

To the TTPP.

'We are not called upon to dispute and defend the truth with logic and argument but we are called upon to show by our lives that we stand on the side of truth. But when I say truth, I do not mean opinion. To treat opinion as if it were the truth is grievously to wrong the truth. The soul that loves the truth and tries to be true will know when to speak and when to be silent'. George MacDonald 1824 -1905. Scottish Poet and writer.

'I have purposefully avoided alluding to the exploits of particular hapus -a favourite practice of the Maori annalist, but one fraught with confusion to the European reader who would be sorely puzzled amongst the multiplicity of so-called tribes, to know which belonged to the invader and which to the invaded. I have classified the allies, hapus and sections of hapus of each tribe under one common appellation. Maori may say I am wrong, but I appeal from them to the common sense of my English readers..... James Stack 1835 – 1919. Missionary.

'As a clan rises to tribal status it places a different emphasis upon the ancestral connections it holds in common with the tribe from which it originated'. Athol Anderson. Historian.

My name is Graeme Walsh.

I write with regards to Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori and more particularly, Poutini Ngai Tahu.

As required by the TTPP, let me state that in making this submission that we (my family and I) have nothing to gain commercially. As you read on, you will note this anyway.

I wish to speak to my submission at Westport.

Background: Our family have three free-hold properties that will be affected by this classification. They are,

- Valuation No 1885012100 LD: Pt Sec 59 Secs 361-362 368 Sq 141 Blk III Kawatiri SD -The 'ten acre' family block with homestead at 74 Cape Road, that borders Mawhera Trust land.

The other two properties are family baches on '1/4 acre' sections at Tauranga Bay.

- Valuation No 1885925402 LD: Lot 2 DP 7271 Blk III Steeples SD. 1189 sqm 417 Tauranga Bay Road, Cape Foulwind. (my place)

Graeme Walsh

- Valuation No 1885025500 LD: Lot 1 DP 4835 Blk III Steeples SD. 1083 sqm 415 Tauranga Bay Road, Cape Foulwind. (Mum's place)

We recognise the significance of historic sites but disagree with the 'shot gun' approach that has been used to determine them, and, the uncertainty of what this classification means. With regards to our particular situation, having been advised that our properties were 'significant to Maori', we were then asked to confirm where they were! This gives us no confidence in 'the process' whatsoever.

Our two family baches, along with the paddock next to the homestead at 74 Cape Road go nowhere close to redesignation in any capacity. Further, these sections are already subject to local council regulations - regulations that restrict what can and can't be done.

That said, we recognise that systems need to be put in place to safeguard areas of proven significance so that they can be protected from unwelcome development. What's left of the Tauranga Bay farmland falls into this category, not because it is a significant cultural site, but because of the promises that Holcim NZ Ltd (the previous owner) made, before selling out.

Please note:

1. Our land is 'significant' to our family - no one else.
2. Yet, TTPP claim our land was identified as being 'significant to Maori' based on "knowledge and records inclusive of manuscripts, published books and newspaper articles". We *were* hoping to view the material that the TTPP have based their claims on so that we could better understand their position. No information has been forwarded so I can only act on what I know *or*, believe to be so through the writings of others. Please bear with me.

Back in 1960 Chief Tuhuru Tainui stated, "*In 1840 when our noble ancestors put their marks to the Treaty of Waitangi, Hobson, the Queen's representative, taking each by the hand, said, "We are one people". So, in the long span of years since British colonisation of New Zealand commenced, bonds spiritual and national have drawn Maori and Pakeha closer together. Both socially and politically the Maori is the full equal and trusted comrade of his fellow New Zealander. They fought side by side in battle, shared prosperity and adversity and met each other on the football field*". The key phrase here is, "We are one people". This statement makes 'Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori (only)' redundant. Giving additional power to one group over another is akin to asserting that one flea has more rights to the dog than all others.

Tuhuru Tainui also stated "*The story of the journey to New Zealand was preserved by oral tradition, handed down from generation to generation. There was no gift of writing, but the Maori gift of memory is prodigious, and it was perfected in the*

*scholared institutions known as 'schools of learning'. Thus, the knowledge has been kept that there were three major visits to New Zealand, the first during the Tenth century, the second almost 200 years later, and the third about 1350 AD. The first voyage was a voyage of exploration, but the others were for **colonisation**; the last one being the main migration by a fleet of eight canoes -the Arawa, Tainui, Tokomaru, Aotea, Mataatua, Kurahaupo, Takitimu and Hourouta".*

This account of Polynesian migration is not entirely correct. Mr Tainui has advanced 'the Great Fleet' story - a story that was invented for school children in the late nineteenth century. As one historian put it, '*The 'Great Fleet' was in itself, just a convenient myth to rope together a cluster of eight canoes that arrived in different parts of the country at different times. However, for convenience, their approximate arrival times were added together and divided. This gave an average arrival time of 1350 AD*'. Thus at least part of Poutini Ngai Tahu's 'history', as told in 1960, is a post European fairy tale. My purpose in referencing this is two-fold.

1. To demonstrate that aspects of fiction can be woven into the tapestry of our nation's history and advanced as fact. The effect of this is that different (often adverse) determinations are made.
2. To point out that *if* Mr. Tainui could name the canoes that brought his ancestors to New Zealand then Maori are *not* indigenous. Therefore, the Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori are the values of our early colonists as opposed to those of an indigenous race. We are all colonists and we all have values. In addition, many descendants of those successive waves of colonisation have inter-married. This brings me back to Mr. Tainui's affirmation that we are 'one people'. Therefore, sites of real significance should collectively be bundled under National Heritage Sites. The focus should then shift to ensure that New Zealand Historic Places Trust (the administrator) does their job. In *most* cases they do. By way of example, my mother's ancestral home is in the Bay of Islands where it has been under NZHPT protection for nearly 80 years. We've never questioned whether this authority consider 'race base' when recruiting staff. They could have a Martian on the team for all we care. What's important to the family is that the caretakers (whoever they may be) share our values in preserving and protecting our country's history.

