending lease of house at Waikanae</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Army (Colonial Defence)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1868</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAYS 8638 AD1/69/fj</td>
<td>CD1868/3230</td>
<td>From: Mr Jenkins, Waikanae</td>
<td>26 September 1868 Subject: Statement as to Māori's burning his house etc on account of his refusing to give up to them his two half caste daughters</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wellington Provincial Government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1868</th>
<th>1868</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIA 16195 WP3/23</td>
<td>68/394</td>
<td>Superintendent - General Inwards Letters and Letters from the Commissioner of Crown Lands and the General Government - Thomas Wilson, Waikanae</td>
<td>1 October 1868 - States that Mr Jenkins reports are false. Details events after Jenkins attempted to build a house in opposition to the wishes of the Māoris</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>1868</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Colonial Secretary 1846-1911**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>1846</th>
<th>1846</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 LA1/52</td>
<td>1846/1573</td>
<td>From: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent Southern Division, Wellington To: Colonial Secretary, Auckland</td>
<td>22 October 1846 Subject: Reporting appointment of F.J. France Signal Man and Keeper of Powder Magazine Enclosed:</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent Southern Division, Wellington To: Colonial Secretary, Auckland</td>
<td>22 October 1846 Subject: Forwarding Accounts and Audit Queries</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent Southern Division, Wellington To: Colonial Secretary, Auckland Date: 1 September 1846 Subject: Account current for incidental expenses to 30 June</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: William Brown, Port Nicholson To: George Grey, Commander in Chief, Wellington</td>
<td>22 October 1846 Subject: Memorial for Publican's Bush Licence at Okiriri</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: Samuel King, Police Magistrate, Petre Date: 22 October 1846 Subject: Suggestions regarding contracting town of Petre - New Zealand Company price against remarks thereon</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: Sub Inspector of Police, Waikanae To: Major Durie, Inspector of Armed Police, Wellington</td>
<td>22 October 1846 Subject: Report proceedings against Rebel Natives</td>
<td>1846</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 LA1/57</td>
<td>1847/631</td>
<td>From: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent of the Southern Division, Wellington To: Colonial Secretary, Auckland Date: 7 April 1847 Subject: Forms of accounts for issue of tools to Road parties Enclosed:</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: D. Scott, Wellington To: Colonial Secretary, Auckland Date: 26 December 1846 Subject: For Lodging Field allowance while acting as Lieutenant to Forces</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent of the Southern Division, Wellington To: Colonial Secretary, Auckland Date: 18 May 1846 Subject: Reporting engagement of Mr. D. Scott as Interpreter</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From: D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police To: Colonial Secretary, Auckland Date: 26 March 1847 Subject: Respecting erection of quarters for him</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1847</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Enclosed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/58</td>
<td>1847/948</td>
<td>W. N. MacCleverty, Lieutenant Colonel, Wellington</td>
<td>Mathew Richmond, Superintendent of Southern Division, Wellington</td>
<td>Recommending the appointment of Mr Snaggs as assistant Surveyor</td>
<td>- 1847/949 From: Mr Fitzgerald, Wellington To: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent of Southern Division, Wellington Date: 15 May 1847 Subject: Recommending the appointment of Mr Snaggs as assistant Surveyor Enclosed: - 1847/950 From: D. S. Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae To: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent of Southern Division, Wellington Date: 15 May 1847 Subject: Letter from Mr Devenich reporting Natives preventing him from driving cattle to Taranaki - respecting forming Police stations beyond Waikanae - 1847/951 From: Joseph Percy and Son, Wellington To: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent of Southern Division, Wellington Date: 15 May 1847 Subject: Petition for extension of time and for further sum beyond that specified in contract for constructing Hutt Bridge - 1847/952 From: T. H. Fitzgerald, Wellington To: Mathew Richmond, Superintendent of Southern Division, Wellington Date: 15 May 1847 Subject: For relief of surcharge of £3.5. for printing forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/61</td>
<td>1847/1698</td>
<td>D S Durie, Inspector of Police, Waikanae</td>
<td>Mathew Richmond, Superintendent, Wellington</td>
<td>Respecting canoes building by Chief William King to proceed to Taranaki</td>
<td>- 1847/1700 From: William Fox, New Zealand Company Agent, Nelson To: Governor Date: 13 September 1847 Subject: Respecting road to Wairau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/243[18]</td>
<td>1863/2380</td>
<td>I E Featherston</td>
<td>Colonial Secretary, Auckland</td>
<td>Copy of &quot;Spectator&quot; containing an account of his meeting with natives at Waikanae and Ōtuki [This document is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/349[27]</td>
<td>1872/2720</td>
<td>George Ferguson Bowen</td>
<td>Colonial Secretary, Wellington</td>
<td>Cancelling notice in Gazette relative to purchase of land from Natives - Between Patea &amp; Waikanae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/349[89]</td>
<td>1872/3154</td>
<td>William Fitzherbert</td>
<td>Colonial Secretary, Wellington</td>
<td>Relative to advances on account of Land Purchases between Waikanae and [Left Bank] Manawatū</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/364[88]</td>
<td>1874/2251</td>
<td>I E Campbell, Clerk, House of Representatives</td>
<td>Colonial Secretary, Wellington</td>
<td>That Reports of Public Petitions Committee on the Petition of Mrs E Ford, Hans Tapsell, Pirini Toma and Waikanae residents be referred to the Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/525[186]</td>
<td>1886/858</td>
<td>Alexander J Rutherfurd, Hon Secretary Wellington and Wairarapa Acclimatisation Society</td>
<td>Wairarapa Society's District</td>
<td>Requesting that J G Duncan of Waikanae be authorised to shoot hares on his farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/787[58]</td>
<td>1900/642</td>
<td>Secretary to School Committee</td>
<td>Waikanae</td>
<td>Claiming £5 for damage done to school grounds, when school room was used as a polling booth, at late general election (Ōtaki Electorate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/796[46]</td>
<td>1900/1767</td>
<td>Ossian P Lynch</td>
<td>Paikakariki</td>
<td>As to complaint of natives of Waikanae and Paraparaumu with regard to disgraceful ravaging of certain graves by persons unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/1026[38]</td>
<td>1908/279</td>
<td>A F Lowe, Secretary Wellington Acclimatisation Society</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Requesting that J G Duncan of Waikanae be authorised to shoot hares on his farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGO 8333 IA1/1100[42]</td>
<td>1910/598</td>
<td>James Alexander Muir</td>
<td>Secretary Waikanae Track Racing Club, Weraroa Manawatū</td>
<td>For license to conduct horse races</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: S Duncan, Waikanae  Date: 27 May 1910  Subject: For permit to exhume the remains of Charles Sharpe Duncan for purpose of deepening the grave Porirua Cemetery
From: W H Field, MP, Wellington  Date: 5 October 1910  Subject: For permit to raffle for Waikanae School
From: James A Muir, Secretary, Waikanae Hack Racing Club, Te Horo  Date: 3 July 1911  Subject: For license under Race Meetings Act to conduct races on 1 January 1912
From: T H Parata, Secretary, Waikanae Hack Racing Club, Waikanae  Date: 20 September 1912  Subject: For permit to conduct horse-races on 1st January 1913