Mr Tainui also stated that, '*The Crown fulfilled McKay's promises, setting aside land with millions of feet of timber on it, as a heritage for the Maori people of Westland*'. Mr. Tainui referred to Mr McKay as '*that grand commissioner who saw to it that all reserves were on the south side of the (Grey) river*'. It is very clear that Mr Tainui was satisfied with the deal that his ancestors struck to preserve heritage land for his tribe. Mr Tainui made no mention of the reserves created for his people up in the Buller or, any other land in that district. His focus was strictly to the south of the Grey River.

At this stage it may be useful to remind the TTPP that non-Maori (predominantly Europeans) have a very good track record of helping Maori to preserve their culture. An example of this was demonstrated in the years following the annihilation of Ngai (Kai) Tahu's Kaiapoi Pa by Te Rauparaha's forces - after which some of the survivors fled to the West Coast.

The Reverend James Stack was a great friend of Ngai Tahu and from his book, 'The Sacking of Kaiapohia' comes the following accounts:

- *After the annihilation of the Kaiapoi Pa in 1830 the area lay deserted for many years. When the Rev John Raven took possession of the land in the neighbourhood of this knoll, the whole surface of the ground between it and the lagoon was strewn with human remains and weapons of all sorts. He set about to have the bones collected -filling up two wagon loads in total which he then had buried at the base of a sand hill, which was subsequently levelled by Ngai Tahu. The remains of the houses and fortifications were then destroyed by fires as Ngai Tahu prepared to clear the land for farming purposes.*
- *In 1848, the chiefs of Kaiapoi, and other sections of the tribe assembled at Akaroa to meet Mr Commissioner Kemp, who had arrived there in the HMS Fly, for the purpose of negotiating with them for the purchase of their lands. The negotiations were successful, and Mr Mantell was sent shortly afterwards to survey the portions which the Maoris had reserved from the sale for their own occupation. Amongst the reserves made was the site of the old Kaiapoi Pah to which Mr Mantell referred as follows in despatch to the Governor, written in 1848. "I have guaranteed to the the natives that the site of the ancient Pah, Kaiapoi, shall be reserved to her Majesty's Government, to be held sacred for both Europeans and Natives". As long as the old Maori lived who regarded with veneration the spot associated with so many proud and pleasant, as well as so many sad and humiliating memories of the past, the site of the old fortress was not willingly and knowingly desecrated. But since their removal by death, their degenerate representatives have shown an utter want of decent respect for the site of the ancestral home of their tribe and for the sake of securing a paltry sum paid as rent, they have allowed an unsightly fence to be erected right across the front wall of the Pah, which was before that in a state of excellent preservation, and cattle to be de-pastured within the enclosure, the result being that the walls have been trampled down, and the ditches filled in and many interesting marks of its former occupants obliterated. There is still time to rescue what remains to mark a spot rendered famous by history -a spot which will be regarded with increasing interest as years roll on.*
- *Seven years ago, the Kaiapoi Maoris agreed, at a meeting conveyed at their Runanga house, to erect a stone monument, on which the chief incidents connected with the history of the Pah were to be inscribed; but so few of them have given anything towards carrying out the project, that it has*

remained in abeyance. Perhaps some of those who are equally entitled with Maoris to call Kaiapoi their birthplace, may be induced, after reading these pages, to help protect the remains of this famous fortress, and to perpetuate the memory of its defenders. Reverend James Stack, 1892.

With further regard to the protection of these 'taongas' - a word that originally meant 'possessions taken by the spear' (Reference: Grammar and Vocabulary of the Language of New Zealand, page 207, printed 1820,) comes this story from the journal of an early French visitor to the Bay of Islands. I could name him but I would hope that his anonymity will inspire any reader who has a genuine interest in our history, to embark on 'a dig' of their own.

- *On the occasion of my visit to the pa of Kehou-Wra, Touai took me with an air of mystery into his hut and shut the door on us both, then he took out of his chest, a mat in which was wrapped the tattooed head moko mokai, the pattern of the moko showed that it must have belonged to someone of high rank. In fact, he told me that it was the head of a powerful warrior who was greatly feared from the coast of Shouraki (Hauraki) His name was Kopou-Oka. In a fight two or three years earlier, he had wounded Koro-Koro very seriously with a blow from his spear; but not long afterwards Shongui (Hongi) killed him with a gun, and Touai showed me the hole that the bullet had made in the head. The chief of Kidi-Kidi (Keri Keri) shared the body of Koupa-Oka with his warriors and presented the head to Koro-Koro. Touai added that on the first journey that he undertook on the banks of Shouraki (Hauraki), he intended to give this head back to Kapou-Oka's son as a pledge of the peace he wanted to conclude with him. Nevertheless, he offered to let me have it for a pound of gunpowder; and if the bargain had suited me, it is clear the Kapou-Oka's son would never have seen the head of his unfortunate father. I drew the conclusion quite naturally from Touai's offer that he thought more highly of a pound of gunpowder than of the friendship of the young man. The head was one of the finest and best tattooed that I had seen in the course of my voyage, but the dogs had gnawed a piece of the left cheek.*

It becomes quite obvious from these first-hand accounts that Europeans were very sympathetic towards the protection of Maori culture. It is also well documented that Europeans helped to record tribal customs and traditions. To be clear, much of Maori history only exists today because of the efforts of our early sealers, whalers, explorers, surveyors and men of the ministry. Men like Boulton, Brunner, Heaphy, Fox, Dobson, Rochfort, Mueller, Smart, Money and Archdeacon Harper, most of whom slogged it out on the ground. But let's not forget Cook. As Charles and Neil Begg so eloquently wrote in their book 'Dusky Bay', "*The Kati-Mamoe of Dusky Sound (the 'Lost Tribe'), their dress and their weapons, their dwellings and their canoes, their way of life, their fears, their courtesy and their dignity are only known through the journals of Captain Cook and his men*".