From: James Booth, Wanganui  Date: 20 January 1882  Subject: Regarding the proposed purchase of land at Waikanae for Ferry purposes: Has interviewed the Natives and is afraid they will not sell
From: James Booth, Wanganui  Date: 2 February 1882  Subject: Forwards letter from Natives declining to sell the land required for site for Ferryman's residence at Waikanae
From: Wi Parata Kakakura, Waikanae  Date: 18 January 1897  Subject: Is willing to sell land owned by himself and brother selected as site for police station at Porirua
From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: 16 December 1880  Subject: Forwarding Resolution of Council asking that the site purchased for Ferryman's House at Waikanae may be handed over to Council
From: J Knocks, Ōtaki  Date: 10 January 1881  Subject: Will give his services in obtaining Title to Ferry site at Waikanae at present used as a Police Station
From: J A Knocks, Ōtaki  Date: 17 January 1881  Subject: Further as to obtaining Title from Natives to Ferry site at Waikanae at present used as a Police Station
From: R Parris, New Plymouth  Date: 28 January 1881  Subject: Will endeavour as directed to obtain Title to piece of land at Waikanae from Native Chief Wiremu Kingi te Rangitake
From: Clerk Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: 28 February 1881  Subject: For reply to letter of 16th December 1880 regarding Waikanae Ferry Reserve and asking for information about it
From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: 31 May 1881  Subject: Further as to the Waikanae Ferry Reserve
From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: 11 November 1881  Subject: Urging Government to purchase site for Ferryman's residence at Waikanae
From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Hutt  Date: 24 April 1879  Subject: Regarding the Waikanae Ferry Reserve and asking for information about it

### Māori Land Purchase Department 1879-1900

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1880/53 09</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: 16 December 1880  Subject: Forwarding Resolution of Council asking that the site purchased for Ferryman's House at Waikanae may be handed over to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1881/15 2</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From: J Knocks, Ōtaki  Date: 10 January 1881  Subject: Will give his services in obtaining Title to Ferry site at Waikanae at present used as a Police Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1881/24 9</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From: J A Knocks, Ōtaki  Date: 17 January 1881  Subject: Further as to obtaining Title from Natives to Ferry site at Waikanae at present used as a Police Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1881/41 0</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From: R Parris, New Plymouth  Date: 28 January 1881  Subject: Will endeavour as directed to obtain Title to piece of land at Waikanae from Native Chief Wiremu Kingi te Rangitake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1881/75 9</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From: Clerk Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: 28 February 1881  Subject: For reply to letter of 16th December 1880 regarding Waikanae Ferry - matter urgent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1881/10 39</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From: R Parris, New Plymouth  Date: 15 March 1881  Subject: Forwarding Declaration signed by Natives relative to the sale of land at Waikanae as instructed [Written in Māori with translation]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1881/11 85</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: 31 March 1881  Subject: Acknowledging Mr Parris' letter regarding Waikanae Ferry Reserve and asking that the Reserve be surveyed and handed over to Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1881/21 10</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: [31 May 1881]  Subject: Further as to the Waikanae Ferry Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai CS1881/51 14</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Wellington  Date: 11 November 1881  Subject: Urging Government to purchase site for Ferryman's residence at Waikanae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/10/ai NO1879/1 600</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>From: Chairman, Hutt County Council, Hutt  Date: 24 April 1879  Subject: Regarding the Waikanae Ferry Reserve and asking for information about it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Major [Charles] Heaphy, Wellington  
Date: 16 April 1881  
Subject: Regarding the Waikanae Ferry Reserve - Treasury and Audit can find no receipt for the £10 payment alluded to by Major Durie, but the Bishop of Wellington recollects the circumstances and states that it was a bona-fide purchase - described boundaries, etc.

### District Survey Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/66</td>
<td>Ngārara Block</td>
<td>1887-1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/71</td>
<td>Kāpiti and Kaitawa Survey District - Ngārara Block West A No. 1, 2 and 3 [Waikanae]</td>
<td>1887-1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/149</td>
<td>Akatarawa - Waikanae</td>
<td>1897-1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/234</td>
<td>Paraparaumu Beach Road, Paraparaumu-Waikanae Road, Ngārara West B Block</td>
<td>1893-1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/291</td>
<td>Waikanae beach road, Ngārara West Block</td>
<td>1895-1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/490</td>
<td>Chain Reserve on Beach, Waikanae Stream: Township of Raumati - Blocks I, II - Proposed roads; Wainui District, Section 4</td>
<td>1907-1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/492</td>
<td>Waikanae township</td>
<td>1907-1907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Māori Affairs Head Office - pre-1930 correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/834</td>
<td>1863/163</td>
<td>Memoranda from Te Hokio, Ngaruawahia, forwarded to Defence Office 26 April 1863 [Printed in Māori and translation] Reports meeting at Waikanae of the Waikatos and southern tribes, conversation between the Governor and Neri te Ahu, 6 February 1863, relative to Waikato issues, and a conversation between the Governor and Te Paea, 7 February 1863. Narrates developments at Kōhekohe and meetings at Rangiriri and the suggestion that Gorst should be sent back to la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/851</td>
<td>1892/1190</td>
<td>Received: 12th July 1892 - From: E Te M Kapa, MHR [Member of the House of Representatives], Wellington - Subject: Wishes to know the names in the certificate for Waikanae Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/861</td>
<td>1892/1873</td>
<td>Received: 18th October 1892. - From: Henry Walton, Waikanae. - Subject: Suggests that Māoris should not be allowed to change their names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/874</td>
<td>1906/232</td>
<td>Received: 28th June 1906. - From: Raniera Erirhana, Waikanae. - Subject: Sub Division 8 and 15 of Sec. 8 Block XL, Belmont. For removal of restrictions. Lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/908</td>
<td>1906/1424</td>
<td>Received: December 1906. - From: Stafford. Treadwell and Field, Wellington. - Subject: Paekakariki 1B. Re removal of restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/910</td>
<td>1907/70</td>
<td>Received: 11th February 1907. - From: Ngaiona Rahera and another, Waikanae. - Subject: Maungaraki No. 7 (119 acres). Wish restrictions removed to enable them to sell.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/945</td>
<td>1908/195</td>
<td>Received: 25th April 1908. - From: Karauria Paaka per Heskelt and Richmond, Auckland. - Subject: Waikanae No. [Number] 3. For removal of restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/947</td>
<td>1908/272</td>
<td>Received: 8th June 1908. - From: Aotea Māori Land Board. - Subject: Whareroa No. [Number] 4. Sale Wikitoria te Kamaru and others to Archibald Mackay. Board’s recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/954</td>
<td>1908/457</td>
<td>Received: 26th August 1908. - From: Education Department. - Subject: School Site at Waikanae. Draft clause for Native Land Bill to enable change from present site to Sections 18 and 19 Block IV. Township of Parata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/954</td>
<td>1908/460</td>
<td>Received: 27th August 1908. - From: Whakatane Co-operative Dairy Co (ltd), Taneatua. - Subject: Lot 30E No. [Number] 1. Rangitai. Site for Creamery near whakatāne. Application by Raumati Eru and another for removal of restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/964</td>
<td>1908/683</td>
<td>Received: 26th August 1908. - From: Chief Engineer Roads Department. - Subject: Onepoto Block X Paekakariki S.D. [Survey District] Claim for compensation referred for inquiry to Native Land Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/967</td>
<td>1909/50</td>
<td>Received: - From: Native land Commission. - Subject: Whareroa No. [Number] 2 part. Recommendations as to dealings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1015</td>
<td>1910/4193</td>
<td>Received: 8th March 1910. - From: NZ Loan and Mercantile Agency. Co Ld., Wellington. - Subject: Sale yard Site Waikanae. Part Section 78. As to completion of purchase from Hira Parata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1032</td>
<td>1910/4758</td>
<td>Received: 9th September 1910. - From: Raumati, Whenuakura. - Subject: Te Putahi No. [Number] 218, Okotuku Block. Wants Native Land Court to investigate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1043</td>
<td>1910/5134</td>
<td>Received: 29th December 1892. - From: Frank H. Phillips, Paraparaumu. - Subject: Census. Wishes to be appointed enumerator districts between Wellington and Whanganui.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1095</td>
<td>1913/306</td>
<td>Received: 4th February 1913. - From: Honourable Native Minister. - Subject: Whareroa No. [Number] 2. Hori Ngarae of Katika ti states block divided by railway line asks that partitions when made be on valuation basis. Certain persons are endeavouring to establish rights to most valuable portion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1295</td>
<td>1922/285</td>
<td>Received: 26th August 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Lots 2 and 3, Block V, Parata Native Township. Sale to Walter George Hart, Waikanae. For consent under section 23 of the Native Townships Act, 1910.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1325</td>
<td>1923/365</td>
<td>Received: 13th July 1923. - From: H.H. Greenway, Waikanae. - Subject: As to extinguishment of Rights of Way. Ngārara west A 16, 17, 24A and 75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1350</td>
<td>1927/460</td>
<td>Received: 17th November 1927 - From: Tee Ropata, Waikanae - Subject: Ngārara West A Section 32C - Application for a loan of £280 to enable him to build a house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1506</td>
<td>1930/14</td>
<td>Received: 10th January 1930. - From: Tui MacDonald, mp[Member of Parliament], Wellington. - Subject: As to supplying marquees for tangi for Mrs. T. Parata at Waikanae on 12th January 1930.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1563</td>
<td>1931/269</td>
<td>Received: 3rd July 1931. - From: W.H. Field, Member of Parliament, Wellington. - Subject: As to erosion of Waikanae River threatening Native lands and habitations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wildlife Service**

| AAAC W3179/42 | 06/50 | Wetland Survey - Wellington (Land District) - Lake Huritini (Waikanae) | 1974 | 1974 |
### Ministry of Works - Water and Soil Conservation

[Several Pākehā Land Claims in this series not recorded but may be of general relevance]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AATE</th>
<th>96/7/0/12</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Soil Conservation/River Control - Wellington Regional Water Board - Easements over Land Taken for Waikanae Water Supply</th>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>96/7/0/12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Soil Conservation/River Control - Wellington Regional Water Board - Easements over Land Taken for Waikanae Water Supply</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>96/3/15</td>
<td>00/0</td>
<td>Soil Conservation/River Control - Manawatū Catchment Board - Waikanae River</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>96/3/15</td>
<td>00/0/0</td>
<td>Soil Conservation/River Control - Manawatū Catchment Board - Waikanae River (Legalisation)</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>96/3/15</td>
<td>00/0/0/3</td>
<td>Soil Conservation/River Control - Manawatū Catchment Board - Waikanae River - Claim: Māori Owners</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>96/3/15</td>
<td>00/0/0/4</td>
<td>Soil Conservation/River Control - Manawatū Catchment Board - Waikanae River - Claim: Rameka Watene Estate</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>96/3/15</td>
<td>00/0/0/7</td>
<td>Soil Conservation/River Control - Manawatū Catchment Board - Waikanae River - Claim: Honai Tamati and others</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>96/3/15</td>
<td>00/0/0/13</td>
<td>Soil Conservation/River Control - Manawatū Catchment Board - Waikanae River - Claim: Māori Owners Palmerston North</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>32/0/6/289</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land for Māori Housing - Waikanae: Claim - Estate of D E Fouhy</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AATE</td>
<td>32/0/6/378</td>
<td></td>
<td>Land for Māori Housing - Waikanae: Claim - Horowhenua County Council</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lands and Survey Department

| AANS 6095 | 6/13/6/3 | 1 | Scenic Reserves - Coastline Reserves - Waikanae River Mouth Area - Wellington Land District                    | 1972 | 1979 |
Local Purpose Reserves - Wellington Land District - Coastline Reserves: Waikanae River Mouth Area

Māori Affairs - Wellington: Housing - Ōtaki and Waikanae

Māori Affairs Head Office

West Coast Commission - Awards to Absentee Owners, Special File No. 116 - Correspondence re. Taranaki land especially claims of Wi Tamihana Te Neke of Waikanae

Register of chiefs and assessments of their character and behaviour, under various districts [Districts named in register: Mangonui, Hokianga, Waimate, Russell, Kaipara, Coromandel, Waiuku, Lower Waikato, Central Waikato, Raglan, Tauranga, Waipukuru, Taranaki, Whanganui, Upper Whanganui, Waikanae, Wairarapa, Nelson]

Community Development - Kokiri Units - Whakarongotai Kokiri Centre, Waikanae

Paraparaumu Scenic Reserve - Additions to Muaūpoko A No.2, Section 2

Whareroa 2E No.8 - Māori Reservation

N.Z. Forest Service

State Forest Waikanae

Section 18 Ngārara West C. Waikanae

Reikiorangi Waikanae

Māori Trustee

Settlement Reserves From: Wi Ngapaki and others, Whenuakura Date: 5 December 1893 Subject: Asking to return their petition about "Waikanae"

Lands and Survey Wellington District

[Department Of Lands And Survey] - Reserves - Scenic - Waikanae Horowhenua CTY (County) - [Wellington Land District] - [Previous File Number Res 7/3/205]

[Department Of Lands And Survey] - Reserves - Recreation - Waikanae Rec. [Recreation] - [Wellington - Previous File Number Res 7/2/178]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AANS Code</th>
<th>RSC Code</th>
<th>File Number</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Reserve Type</th>
<th>Date Rang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>W5883/51</td>
<td>8/5/31</td>
<td>Reserves General - Waikanae Plantation Reserve</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>W5883/83</td>
<td>13/316</td>
<td>Scenic Reserves - Waikanae Scenic Reserve</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ngārara Block Files**