As already referenced, when making determinations it is important to ascertain that the source material is correct. That is because our property rights are at *risk*. Subtle variations in what appear to be primary source accounts can change the narrative. An example of this can be found in Ngai Tahu historian, Athol Anderson's well researched book 'The Welcome of Strangers.' He states: '*In 1846-47 there were two main areas of settlement: at Kawatiri and the central West Coast known generally as Arahura. In the former, there was a small settlement on the North side of the Buller River and a garden opposite on the South bank. This occupation began in 1846 and it was intended to confirm the right of Arahura people to ownership of Kawatiri.* Mr Anderson was using Heaphy (and Brunner) as his reference source but stopped short.

This is what Heaphy wrote: *May 1st 1846: "On the southern bank of this river, the Arahura natives had a few *rods of land planted with potatoes for seed for a larger plantation, their object being to obtain title to the Kawatiri district by occupation, and they hope to sell such title on the place being required for settlement, which they have in some way become convinced will shortly be the case".* (*One rod = one perch. 1 acre = 160 perch -so as you can see, the spud patch wasn't big.)

The 'vibe' that resonates loud and clear is that '*the value*' of the Kawatiri land to Maori, was in its *cash value* -as opposed to its cultural value. This brings me to the sale and purchase of the West Coast just a few years later.

Between 1848 and 1860 the Crown bought the West Coast three times. Apparently the first purchase was unsatisfactory but it appears that the 1849 and the 1860 purchases were more agreeable. Bishop Selwyn certainly thought so. In June 1849 the Bishop was passing through Akaroa on his return from the Chatham Islands when he met up with Ngai Tahu. At the time he recorded the 'vibe'.

'HMS Fly had lately left the harbour with the agent appointed by the government to buy the whole of the Middle Island not included in the former purchases at Nelson and Wairau. The tribe, which had assembled to receive the payment, had not dispersed, and I was able to converse with them. They seemed to be perfectly satisfied with the sale, having received £2000.00 for which they had given up, as they told me, plains mountains, rivers etc as far as Foveaux Straits, trusting to the faith of the government to make suitable reserves for their use'. All very clear.

However, it is doubtful if Bishop Selwyn was aware that one sub-tribe was *not* satisfied. The Poutini Ngai Tahu (the 'West Coasters') arrived late, only to find that the £110.00 that had been put aside for them had been spent by their East Coast relations. They subsequently returned home empty handed.

Roll on nearly ten years and when James MacKay arrived on the West Coast to tidy matters up, he was told quite categorically that the lands had *never* been

purchased. However Chief Tarapuhi did remember the 1848 payments on the east coast that were intended for them. He also had a bit to say about Ngati Toa who had been one of the parties that had sold *their* (Poutini Ngai Tahu) land. Tarapuhi made it quite clear that "*They are thieves as their feet have never trodden on this ground. They are equal to rats which when men are sleeping, climb up to the storehouses and steal food*". Having got that off his chest he proceeded to do business -and so after careful consideration, Poutini Ngai Tahu settled on (1) three hundred sovereigns cash and, (2) on the proviso that they got to keep the areas that were, of significance to them. In addition to these reserves the three superior chiefs were awarded 500 acres each whilst two lesser chiefs successfully demanded 250 acres. (Reference: The West Coast Gold Rushes by Philip Ross May.) In the following years the land was surveyed and titles issued. Local chiefs assisted the European surveyors with the marking out of the native reserves. Down in Westland, Kerei, '*the Chief of all the West Coast natives*' assisted Gerhard Mueller. The two men became great friends. In one of his letters to his wife, Bannie, Mueller described Kerei as; '*a strapping fellow - of course what he says is law amongst the natives, and I could consequently not have got a better one from among the lot. He is quite a gentleman compared to the others - dresses tip top European fashion: tight riding trousers, leggings, waistcoat, coat, white mackintosh & c. It appears he has made some money at the diggings, and has further, a good, regular income from rents from some land he has let at the Grey township. He is a very sensible fellow, hard- working and particularly obliging. He has two boys; his wife died a year ago, and his father and mother are still alive, living close by here, but both expected to breath their last shortly. I saw the old man the day before yesterday, and he was then so poorly the natives would not allow him to stay any longer in their family whare - he might die overnight, and so cause the hut and all in it to be tapood. They consequently built a little hut for the old man - looking just like a dog hut - where he might die if he pleases; a few sticks for fire they placed in front of it, and so left the old man to himself.*' From this account (and others), it is clear that Mueller greatly valued their friendship and the respect they had for each other must surely have shown through in their survey work. Another of Mueller's friends was Kahu who Mueller describes as, '*one of the 'old school' - roasted Mauri good kaikai*'. Clearly Kahu was a bit of a character with his tales from earlier years.

Preceding Mueller's survey, Brunner would not start the survey of the Native Reserves on the south side of the Buller, (our side) until Riwai brought up the agreed plans from Mackay. That was on 14 March 1862.

As a consequence of these surveys, more value was added to the Maori reserves as well as to the individual chief's private land holdings through (1) the *certainty* of property ownership by way of deeds and (2) roading and other infrastructure. By way of example, on 11th March 1866 Mueller wrote; '*All last week I was busy enlarging the town of Greymouth, the greater part of which is on Mauri Ground (Native Reserve) bringing the handsome rent of four thousand pounds per annum,*

which accounts for the Mauris walking about here like gentlemen - polished boots and white collars. Their other halves (most of them twice the weight of a male Mauri) come out dressed in showy colours - sometimes in satin - of European fashion, walking up and down the street, smoking dirty clay pipes.

At this stage it may be useful for the reader to dip into Kerei's background.

Kerei's father, Tekerei, and Niho were two of Te Rauparaha's fighting chiefs. From the Ngati Rarua tribe it appears that they had remained in the South Island after Te Rauparaha's 1828 raid across the top of the South Island and down into West Wanganui Inlet. At some stage they continued their conquest down the West Coast. Some historians say that it was at the time of their original incursion, whilst another account states that it was later. Either way, Ngati Rarua, were settled on the West Coast by 1832 from whence they crossed the alps to support Te Rauparaha at Kaiapoi. Though much has been written about the conquest of 'Tai Poutini' the following account is how Brunner understood it. On 22 October 1847, Brunner wrote from near the ruins of Tuhuru's former pa site at Okarito. *'Okaritu is the pa where Enihu (Niho) captured and killed many of the natives of the Ngaitau (Ngai tahu) tribe, and also took 'Tu Uru, (Tuhuru) the chief, prisoner, who he has since released to return to work greenstone for him'*. Expanding on Tuhuru's capture, other accounts state that he was, *'held to ransom, the price being the widely known and much prized mere called Kaikanohi - 'a feast for the eyes'*. I note Tuhuru's capture and subsequent internment is not widely acknowledged in Poutini Ngai Tahu's documented history.

Murray McCaskill, author of 'The Maori in Westland' wrote that the Poutini Ngai Tahu were *'less savagely treated than was the custom of the time.'* Additionally, *'they accepted the protection of their conquerors and intermarried with them'*.

In March 1863 William Smart wrote from Westport, *'There are a good many Maories here and some fine looking men amongst them. Tamati Freeman is their chief, one of the Maories who went with Te Rauparah to attack Kaiapoi years ago'*. (Tamati Pirimona Marino, aka Tommy Freeman, was a chief of one of the Aorere pa. His tribal affiliations were Ngati Mutunga, Te Atiawa and Ngati Rarua. Gottfried Lindauer who painted his portrait, wrote that Marino had joined Te Rauparaha's raid, and added; as his share of the conquest he received a large area of land at Massacre Bay. Source: Hilary Low.)

I note that at a monthly meeting of the Tai o Poutini Plan Committee in Hokitika, 23 February 2021, a *'short history lesson'* was given in which a local iwi historian stated: *"Ngāti Rarua came through Tai Poutini at the time of the musket wars. They left faster than they arrived when Ngāi Tahu retaliated. They have no history in our land whatsoever."* Judging from the above accounts they do. Most likely their descendants still live there today. And, as has already been demonstrated, they quickly became highly respected members of the community.

Brunner's survey of the Native Reserves on the south bank of the Buller brings me back to the family block and the uncertainty that now surrounds it. Clearly the land meant very little to Ngai Tahu prior to 1846 and any brief occupation of the wider site was secondary to their intention to sell it.

The small section of land at risk, borders Mawhera Trust land. It is a narrow-gutted strip of land with a dog's leg in the boundary fence. For a short while it provided rail access to the Buller River by way of a branch line. That was in the 1880's when the rock training wall was being built. During WW2 the balance was excavated and the soil removed for aerodrome construction. My great grandfather lived in a hut very close to this site prior to enlisting for the Boer War. Later on my grandfather purchased this strip off the Harbour Board. That was in the 1950's. In the leadup to the sale, a neighbour's son, a Maori gentleman, with ties to the Native Reserve, a Mr. 'Augie' Lucas, approached my grandfather directly to see if he was interested in 'the rest'. He wasn't. About 20 years ago I came across a memo in the Harbour Board Records. In the memo my grandfather was commended for the work he had done on improving the place which had previously been abandoned to grow gorse. This led to the recommendation that the Harbour Board should offer the rest of their railway reserves (which were now redundant) to their respective neighbours. Given this history it would be difficult to argue that the site was 'significant to Maori' back then. The vibe indicated otherwise.

My grandparent's farm house was once a hive of activity. Growing up in the 1960s and 70's I recall my grandmother going into the old folk's home and bringing out some of the 'old girls' for afternoon tea. Mrs (Charlie) Martin was one. Well into her 90s she told me of life living 'off the end of the paddock' - on Martin's Island. That would've been at the turn of the 20th century. She said that she lived with her husband Charlie, on the 'highest point' on the island and that they had a lovely orchard with a plum tree. I didn't know that there was a 'high point' but I knew where that plum tree was and for many years, I would note the height of the floods that swept across the island. Old Mrs Martin was right. That part didn't flood. An early map shows an orchard and a 'Native clearing' (a native garden) but these more obvious areas of significance to Maori don't appear on the TTPP maps. I believe Martin's Island to be on Harbour Board land/not private.

As you may start to appreciate, our family understand the historical importance of genuine archeological sites. To date, the *most* significant (Maori) site in the Buller district is the Carters Beach camp site. This is situated just a couple of kms down the road from 'our' place. It only survives today because of dad's brother, Owen Walsh. Uncle Owen was aware of the site when he and his wife Maisie purchased the farm on his return from WW2. Owen *fully* understood the significance of it and kept it intact in an era that saw other farmers develop their adjoining blocks. *If* Owen had followed *their* lead, he could have bulldozed clean the entire site in an instant - and, *no one* would've been any the wiser. However, he chose not to. He was a true custodian.

On a recent visit 'home' from Perth, my cousin Dave shared with me the events leading up to the first big archaeological dig in the late 1960's. At the time Dave had been helping his dad to dig a post hole down the back where the pigsty was. The digging was 'hard going' and Dave found some excuse to sneak away. Anyway, by the time he returned his dad had cleaned out the hole -digging up a large stone artefact in the process. Owen contacted his brother-in-law John Dickson who farmed down the Okari. John already had a keen interest in Maori artefacts and he in turn contacted Otago University.