**Ngārara Commission**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACIH Code</th>
<th>Date Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16077 MA70/2/4</td>
<td>89/2033</td>
<td>Evidence of the Commission relative to Ngārara - Nos. 1-35 - 15 November - 6 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16077 MA70/2/3</td>
<td>89/2033</td>
<td>Evidence and report of the Native Affairs Committee of the Legislative Council, relative to Ngārara - 17-24 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16077 MA70/1/1</td>
<td>89/2033</td>
<td>Evidence of the Commission relative to Ngārara - 1888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Māori Affairs Head Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACIH Code</th>
<th>Date Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16047 MA14/8/8934</td>
<td>no date</td>
<td>Register of owners for the Ngārara Block [1 item separated from file as SEP No. 934]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16047 MA14/14/934</td>
<td>no date</td>
<td>Register of owners for the Ngārara Block - Sketch map: Ngārara Block April 1890 [SEP No. 934]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Māori Land Purchase Department**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AECZ Code</th>
<th>Date Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1881/148</td>
<td>From: Registrar, Native Land Court, Auckland Date: 26 March 1881 Subject: Interlocutory order was made for Ngārara block at Foxton in 1872 [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Additional Archives Description field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1881/293</td>
<td>From: Chief Surveyor, Wellington</td>
<td>Memorandum regarding cost of survey of Ngārara Block: Forwards tracing</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1881/304</td>
<td>From: Registrar, Native Land Court, Auckland</td>
<td>Copies of Orders regarding Ngārara Block</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1890/295</td>
<td>From: Hon Native Minister, Wellington</td>
<td>3 September 1890 Subject: Negotiations to be opened up at once for purchase of portion of Ngārara block</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1891/189</td>
<td>From: Edward William Earp, Wellington</td>
<td>9 July 1891 Subject: Submitting proposals for dealing with a portion of Ngārara block by private purchaser</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1891/190</td>
<td>From: W J Butler, Wanganui</td>
<td>13 July 1891 Subject: Report on Ngārara block</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1891/231</td>
<td>From: Hon Native Minister, Wellington</td>
<td>7 August 1891 Subject: Authorizing purchase of 5000 acres in Ngārara at 20s.0d per acre</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1891/313</td>
<td>From: Hugh Gully, Crown Solicitor, Wellington</td>
<td>26 September 1891 Subject: Forwards transfer of section 26 &quot;Ngārara West C&quot; block with assent of Mr Justice Richmond endorsed thereon</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1892/35</td>
<td>From: Timoti Te Urutauwhare and others, Tikorangi</td>
<td>12 March 1892 Subject: Wish to sell their land in Te Ngārara block [Written in Māori with translation]</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1893/34</td>
<td>From: T R Ellison, Wellington</td>
<td>6 March 1893 Subject: Applying for a balance alleged to be due to Pakana [Pahana?] Tuterangi on Section 35 Ngārara West C block</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/37/ar</td>
<td>1895/188</td>
<td>From: Takinga, Parewainui Lower Rangitiki</td>
<td>22 April 1895 Subject: Offering to sell certain shares in Ngārara West B Block to the Government [Written in Māori with translation]</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justice Department - pre-1930 correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Additional Archives Description field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/636/s</td>
<td>1896/1132</td>
<td>From: Moorhouse and Hadfield, Wellington</td>
<td>22 August 1896 Subject: That parts sections 41 and 78, Ngārara Block be excepted from operation of section 117, Native Land Court Act</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/636/s</td>
<td>1897/102</td>
<td>From: Governor, Wellington</td>
<td>14 January 1897 Subject: Excepting part of section 78 and part of section 41 of Ngārara West C Block from operation of Section 117 Native Land Court Act</td>
<td>This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Page Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/617/ac</td>
<td>1899/581</td>
<td>Governor, Wellington</td>
<td>Excepting part of Ngārara West C Block from operation of section 117 [Application of Wī Parata enclosed]</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/632/k</td>
<td>1899/1577</td>
<td>Moorhouse &amp; Hadfield, Wellington</td>
<td>Application for exception of interest of Reupena Takarua in Ngārara West B from operation of section 117 of the Native Land Court Act 1894</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/636/s</td>
<td>1900/267</td>
<td>Hemi Matenga, Wellington</td>
<td>For an Order in Council excepting part of sections 78 and 41, Ngārara West C Block, to enable leases to be given</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/657/g</td>
<td>1901/151</td>
<td>W H Quick, Wellington</td>
<td>For exemption of Lot 1, Township of Parata, part subdivision 41, Ngārara West C, from operation of section 117 of the Native Land Court Act 1894 [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/657/g</td>
<td>1901/258</td>
<td>Governor, Wellington</td>
<td>Excepting part etc [of the land known as Section] 41 Ngārara West C from operation of Section 117 [Native Land Court Act 1894]</td>
<td>1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/593/a</td>
<td>NO1891/870</td>
<td>Kipa Whiro, Te Hora (Havelock)</td>
<td>Acknowledging receipt of letter regarding land for Hapū (which was if possible to includeTitirangi and Okoha). Asks for an Island named Motu Ngārara. Is now “Marama” [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/657/g</td>
<td>1899/999</td>
<td>W H Quick, Wellington</td>
<td>For exemption of Lot 1, Township of Parata, part subdivision 41, Ngārara West C, from operation of section 117 of the Native Land Court Act 1894, to permit of transfer to Wellington Diocesan Board of Trustees [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/688/y</td>
<td>1902/1597</td>
<td>Moorhouse and Hadfield, Wellington</td>
<td>Application of Wī Parata Kakakura for Order in Council for exception of Section 23, Ngārara West C from operation on Section 117 of Native Land Court Act 1894, 666 acres</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/696/af</td>
<td>1903/792</td>
<td>Stafford, Treadwell and Field, [Barristers and Solicitors], Wellington</td>
<td>Application of Matai Kahawai for consent to sale of his interest in Ngārara West A No. 53</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/713/zw</td>
<td>1904/694</td>
<td>Moorhouse and Hadfield, Wellington</td>
<td>Application of Te Reimana Poherama Tauhei for Order in Council excepting from operation of Section 117 Native Land Court Act 1894, Section 4 Ngārara block, West B No.1</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/733/ba</td>
<td>1905/815</td>
<td>Young and Tripe, Wellington</td>
<td>Recommendation of Aotea Māori Land Council that Ngārara West A Section 23 be excepted from operation of Section 117 Native Land Court Act, 1894, sale to E J Hill [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below]</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACGS 16211 J1/733/ba</td>
<td>1905/880</td>
<td>Governor Subject</td>
<td>Consenting to alienation of Ngārara West A Subdivision no. 23</td>
<td>1905</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Māori Land Administration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADYU 18191 MA-MLA1/2</td>
<td>1903/151</td>
<td>Matai Kahawai, per W H Field, Wellington</td>
<td>Application for a Judges certificate in lieu of a papakainga certificate regarding proposed sale of undivided fourth of portion of Section 47 Ngārara West A and</td>
<td>1903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 12 Ngārara West C

From: Matai Kahawai per W H Field, Wellington  
Date: 7 August 1903  
Subject: Application for a judges certificate in lieu of a papakainga certificate regarding proposed sale of undivided fourth share of section 53 Ngārara West A Block