In 1969 Owen gave permission to Wayne Orchiston from Sydney University to carry out an investigation as part of his doctoral research. As a consequence of that, Dr Orchiston shared his research findings with Owen. (He gave him a copy of his thesis.) In turn, Owen delighted in sharing his new found knowledge with those who were interested. Few were. Owen knew the names of the rock artefacts and where they came from. He would place them on the table and separate them out and show the percussion marks that separated 'man-made' from 'nature'. There was obsidian from the Bay of Plenty, argillite from up Nelson way and various shades of greenstone from down South Westland. Other more non-descript rock was said to have come from Otago. It was only in old age when Owen and Maisie sold their farm that interest was triggered by external parties. That was about 20 years ago. It was promoted as a 'new find' but of course it wasn't. At the time Owen and Maisie donated *their* treasured collection to Owen's old school, St Canices. In the News, 9 November 2022 it was reported that the collection had been 'dug up' by local farmers Owen and Maisie Walsh *but* had been on display with "*permission from local iwi*". Although I cannot comment on what input local iwi had, I can say that this statement minimises the enormous contribution that Uncle Owen and Aunty Maisie made with regard to preserving a significant period of our country's early history. I note that the artefacts have since been packed into boxes and are on the move to Coaltown.

Moving a bit further down the road we arrive at Tauranga Bay. The TTPP claim that it was a landing place for canoes. Most probably it was but those landings would have been infrequent. You would have to choose your days. Heaphy recorded that there was an absence of ocean-going canoes on the West Coast. (European and American whalers on the east coast reported the same. Hulls were rotting on the beaches as Maori made the transition to the more robust whale boats. Even Te Rauparaha used a whale boat). Heaphy and Brunner followed the lead of those who had passed before them and negotiated the coast by foot. It is important to remember that the West Coast was *not* like other parts of New Zealand - hardly anyone lived there *and* the odd 'foot print in the sand' is *not* proof enough to claim the site 'significant only to Maori'. Tauranga Bay simply *does not* compare to other coastal areas that were known to be *intensively* occupied. A line *has* to be drawn.

The 1841/42 Sketch of the 'Middle Island' - made by Maori for Mr Halswell (Protector of Aborigines) does not support the notion the Tauranga Bay was

'significant to Maori'. In explaining the 'map', author of 'Greenstone Trails,' Barry Brailsford states, "*the Places are drawn large or small in accordance with their importance as anchorages and food resource areas and not according to scale*". 'Tauranga' is not mentioned. Nor have I seen any evidence that Tauranga Bay was put forward by Maori when they were sorting out their reserves.

However, with uninterrupted family connections going back over 150 years, the Bay occupies a *significant* spot in our family history - as it does for many others. Our two baches sit on free-hold land that was gifted to my grandfather (Mum's father) by his great friend Paddy Wall. Paddy was the first white child to be born in the bay - back in the 1870's - less than 30 years after Heaphy and Brunner came through. Most of the Tauranga Bay farmland was his.

In the early days there was only three dwellings in the bay. The Wall homestead and two baches. As stated, one belonged to my grandparents. The other bach belonged to Dr Percy Foote. (That's the 'Bayhouse') Paddy was very protective of the bay and selective as to who he shared it with. The original family bach was on the seaward side of the road/rail formation down by Walls Creek. However, as the sea started to cut in during the late 1930's it was shifted, in stages, to the inland side of the formation. The family tow truck was used for the job.

The 1930's and 1940's saw big shifts in weather and sea patterns. Mum reported a bank of bones being washed away. They were exposed with one tide but disappeared with the next. They were "*very old and stained*". Mum thought they may have been Moa bones but, as stated, they got washed away before she could get anyone to take a look. This was at the northern end of the bay - just out from the seal colony carpark. The bay was mum's domain.

In those days the sand hills were extremely fragile and were constantly shifting. Mum recalls how it *wasn't* uncommon to be 'driven' back to town by blinding sandstorms. Upon the family's return, my grandfather would have to remove sheets of iron from the roof and shovel out the sand before the ceilings caved in. To address this erosion mum's family planted marram grass and sowed lupins. The family's old 1922 Willys Knight lorry was loaded up with bundles of roots (and the odd sack of lupin seed) before setting out to tackle the sand dunes. With high stepping (34 inch) wire spoked wheels the old lorry proved to be a *very* suitable vehicle for this undertaking. At one hundred years of age, the old lorry is now in retirement over here in Christchurch. Following on, the sand hills were fenced. Driftwood and wire were the main materials and, whilst rather crude, they 'deflected' the sand - as well as the small herd of cattle that 'roamed' the bay - thus allowing the plantings to establish. The cattle were healthy. They ate seaweed off the beach.

It was Paddy Wall's niece, Ella Mathews (nee Wall) who wrote 'Yesterdays in Golden Buller' - a history of the Buller District. Unfortunately, Paddy would not be

interviewed for the book. This was a shame as many of his stories have been lost. My mother knew Paddy well. Most likely mum is the *last link* with that era. As a small girl she would follow Paddy around. Parakeets use to be in the bush in those days. Paddy told mum that a few Maori would come down from the Buller Gorge to fish but he never said that they lived there. This is at odds with what Ella wrote in 1957: *'Less than 80 years ago there was a village at the point'*. If this were so then that would put the village as being there in the 1870's. There certainly wasn't a village there when Heaphy and Brunner came through in 1846 and there wasn't one there in the early 1860's when both Smart and Money passed through. Desperate for food they hardly gave the Bay a mention. At best, Charles Money wrote about *'a point of rock which bore a strong resemblance to those which we had been led to expect, by the maps drawn on the sands at the Grey by the old chief for our guidance -some ten miles from the Buller River*. With no further mention of the bay, the next day Money arrived at the Buller River having almost starved to death.

William Smart, who followed Money, was advised by Terapuhi to *'use the overland route up the Grey River, across a saddle and down the Buller'*. Finding this route to be *'narrow and rough'* and with a scarcity of birds and short on provisions, Smart travelled back down the Grey with Tainui (who was visiting from Kaiapoi) and reverted to the beach route too. Having crossed the Okari he wrote, March 1, 1863: *We then travelled on until we got to a point and some rocks. Here we camped, waiting for low water. Got up in the middle of the night and got around these and camped again until daylight*. Neither traveller mentioned a village in Tauranga Bay. If there had been a village they would have stopped for a feed.

Most likely what Ella was referring to was a camp site for those seasonal fishing expeditions. As Paddy recalled, *'the fish was dried down the southern end of the bay where the cutting goes through to the back beach'*.

As already touched on, it is important to understand that the South Island and, more particularly the West Coast, was very sparsely populated. By the 1840's there were less than 2000 Maori in the South Island – with probably less than 100 living on the West Coast. Most likely *if* it wasn't for the greenstone there would've been no one left living there at all. The environment was harsh and food was scarce. Life was tough. Indeed in 1846 Brunner reported there were 48 people living down the coast at Kararoa but this had reduced to only 6 in 1847. Brunner was told that the others had gone back to Massacre Bay to live *'now that the wars were over'*. From this 'settlement' Brunner also wrote: *For what reason the natives choose to live here I cannot imagine. It is a place devoid of all value or interest. They have but little ground to cultivate, and they catch no fish, the only acceptable food being mussels, which they find on the rocks on a calm day at low water. There is not even ponamu to be found here as an inducement*. All up Brunner estimated 97 Maori inhabitants between Kahurangi and the Cascade and ten years later MacKay estimated 87 between West Wanganui and Foveaux Straight. An 1868 census

listed 116 people - a *'mere five percent of the Maori population of the South Island'*. So, as you can see, the West Coast population fell a long way short of that in other areas. In the Bay of Islands there were 'tens of thousands'. Marianne Williams (the wife of the missionary Henry Williams), wrote of the circumstances leading up to the launch of Henry's new, NZ made, 50 ton schooner. "*By 7.00am over 50 war canoes had arrived*" and "*on rough estimate three to four thousand people were present*". That was on 24 January 1826. In most cases Marianne referred to Maori as 'New Zealanders'. The word '*Maori*', first penned in 1815 didn't come into common use until later - about 1830. Tribal names were more correct. Even Ngai Tahu elder Teone Tikao mentioned the infrequent use of the word '*Maori*' when interviewed by Herries Beattie in the early 1920's. It was very much 'tribal'. This begs the question: how do you define '*Maori*'? I digress.

Heaphy and Brunner and party camped in the bay on a couple of occasions. On their way down they caught '*3 bull trout and an eel*' in Walls Creek as well as 23 Weka and 9 pigeons. Most likely they camped where the middens use to be - which was near to where the fireplace for the Wall family's second homestead stood until about 10 years ago. On the way back through Tauranga Bay, Heaphy and Brunner and their Maori guides were hoping to have another good feed but didn't. This is how Heaphy described it.

24th June 1846: *After considerable detention by unfavourable weather, we arrived at Tauranga near Cape Foulwind where we had before obtained a good supply of birds and from which place we expected to be able to carry an abundance of provisions to the Kawatiri. There, however, we found the woodhens and penguins to be as scarce as they were before plentiful, the natives whom we had met, having left behind them their dogs at this place. This wasn't a one off. The following year Brunner made a similar observation whilst camped at Mawhera. 'The district use to be noted for its numerous birds - wekas, kakapos and kiwis - but they are now almost extirpated by the wild dogs'.*

I note that in responding to questions at this week's submissions, Ngati Wae Wae representative, Mr Francois Tumahai was reported to have said: "*We moved around because we didn't rape and pillage an area for kai. That's how it worked. So we moved and let it replenish itself*". (The News, November 8, 2022). Mr Tumahai also said that "*you can't change history*". Well, you *can*, and some of the West Coast invaders did *exactly* that - by wiping out all traces of previous occupants. This included the stripping out of ancient burial caves as well as renaming pas and other key landmarks.

Following on, Uncle Owen 'changed history' - by allowing Dr Orchiston to have 'a dig' *and* to validate what the community already suspected. That is: that there was an *important* trading post buried in his 'back yard'. But in most cases Mr Tumahai is correct and I have read many accounts that support his statement. However, Heaphy's journal entry is testament that this wasn't always the case. Additionally,

Mr Tumahai's statement doesn't address the 'elephant in the room'. In this case, 'the elephant' is the Moa. Evidence indicates that *all* nine species of Moa were hunted to extinction within 200 years of Polynesian colonisation. There were other bird species *too* but Moa was the most important source of protein and was certainly on the menu for those early travellers who passed through Tauranga Bay. I don't make this claim based on the bones that mum saw *but*, on the gizzard stones that were found in the middens beside Walls Creek - land previously marked 'Draft Recreational Reserve' and owned by Holcim but, since developed - with council permission.

In other regions there is evidence to suggest that some of the fishing net techniques used by Maori were also *not* sustainable - at least the methods employed weren't sustainable when looking back through 21st century lenses. That said, early navigators and explorers marvelled at the skill that went into weaving them. Some nets were *well* over 1000 yards in length (some reports say 'a mile long') *and* 5 fathoms (30 ft) deep. '400-500 villagers' would be employed and 'many thousands' of fish would be caught in a single trawl. However, there is no evidence to suggest that Poutini Ngai Tahu used such nets - they didn't have the population to handle them *and* the sea conditions were more challenging. That said some of *their* North Island ancestors would most certainly have been familiar with these techniques. This is not a criticism - not at all - as it was simply not possible for their ancestors to know what we know now.