Māori Affairs Head Office - pre-1930 correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACIH 16036 MAI/244</th>
<th>12/967</th>
<th>Ngārara West A49 No. 1 Māori Trustee Appointed Agent</th>
<th>1951 1955</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/430</td>
<td>21/3/5</td>
<td>Ngārara West A Section 78A - That land be set aside as a Māori Reservation under Section 298/31</td>
<td>1932 1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/449</td>
<td>21/3/319</td>
<td>Ngārara West A3C2 - Set aside as Māori Reservation</td>
<td>1956 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/762</td>
<td>54/19/29</td>
<td>Māori Trustee - Ngārara West A3C and A32C2 - Land taken for Public Works</td>
<td>1965 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/765</td>
<td>54/22/5</td>
<td>Māori Trustee - Ngārara West A3C Subdivisions and other blocks - Vested under Section 109</td>
<td>1964 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/868</td>
<td>1906/14</td>
<td>Received: 1st June 1906 - From: Field, Luckie and Toogood, Wellington - Subject: For consent of sale of pt. Sc [Section] 12 Ngārara West C Block</td>
<td>1906 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/869</td>
<td>1906/98</td>
<td>Received: 11th June 1906 - From: Judge Palmer, H.L. Court - Subject: Advising portion of Ngārara west A Secs [Sections] 14 and 76 cut off to satisfy survey liens in favour of Messrs Mason and Richmond.</td>
<td>1906 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/899</td>
<td>1906/1142</td>
<td>Received: 26th October 1906. - From: W.H. Field, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West A pt Sec 50 (18 acres about). For consent to lease. (Aotea).</td>
<td>1906 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/903</td>
<td>1906/1253</td>
<td>Received: 10th November 1906. - From: W.H. Field, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara west A sec 50 (part) 18 acres. For consent to sale by Matai Kahawai to W.H. Field.</td>
<td>1906 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/930</td>
<td>1907/596</td>
<td>Received: 16th October 1907. - From: Aotea Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West A, Section 53 A, Sale Matai Kahawai to W.H. Field. Board’s recommendation. (Field, Luckie and Toogood).</td>
<td>1907 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/930</td>
<td>1907/598</td>
<td>Received: 16th October 1907. - From: Aotea Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West A.H. Section 24B. Sale Tamihana te Karu to W.H. Field. Board’s recommendation. (Field, Luckie and Toogood).</td>
<td>1907 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/943</td>
<td>1908/149</td>
<td>Received: 3rd April 1908. - From: Aotea Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West A Section 76B. Sale Mapuna te Tuhi and others to W.H. Field. Board’s recommendation. (Field, Luckie and Toogood).</td>
<td>1907 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/945</td>
<td>1908/196</td>
<td>Received: 29th April 1908. - From: Aotea Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West C Section 40. Removal of restrictions recommended to enable sale to J.W. Howell. (Field, Luckie and Toogood).</td>
<td>1907 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/963</td>
<td>1908/675</td>
<td>Received: 24th November 1908. - From: Aotea Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara west B No. [Number] 1 sub 3. Sale Wiremu Takarua to W.J. Howell. Board’s recommendation. (Field, Luckie and Toogood).</td>
<td>1907 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/965</td>
<td>1908/720</td>
<td>Received: 22nd December 1908. - From: Aotea Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West B no. [Number] 7 (part). Mortgage Kaierau Takurua to Robert G McLean. (Stafford and Treadwell).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1038</td>
<td>1910/4962</td>
<td>Received: 27th October 1910. - From: Ikaaroa Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West A Sections 25 and 46B and Ngakoro 3D No. [Number] 1 Sub 3B. Mortgage Wakahau te Kotua to W.H Field. Board recommends consent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1053</td>
<td>1911/315</td>
<td>Received: 8th June 1911. - From: President Ikaaroa Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West A Section 78, part. Mortgage Hira Parata to W.H Field and Martin Luckie. Board recommends consent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1059</td>
<td>1911/616</td>
<td>Received: 3rd October 1911. - From: House of Representatives. - Subject: Petitions 67/11 and 68/11 Pipiwai Ngārara and others. For alteration in locality of Site for Church in Taumataoteo Block. Referred to Government for immediate inquiry. [Includes: 1911/30, 1911/466, 1911/467.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1069</td>
<td>1912/422</td>
<td>Received: 9th February 1912. - From: Ikaaroa Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West B Nos. [Numbers] 2 and 3. Proposed Mortgage by Te wharemaru Ihakara to W.J. Howell. Board has no recommendations to make.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1072</td>
<td>1912/1139</td>
<td>Received: 15th April 1912. - From: Ikaaroa Māori Land Board. - Subject: Ngārara West B Section 7 Subs 1. Mortgage Kaierau Takuma to Oswald Beere. Board recommends consent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1109</td>
<td>1913/3544</td>
<td>Received: 30th August 1913. - From: Native Affairs Committee, House of Representatives. - Subject: Petition No. [Number] 256/13 Utauta Wi Parata. For rehearing re succession to Wi Parata Waipunaha in Ngārara West A and other Blocks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1120</td>
<td>1914/917</td>
<td>Received: 27th March 1914. - From: President Ikaaroa Board, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West a Section 78 (part). Mortgage Hira Parata to Field and Luckie. Board recommends consent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1150</td>
<td>1916/266</td>
<td>Received: 1st February 1916. - From: Ikaaroa District Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West A Section 78. Mortgage Hira Parata to Thomas Shailer Weston. Board recommends consent under section 230/1909.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1160</td>
<td>1916/4152</td>
<td>Received: 15th November 1916. - From: Registrar Ikaaroa District Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West A Section 25. Mortgage Metapere Ropata to Jonathan Askew. Board recommends consent by Governor in Council under Section 230 of the Native Land Act 1909.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1173</td>
<td>1917/385</td>
<td>Received: 28th September 1917. - From: Ikaaroa District Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West A. Section 77B. Mortgage Pero Ngapaki to Elizabeth Minogue - Board recommends consent under Section 230 of the Native Land Act, 1909.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MAI/1174</td>
<td>1917/416</td>
<td>Received: 9th October 1917. - From: Clerk, Lands committee (House of Representatives), Wellington. - Subject: For report on Petition No. [Number] 441/1917 of W.J. Hunt for compensation for loss sustained in connection with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
agreements to Lease over Ngārara Blocks. [Includes: 1903/57, 1891/267, 1892/15, 1892/197, 1912/513.]

ACIH 16036 MAI/1212 1919/477
Received: 12th September 1919. - From: Clerk, Native Affairs Committee (House of Representatives), Wellington. - Subject: For report on Petition No. [Number] 29/19 of Henry Walton for transfer to him of Ngārara West A Section 28 purchased from te Aupiki Tamihana, deceased.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1224 1920/23
Received: 6th February 1920. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West A Section 79. Mortgage. Rau Winara Parata to A.A. Brown. For consent under Section 230/1909.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1294 1922/259
Received: 11th August 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West A 3 B. Mortgage. Wikitoria Eruini to Harold Hay Olliver. For consent under Section 230/1909.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1325 1923/365
Received: 13th July 1923. - From: H.H. Greenway, Waikanae. - Subject: As to extinguishment of Rights of Way. Ngārara West A 16, 17, 24A and 75.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1400 1926/464
Received: 12th October 1926. - From: Te Ata Ihakara, Lower Hutt. - Subject: Ngārara West B Section 7 No. [Number] 2A. Application for payment of money held by the Board under Section 92/13.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1402 1926/508
Received: 5th November 1926. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West C 41 Part, Lot 4 DP 3433 - Mortgage: Wharerau Winara Parata to Webster and Neale for consent under Section 230/09.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1430 1927/460
Received: 17th November 1927. - From: Tee Ropata, Waikanae. - Subject: Ngārara West A Section 32C - Application for a loan of £280 to enable him to build a house.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1452 1928/345
Received: 25th July 1928. - From: Clerk, Native Affairs Committee, H of R [House of Representatives], Wellington. - Subject: For report on Petition No. 126/28 of Hoani Ihaka for rehearing of application for appointment of successors to Hoani Ngārara, deceased, in Mangapoike A Block.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1469 1929/512
Received: 25th September 1929. - From: Clerk, Native Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Wellington. - Subject: For report on Petition No.[Number] 344/29 of Huaraui Tamihana and another for amendment of a succession order to the interests of Te Wai Ngiao Ngārara alias Ahenata Awhi Ngārara in Taumataaroa 30B 1Block.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1499 1929/512
Received: 25th September 1929. - From: Clerk, Native Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Wellington. - Subject: For report on Petition No.[Number] 344/29 of Huaraui Tamihana and another for amendment of a succession order to the interests of Te Wai Ngiao Ngārara alias Ahenata Awhi Ngārara in Taumataaroa 30B 1Block.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1504 1929/512
Received: 25th September 1929. - From: Clerk, Native Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Wellington. - Subject: For report on Petition No.[Number] 344/29 of Huaraui Tamihana and another for amendment of a succession order to the interests of Te Wai Ngiao Ngārara alias Ahenata Awhi Ngārara in Taumataaroa 30B 1Block.

ACIH 16036 MAI/1516 1930/8
Received: 17th January 1929. - From: Bell, Gully, Mackenzie and O'Leary, Barristers and Solicitors, Wellington. - Subject: Ngārara West A Section 29 - Succession to Amapiria Waiho (deceased) by Karaitiana Makitanara - for Order in Council under Section 7/22. [Includes: C.J. (29/3)]

Māori Trustee pre-1930

AECW 18683 MA-MTI/19 1894/459
From: Tamihana Ngārara, Te Hauke. Napier Date: 16 July 1894 Subject: Stating this certain land, to which his family is legally entitled, has been appropriated by some outsider.