Equally, it is important for today's descendants of those early Maori to understand that their non-Maori ancestors were not responsible for upsetting the balance in other ways. Our successes *and* our failures are interwoven either by blood or by association. Whether we have Polynesian DNA or not - and the vast majority of New Zealanders don't, most folk have a deep spiritual connection with their environment that ensures that the land is well managed. Although we are drifting off topic, it is important that Mr Tumahai's claims are put into context.

In summary, the matter of sites and areas significant to Maori was discussed and resolved back in 1860 when the West Coast Maori population was around 100. At the time, the local chiefs hand-picked the areas of significance to them and their families and assisted in pegging out the reserves. The reserves were then surveyed and Deeds of Title were issued. No longer did tribes have to go to war to either retain or to assert ownership. The surplus land was sold to the Crown whilst some of the newly created Maori Reserve land was leased out by the owners for commercial use. This created a revenue stream amounting to thousands of pounds per year. In 1960, local iwi management were still very happy with the outcome. To reiterate what Mr Tainui stated at the time of Westland's centennial, '*The Crown fulfilled McKay's promises, setting aside land with millions of feet of timber on it, as a heritage for the Maori people of Westland*'.

For their descendants to now say that there are other sites of significance that they need to help manage, is an insult not only to the property owners but also to their ancestors. I trust that I have supplied sufficient documentation to shut down this notion.

As we close this section of my submission, I think it appropriate that Archdeacon Henry Harper should have the last word. The Archdeacon spent nine years living in Westland (1866-1875). That was when there was a population of over 30,000. Henry was loved and respected by the community and that feeling was mutual. At the time of his departure, it was stated *“you have won the attachment of the young, the love of the poor and the affection and respect of all.”* From Arahura he had this to report to his good friend, St. John. *Changing the conversation, I said I had remarked in their Social Hall, a curious carved and painted figure, about three feet high, of an old Maori warrior, club in hand, with eyes inlaid with white oyster shell, standing at one end of the hall on a revolving circle of wood on the floor, what was it for? “Well, you see, often at night we have a debate, all sitting on the floor against walls, except those who speak, walking up and down the centre of the room. One Maori sits behind that figure, and as that speaker moves about, he turns it so as always to face him”. “Yes, but why?” “That figure, he what you call chairman, he one of our ancestors, he always look at the speaker, to make him to remember to speak well, not foolish, to speak as if his ancestor heard him”. I could not help feeling that such a feeling as this of the true “noblesse oblige” might do much to control the speech of many of our political orators, and chasten the wild, thoughtless talk which often discredits our legislative assemblies.*

Thank you.

Tauranga Bay

In starting my submission, I asked that you, the reader, bear with me. I thank you for doing so. If you wish to learn more about our unsuccessful efforts to get those in authority to take the lead, and protect the bay from further development then read on. If not then tune out. For those of you who are still with me, you have my assurance that this is just a *very* brief summary. There are many layers that I won't go into.

Until recently there had been *no* development at Tauranga Bay for over *50 years*. The largest landowner was Holcim Cement and they had promised that they would protect the coastal environment which they claimed to be their *"most ecologically significant zone"* (their words). They said that they were going to restore it to *'pre European times'* and they backed this up by filing restoration plans with council. Further evidence of their promise came by way of Holcim winning two national environmental awards based partly on what they had done *or* would do. The first

award was dished out in 2007/08 followed by another in 2015. The retired Commissioner for the Environment, Dr Morgan Williams QSM was the judge on both occasions. However, in 2010 Holcim started to sell their Tauranga Bay coastal land. Some of this land contained middens. Holcim didn't care. They promoted it for its '*subdivision potential*'. Holcim initially sold two blocks from what had been designated 'Draft Recreational Reserve'. The first block was the one between Okari Road and Walls Creek. The second block ran between Walls Creek and Tauranga Bay Road. This was Holcim's former nursery site. My mother and I spoke at the two hearings established to hear the applicant's case for the subdivisions. We both spoke *against* development stating that it would set a precedent -allowing the whole of the bay to be developed.

To support our case, we touched on the historical significance of the Bay and pointed out that the area around Walls Creek was where Heaphy and Brunner had camped. No one cared. Not even Maori. Leading up to the first hearing I advised NZHT but NZHT didn't care either. They left it to the developers to advise them if *they* "knew of any historical activity on the site". Not surprisingly they said "no". Before delivering their approval, the commissioners stated in the News (9 September 2011) that three extra houses was not the '*be all and end all*' and after delivering their approval they stated, (11 October 2011) that a '*precedent had not been set as most of Tauranga Bay was either administered by DOC or zoned Cement Production under the Buller District Plan*'. The very next year Holcim's former nursery section was carved up - again with council approval. This time the *same* three commissioners, (Sharon McGarry, Margaret Montgomery and David Barnes) stated in the News that it was "*highly likely that there would be more subdivision*" (unless the community got active).

We never stopped being active and, in 2018 we had another go. On presenting to the Buller District Council's Draft Long Term Plan, I informed Council that; "*it is a legitimate and serious duty for those responsible for land and sea coasts to preserve as much as possible - especially of the best -for present and future use of the people of New Zealand*". Unfortunately, we met with the same response. If Maori had been true to their values they should have rolled up their sleeves and given us a hand. They could have done so individually or collectively. They had three opportunities - 2011, 2012 and 2018.

Taking a step back in time, efforts to protect Tauranga Bay from despoliation gained traction in 1970 when family friends, Professor Alister & Pam McLellan wrote to the Director General of the Lands and Survey Department. At the time the 'Cement Company' had only *recently* purchased *all* that Tauranga Bay farmland from Okari Road to the Seal Colony carpark. Having noted the company's disregard for the environment, the McLellan's suggested that this buffer zone be gazetted as a Scenic Reserve. The Director General gave his support and 14 months later so too did council (the Buller County Council). They voted unanimously to support the notion that "*Tauranga Bay be reserved as a natural*

beauty spot". Their recommendation was that it be gazetted as a Recreational Reserve (rather than a scenic reserve). That was because they could "attract subsidisation from Lands and Surveys for toilets" -they wrote that they had the funds. Council assured the community that "*natural beauty spots like Tauranga Bay were given to them by nature and it was their job to preserve them*". Council added, "*Following a recent visit, a senior officer of Town and Country Planning division favoured a Skyline Reserve*". So far, so good. Then things started to slow down. That said; upon prompting, council advised that *Tauranga Bay in its entirety* was (still) to be retained in the draft plan as a recreational reserve - although Minister of Lands, Matt Rata thought Carters Beach was a better proposition. Another strongly worded letter requesting action received the following reply. "Council are *fully aware of the actions it could take without further recourse in the designation of Tauranga Bay as a Skyline Recreational Reserve*". However, council concluded that "*we must try to reach an amicable arrangement with NZ Cement Holdings in the first instance*". Nothing of substance eventuated. A small coastal strip of former Cement Company land was eventually gazetted, as was a section around beside the Bayhouse. However, this stemmed mainly from an exchange of a much larger piece of Harbour Board land down by the Seal Colony carpark. Having secured this very desirable section the cement company then realised that in waiving their rights to the land on the seaward side of the road, they had lost their easement to discharge sediment into the bay. However, with very little fuss this easement was gifted back to them.

The back story was that the Cement Company 'panicked' as they looked to wriggle out of the sale of their land to the Crown. Those were the words of councillor Howard Williams, who was present at that meeting. When faced with the prospect of having to sell their land, the cement company simply countered by saying that *they would 'protect it'*. In a follow up letter from the Director General, it was confirmed that 'the cement company had a 'shared vision' for the protection of the bay. In accepting their word, he wrote: "*public interest, at least for the present time is protected*". In the following years the cement company got active and submitted a Landscape Plan for the Bay but this was largely to satisfy impending RMA requirements. Nevertheless, they filed a very impressive set of plans with council and, council were meant to follow through and monitor progress on an *annual* basis. On paper at least, it looked like the Bay was protected. It wasn't. It was all an illusion. In trying to work out what went wrong I requested copies of the annual rehabilitation returns under the OIA. The *only* return council could produce was for 2007/08. (That was the year Holcim won their first national environmental award.) When I asked council where the rest of the annual reports were, they replied, "*These were the only records staff could find that related to your request sorry. In speaking to staff I am unable to determine why that is*". And so, council wiped their hands clean.

As stated, Holcim's vision and early rehabilitation work won them local, national and international acclaim. In the early 1990's they had built an 'on-site nursery' and

in 2007 and again in 2015 they won the MIMICO Environmental Excellence Award. The 2015 award came right on cue just as the Cement plant was closing down. At the time it was stated:

"The Holcim NZ project is a major rehabilitation project at the Tauranga Bay quarry and surrounding lands following Holcim's decision to close the quarrying and cement facility by mid 2016. The aim is to rehabilitate the site into a recreation amenity for public use and restore surrounding lands to a maturing indigenous forest. It is a major project drawing on Holcim's global Quarry Rehabilitation directive and involving working with a very extensive group of stakeholders. The aim of restoration, supported by a substantial budget, is to restore a mosaic of indigenous forest and wetland communities similar to what existed prior to European settlement"

A similar message made the front page of the (Westport) News but we knew it was all bullshit. That was because the 2015 award came 5 years after the 'on-site nursery' had been shut down and the site sold for redevelopment. At the time Holcim advised me that 'on-site' didn't actually mean that. Despite their 'promise' they also said that they weren't sure what they would do with the rest of their coastal land. What *was* obvious was that *without* a nursery, they were hardly likely to continue with their rehabilitation, were they? A short while later Holcim sold their assets and abandoned the district and although there was some clause in the sale and purchase agreement about the new owner taking over any outstanding commitments, nothing came of it. In my view Holcim had pulled off one of the biggest environmental corporate frauds that this country has seen. The 'Emperor's new clothes' had nothing on this outfit.

I wrote to the former Commissioner for the Environment, Dr Morgan Williams about it – after all he had been the judge on both occasions. He replied "*Fascinating and worrying*". He never said if he had visited the bay before awarding them 'first prize' and I don't think he had. Judging by the information that he shared with me, both awards had been based on desk top evaluations. So, Holcim had sold him a promise and then they had cashed in on the benefits that the awards brought their way. Globally they looked like environmental superstars. Feeling rather 'hoodwinked' Dr Williams said that he would contact the current Commissioner for the Environment, Simon Upton. In a past life Mr Upton had been a highly respected member of Holcim's Board of Directors and Dr Williams was hoping that Mr Upton might still have some influence. How he got on he never said. I never heard from him again and nothing changed.

So, in a nutshell, that's the 'history' of the Bay. You now know a little bit more about the work that has gone into attempting to protect it. Although outwardly promoting an environmental conscience, those who are meant to be managing it, couldn't care less. Throughout the process the Buller District Council have

displayed an unwillingness to help. Their agenda (their 'cash cow') being development and the revenue that it brings.

The Bay *is* 'significant' but it is *significant* to us all. Therefore, in order to protect it we need an inclusive, as opposed to a separatist policy.

Thank you.

Graeme Walsh.