AECW 1900/598
Native Reserves - Regarding monies paid to Matai Kahawai, a minor, for shares in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18683 MA-MTI/79</td>
<td>the sale of Section 56 Ngārara West A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECW 18683 MA-MTI/80</td>
<td>Native Reserves - Regarding monies paid to Mata Kokiri and Tahata Toanui, both minors, for shares in the sale of Ngārara West A Sections 45 and 75</td>
<td>1900 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECW 18683 MA-MTI/81</td>
<td>Native Reserves - Regarding monies paid to Hineara Hare Tutarangi for shares in the sale of Ngārara West</td>
<td>1901 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECW 18683 MA-MTI/82</td>
<td>Native Reserves - Regarding monies paid to Rangihamu Eruera, a minor, for shares in the sale of Ngārara West 6 Section 3</td>
<td>1901 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECW 18683 MA-MTI/92</td>
<td>Native Reserves - Regarding Statement of Account for the interest of Hinekomata Winara in Ngārara West A Block Section 18</td>
<td>1912 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECW 18683 MA-MTI/104</td>
<td>Native Reserves - Regarding monies paid to Ngahora Moananui te Whiti alias Ngahoru Moana, minor, for shares in the sale of Ngārara West A No. 23</td>
<td>1916 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECW 18683 MA-MTI/106</td>
<td>Native Reserves - Regarding the interest of Tata Winara Parata in respect of Ngārara West A Part Section 79</td>
<td>1916 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECW 18683 MA-MTI/106</td>
<td>Native Reserves - Regarding monies paid to Ngahorumoana te Whiti for shares in the sale of Ngārara West A Section 46B</td>
<td>1916 1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District Survey Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/19</td>
<td>For survey of Ngārara west block</td>
<td>1881 1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/66</td>
<td>Ngārara Block</td>
<td>1887 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/71</td>
<td>Kāpiti and Kaitawa Survey District - Ngārara Block West A No. 1, 2 and 3 [Waikanae]</td>
<td>1887 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/73</td>
<td>Pukehou Blocks 5A, 5L, 5K and Waopukatea No. 2; Kaitawa Survey District - Ngakororo Block Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4; Ngawhakangutu No. 1 North Block and No. 1 South Block; Waitohu and Kaitawa Survey District Waopukatea No.1 Block</td>
<td>1887 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/89</td>
<td>Ngārara West B No 1 Subdivision No 3a</td>
<td>1891 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/92</td>
<td>Ngārara Returning and forwarding plans</td>
<td>1888 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/98</td>
<td>Ngārara Block</td>
<td>1888 1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/137</td>
<td>Blocks Ngārara, Muhunoa, Pukehou, Maukuri, and Horowhenua - Warrants to take roads through Native Lands</td>
<td>1891 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/140</td>
<td>5826</td>
<td>Ngārara West A Section: 24 - Native Land Court papers 1891 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/148</td>
<td>6439</td>
<td>Waikanae Hutt Road, Ngārara West Block; Kaitawa Survey District Blocks IX and X; 1891 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/149</td>
<td>6520</td>
<td>Kaitawa Survey District Ngārara West A No. 59 Block; Sections 47, 48, 49,50 1892 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/303</td>
<td>14879</td>
<td>Ngārara Block; Classification of Native Lands, Native Land Laws Amendment Act 1896 Section 32 1896 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/619</td>
<td>20/27</td>
<td>Paraparaumu Scenic Reserve 4277; Ngārara West A Blocks 1911 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/164</td>
<td>7143</td>
<td>[Te] Ngārara West Block B, Hutt County Road 1892 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/168</td>
<td>7429</td>
<td>Ngārara West A and C Block 1892 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/184</td>
<td>8696</td>
<td>1 Ngārara Block 1892 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/184</td>
<td>8696</td>
<td>2 Ngārara West A Block 1900 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/184</td>
<td>8696</td>
<td>3 Ngārara West A Block Kaitawa Survey District 1904 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/184</td>
<td>8696</td>
<td>4 Ngārara West A Kaitawa 1907 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/218</td>
<td>9354</td>
<td>1 Block Ngārara West C [Kaitawa District] Section 23 1893 1893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/219</td>
<td>9421</td>
<td>Ngārara West C Block - Subdivision 41 1893 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/234</td>
<td>10595</td>
<td>Paraparaumu Beach Road, Paraparaumu-Waikanae Road, Ngārara West B Block 1893 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/234</td>
<td>10601</td>
<td>Ngārara West C Block c.1890 c.1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/244</td>
<td>10915</td>
<td>Ngārara West Block 1893 1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/249</td>
<td>11346</td>
<td>Subdivision 43, Ngārara Block [Ngārara West A] 1894 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>NG Block(s)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/261</td>
<td>11923</td>
<td>Ngārara West A and Kukutanaki [Kukutanaki] Blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/275</td>
<td>12637</td>
<td>I Ngārara Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/275</td>
<td>12637</td>
<td>II Ngārara Block - Road through Wi Parata's Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/281</td>
<td>12948</td>
<td>Notice of claim Section 28 Block A Ngārara West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/283</td>
<td>13093</td>
<td>Notice of claim Section 45, Ngārara West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/291</td>
<td>14120</td>
<td>Waikanae beach road, Ngārara West Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/486</td>
<td>24681</td>
<td>Proposed Scenic Reserve: Part of Ngārara West C No. 41 [Waikanae]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/523</td>
<td>25962</td>
<td>Plan of Part Ngārara West A and Muaūpoko A No 1 Block III Kāpiti and Block IX Kaitawa Survey District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/545</td>
<td>26942</td>
<td>Part Sections 13 and 14 Ngārara West C Block 10 Kaitawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/572</td>
<td>28091</td>
<td>Mr. Davis's survey of part Ngārara West 2B Block III Kāpiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/595</td>
<td>29022</td>
<td>Subdivision of Ngārara West A Section 79, Block 5 and 5 Kaitawa Survey District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Commissioner of Crown Lands Wellington**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>NG Block(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABWN 6095 W5021/253</td>
<td>7/825</td>
<td>1 Commissioner of Crown Land, Wellington - Ngārara West A 63 Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABWN 6095 W5021/308</td>
<td>10/95</td>
<td>Elder Mrs Anne Conveyance to Crown for State Forest Purpose Ngārara West C 1B : Sect 1 Block III Akatarawa SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Māori Trustee post-1930**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>NG Block(s)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAMK 869 W3074/68/m</td>
<td>5/9/86</td>
<td>Māori Trust Mortgages - Ngārara West A3 C3 (Section 438)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Land Corporation Limited, Wellington District Office
This series covers the management of Crown land leases and licences within the Wellington Land District area administered under the Lands Act 1924 and 1948. These files contain information on the terms and conditions of tenure, and also considerable detail on the land (etc) subject to that tenure.
Land Corporation Limited, Wellington District Office
Surplus Government Properties all restricted: need permission

|--------------------|--------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAMA W4320/123</th>
<th>017/9 2</th>
<th>Part Ngārara West, B72A (5 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</th>
<th>1884</th>
<th>1987</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/123</td>
<td>017/2 16</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West A80A SO [Survey Office] Plan 27533, CT [Certificate of Title]B2/778 (Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/39</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (2A Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/88</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B72A (1 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/90</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (3 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/91</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (4 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/93</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (7 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/94</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (11 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/95</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (12 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/96</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (13 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/98</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (14 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/98</td>
<td>38/104</td>
<td>Part Ngārara West B 72A (15 Avion Terrace, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/101</td>
<td>38/214</td>
<td>Section 25, Ngārara Settlement, CT [Certificate of Title] 520/50 (Soldiers Road, Paraparaumu)</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/101</td>
<td>38/216</td>
<td>Mazengarb Road, Paraparaumu Part Ngārara West A80A Plan 27533, ST B2/778</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/101</td>
<td>38/220</td>
<td>Ngārara West B, Part 8, Part CT [Certificate of Title] 522/72, Hurley Road, Paraparaumu</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/102</td>
<td>38/226</td>
<td>Part Sections 19 and 20, Ngārara West A Block, Waikanae Beach site Corner Greenaway and Moanan Roads, Waikanae</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA W4320/111</td>
<td>38/719</td>
<td>Lot 70, DP [Deposited Plan] 4282, Part Ngārara West Subdivision 3, Block 3, Kāpiti Survey District, (Paraparaumu Beach Post Office Site, Corner Mclean and Seaview Roads)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Muaūpoko Block Files**

**Māori Land Purchase Department**

| AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/1/bh | 1873/103 | From: Te Watene Tiwaewae, Horowhenua Date: 4 April 1872 Subject: For a reply to previous letter asking for surveyor to be sent accounts - Mr Thompson is there but Muaūpoko are making a fuss about him as he is working privately - If government authorise Mr Thompson it will be all right - Asks for a speedy reply [Correspondence written in Māori] | 1872 | 1873 |
| AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/17/r | 1880/112 | From: Deputy Inspector of Surveys, Wellington Date: 12 February 1880 Subject: Tracing of "Muaūpoko” Block Ōtaki District is applied for to his office - Is there any objection to its being supplied? [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below] | 1880 | 1880 |
| AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/17/r | 1881/184 | From: J W A Marchant, Wellington Date: 20 April 1881 Subject: Proposes to lodge a lieu for £230 against Te Ngārara Block and to readjust liens already registered against Muaūpoko Block [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below] | 1881 | 1881 |
| AECZ 18714 MA-MLP1/17/r | 1881/419 | From: Registrar, Native Land Court, Auckland Date: 1 October 1881 Subject: Forwards testamentary order regarding interest of Eruini te Tupe in Muaūpoko Block [This item is part of a larger record. To order this document please use the record number in the Additional Archives Description field below] | 1881 | 1881 |
| AECZ 18714 MA- | 1884/202 | From: Karaitiana Te Tupe and another, Wellington Date: 21 October 1884 Subject: Allege that there is a balance due on the Muaūpoko purchase | 1884 | 1884 |
### Commissioner of Crown Lands Wellington

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19480 LS-W2/48</td>
<td>1887/1357</td>
<td>From: Under Secretary Crown Lands, Wellington Date: 23 November 1887 Subject: Forwards Division Orders in Muaūpoko Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19480 LS-W2/50</td>
<td>1888/619</td>
<td>From: Under Secretary for Crown Lands, Wellington Date: 6 June 1888 Subject: To issue title to Muaūpoko a block</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### District Survey Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/8</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>Otairi Survey District - Muaūpoko - resurvey requested; plan of Paraparauma [Paraparaumu]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/27</td>
<td>1119</td>
<td>Muaūpoko Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/60</td>
<td>2459</td>
<td>Muaūpoko Block</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/112</td>
<td>4771</td>
<td>Muaūpoko A No 2 Section No 2 Subdivision 1 to 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/283</td>
<td>13091</td>
<td>Notice of claim Muaūpoko A No 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/523</td>
<td>25962</td>
<td>Plan of Part Ngārara West A and Muaūpoko A No 1 Block III Kāpiti and Block IX Kaiwata Survey District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Māori Affairs Head Office - post-1930

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/71</td>
<td>5/5/39</td>
<td>Paraparaumu Scenic Reserve - Additions to Muaūpoko A No.2, Section 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parata Township Files

### Māori Affairs Head Office - pre-1930 correspondence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/423</td>
<td>21/1/55</td>
<td>Parata (Township) Lot 41, DP 1031 - Burial Ground Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/954</td>
<td>1908/457</td>
<td>Received: 26th August 1908. - From: Education Department. - Subject: School Site at Waikanae. Draft clause for Native Land Bill to enable change from present site to Sections 18 and 19 Block IV. Township of Parata.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1282</td>
<td>1922/33</td>
<td>Received: 28th January 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Lots 26 and 27 Block II Parata Native Township. Sale to Mrs. E.R. Brown. For consent under Section 23 of the Native Townships Act 1910.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1282</td>
<td>1922/34</td>
<td>Received: 28th January 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Lot 22 Block IV Parata N.T. Sale to Mrs. E.M.I. Williams. For consent under Section 23 of Native Townships Act 1910.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 1922/35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Received: 28th January 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA1/1282</td>
<td>Board, Wellington. - Subject: Lots 32, 33, 39 and 40 Block III Parata Native Township. Sale to A.G. Williams. For consent under Section 23 of the Native Townships Act, 1910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1282</td>
<td>1922/36 Received: 29th January 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Lots 10 - 13 Block VI Parata Native Township. Sale to C.C. and A.E. Odlin. For consent under Section 23 of Native Townships Act, 1910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1282</td>
<td>1922/37 Received: 1st February 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Lot 4 Block V Parata Native Township. Sale to A. Johnston and A.G. Williams. For consent under Section 23 of the Native Townships Act, 1910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1295</td>
<td>1922/285 Received: 26th August 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Lots 2 and 3, Block V Parata Native Township. Sale to Walter George Hart, Waikanae. For consent under section 23 of the Native Townships Act, 1910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1299</td>
<td>1922/379 Received: 31st October 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa District Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Lot 4 Block V Parata Native Township. Sale to A. Johnston and A.G. Williams. For consent under Section 23 of the Native Townships Act, 1910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1302</td>
<td>1922/438 Received: 17th November 1922. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Parata Native Township Sections 6,7 and 42 (648). Sale to W. Hunter and S. Hunter. For consent under Section 23 of Native Townships Act 1910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1312</td>
<td>1923/145 Received: 13th June 1923. - From: The Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Parata Native Township Block 11 Section 25. Sale to Malcolm Pratt Webster and Thomas Neale. For consent under Section 23 of the Native Township Act, 1910, as amended by Section 12/1923.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1329</td>
<td>1924/52 Received: 3rd March 1924. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Parata Native Township Block IV Section 24. Sale to Horace Wilford Hume Clifton for consent under Section 23 of the Native Townships Act, 1910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1516</td>
<td>1930/5 Received: 8th January 1930. - From: Registrar, Ikaroa Māori Land Board, Wellington. - Subject: Section 34 Block. [Block] 11 Parata Native Township - sale to Horace Freeman - for consent under Section 23 Native Townships Act, 1910.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Māori Affairs Department - Wanganui Office**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABRP 6844 W4598/60</th>
<th>6/2/1 1 Parata Māori Township</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABRP 6844 W4598/59</td>
<td>6/2/1 2 Parata Māori Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRP 6844 W4598/60</td>
<td>6/2/1 3 Parata Māori Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRP 6844 W4598/59</td>
<td>6/2/1 4 Parata Māori Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRP 6844 W4598/60</td>
<td>6/2/1 5 Parata Native Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRP 6844 W4598/59</td>
<td>6/2/1 6 Parata Māori Township</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lands and Survey Wellington District**

|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|

**District Survey Office**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/344</th>
<th>16720</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Parata township [now Waikanae]</th>
<th>1897</th>
<th>1901</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/344</td>
<td>16720</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parata township [now Waikanae]</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADXS 19483 LS-W1/481</td>
<td>24530</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parata Township, Block VI, Section 43 Waikanae, School Site</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Māori Trustee**

| AAVN 869 W3599/239 | 54/16 / 11 | 1 | Parata Māori Township Sections | 1909 | 1965 |
**Kāpiti Island Files**

[NB: the files below are a selection only]

### Old Land Claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACFC 16153 OLC1/3</th>
<th>OLC 43</th>
<th>Case files [Samuel Ashmore, Kāpiti Island]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACFC 16153 OLC1/5</td>
<td>OLC 128-129</td>
<td>Case files [Daniel Cooper, James Holt and William Barnard Rhodes, Cloudy Bay and Kāpiti Island]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFC 16153 OLC1/5</td>
<td>OLC 129</td>
<td>Case files [Daniel Cooper, James Holt and William Barnard Rhodes, Kāpiti Island]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFC 16153 OLC1/8</td>
<td>OLC 185</td>
<td>Case files [Thomas Evans, Kāpiti Island]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFC 16153 OLC1/8</td>
<td>OLC 186</td>
<td>Case files [Thomas Evans, Kāpiti Island]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFC 16153 OLC1/8</td>
<td>OLC 187</td>
<td>Case files [Thomas Evans, Kāpiti Island]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACFC 16153 OLC1/49</td>
<td>OLC 927-931</td>
<td>Case files [William Mayhew, Banks Peninsula, Kāpiti Island and Mangawai]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Commissioner of Crown Lands - Wellington

| ADXS 19480 LS-W2/2 | 1853/170 | From: John King, Wellington Date: 29 June 1853 Subject: Respecting Mr Brown's title to 2 islands at Kāpiti | 1853 | 1853 |

### Māori Affairs Department - Head Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACIH 16036 MA1/82</th>
<th>5/5/126</th>
<th>2 Kāpiti Island - Acquisition of Crown</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1927</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/82</td>
<td>5/5/126</td>
<td>3 Kāpiti Island - Acquisition of Crown</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/81</td>
<td>5/5/126</td>
<td>[1] [Kāpiti Island - Acquisition of Crown]</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/82</td>
<td>5/5/126</td>
<td>[2] [Kāpiti Island - Acquisition of Crown]</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACIH 16036 MA1/1026</td>
<td>1910/4525</td>
<td>Received: 19th July 1910. - From: Euc V. Wallace, Mt Cook Res., Wellington. - Subject: Kāpiti Island, wants to sell his interests.</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Marine Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year1</th>
<th>Year2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADOE 16612</td>
<td>9/11/26</td>
<td>Waikanae river and Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADOE 16612</td>
<td>12/419</td>
<td>Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lands and Survey Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Year1</th>
<th>Year2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/1</td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5491/258</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Opossum trapping, Kāpiti Is [Island]</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/3</td>
<td>[Department Of Lands And Survey] - Historic And Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island (Cross-Ref.[Reference] - Res 7/5/2)</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1959?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5942/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/3</td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island - Request to Visit</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5491/258</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/4</td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5491/257</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/6</td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5491/257</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/6</td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island: Goats</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5491/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Wellington Land District - Kāpiti Island: Appointment of Caretaker</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/6</td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Wellington Land District - Kāpiti Island: Acquisition of Māori Land on Island &amp; Adjoining Islands</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5491/5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Wellington Land District - Kāpiti &amp; Mana Islands Reserves Advisory Committee Minutes</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/5</td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island -</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W5491/256</td>
<td></td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island -</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095</td>
<td>4/53/5</td>
<td>Historic &amp; Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island -</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Historic & Scenic Reserves - Kāpiti Island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AANS 6095 W5491/256</td>
<td>4/53 [M]</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1908</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nature Conservation Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAZU W3619/8</td>
<td>24/11/69</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAZU W3619/17</td>
<td>46/4/73</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAZU W3619/17</td>
<td>46/4/73</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DSIR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABLS 568 W4689/6</td>
<td>3/9/3 1</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLS 568 W4689/6</td>
<td>3/9/3 2</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLS 568 W4689/6</td>
<td>3/9/3 3</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLS 568 W4689/6</td>
<td>3/9/3 4</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLS 568 W4689/6</td>
<td>3/9/3 5</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABLS 568 W4689/6</td>
<td>3/9/3 6</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Department of Conservation - Wellington District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AANS 619 W5883/61</td>
<td>8/5/359 /1 8</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 619 W5883/60</td>
<td>8/5/359 3</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 619 W5883/61</td>
<td>8/5/359 /4 2</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 619 W5883/60</td>
<td>8/5/359</td>
<td>Reserves General - Kāpiti Island - General</td>
<td>1985 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AANS 619 W5883/60</td>
<td>8/5/359</td>
<td>Reserves - Kāpiti Island - General</td>
<td>1964 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA 619 W3150/29</td>
<td>20/172</td>
<td>Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1912 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAMA 619 W3150/29</td>
<td>20/172</td>
<td>Kāpiti Island</td>
<td>1961 1971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AANS 25344 W5883/90


AANS 25344 W5883/112


AANS 25344 W5883/112


AANS 25344 W5883/116

| NYA00 3529 | Board Papers - Wellington Conservation Board - Agenda And Minutes - Meetings Held on 16 Feb [February] - Chinchillas, Waahi Tapu Sites, Pest Management, Hutt River, Kāpiti Island | 1996 1996 |

AANS 25344 W5883/118

| NYA00 3558 | Board Papers - Wellington Conservation Board - Agenda and Minutes - Meeting Held 21 Jun [June] - Kāpiti Island, Mana Island Plantings, Mountain Bikes, RMA [Resource Management Act], Witako | 1996 1996 |

AANS 25344 W5883/113

| NYA00 3564 | Board Papers - Wellington Conservation Board - Meeting Items Sent To Judy Robinson ([Executive Officer @ [at] WCB[Wellington Conservation Board]]) - Topics: Kāpiti Island, Rabbit Calcivirus, Concessions, Roots Putake, Budget Draft, Hazardous Substances And New Organisms Act, Te Marua | 1996 1996 |

AANS 25344 W5883/117


AANS 25344 W5883/118

| NYA00 3576 | Board Papers - Wellington Conservation Board - Agenda and Minutes - Meeting Held 8 Nov [November] - Kāpiti Island, Moths, | 1996 1996 |
| AANS 25344 W5883/116 | NYA00 3577 | Board Papers - Wellington Conservation Board - Agenda And Minutes - Meetings Held on 19 Apr[April] - Kāpiti Island (Tourist Lodge, Rats, Field Inspection), Whitianga park, Baring Head Wind Farm, Kanpur Rd [Road], Hutt River | 1996 | 1996 |
| AANS 25344 W5883/131 | R01-107 | 1 Management Resources - Planning - Kāpiti Island | 1989 | 2001 |


**Department of Conservation - Head Office**

| AANS 828 W5942/448 | 32/3/2 | 1 [New Zealand Forest Service - Scenic Reserves] - Kāpiti Island | 1921 | 1975 |
| AANS 828 W5491/954 | 90/7/3/1 | 1 Wild Animals - Control - Opossums - Policy & Administration - Kāpiti Island - Wellington Conservancy | 1922 | 1981 |