

“This is an appeal to you”: land and identity at the Taieri Native Reserve

ANGELA WANHALLA

(Ngāi Te Ruahikihiki, Ngāi Tahu, Pākehā)

In December 1892, thirteen residents of the Taieri Native Reserve in Otago signed and sent a letter, comprised of just a few lines, to the Native Minister, Alfred Jerome Cadman.¹ Sadly, the original letter in te reo Māori has been lost, with only the English translation now held at Wellington’s Archives New Zealand office.

To the Minister for Native Affairs, and to your Government.

Long may you all live. May God have you in his safe keeping under the Queen’s “Mana”. We greet you even though you did not visit us personally at our settlement, however, some of our number saw you. Ended is the greeting.

This is an appeal to you and your Government to give effect to this new application for some land because our ancestors had a right to land and from them it passed to our parents by whom we were begotten as members of the Ngaitahu and Ngatimamoe Hapus. Do you look into this our want. Enough.

From us who are residents of this place.

Robert Brown, Halfcaste
Korako Matene, Tangata
Teone Mokokoko, Maori
William Sherburd, Halfcaste
Mere Hinehou, Wahine
Hariata, Maori
John Walter Martin, Native
George Martin, Native
Mary Kui
James Kui
Ani Wellman, Halfcaste
Jane Brown
Lizzie Brown²

I encountered this letter two decades ago while doing my doctoral research on the history of the whānau who lived at Taieri Native Reserve and was amazed to see my great-great grandfather’s name as the leading signatory. His wife, Jane Brown (formerly Palmer) and daughter, Lizzie, or Elizabeth Garth, also signed the letter. While the document has immense personal significance, the letter has wider historical meanings: it highlights the role of letter-writing in Māori-led community and whānau activism, and points to the importance of small communities in advancing iwi aspirations. Set within its historical, community and whānau context, I argue that the Taieri letter addressed local concerns about resources and land rights that fed into Te Kerēme (the Ngāi Tahu Claim) in the 1890s and beyond.

Context

The Taieri letter was composed as a direct response to Cadman's tour of Ngāi Tahu communities in December 1892. The Native Minister visited Waikouaiti, Bluff, Riverton, Moeraki, Waitaki, Temuka, Kaiapoi, and Ōtākou but not Taieri, as the letter writers pointed out. They did have a representative at the Ōtākou meeting on 8 December, Tiaki Kona (John Connor), who greeted the minister with the following speech:

I am from the Taieri river. The Taieri people, unfortunately, are unable to come here to see you; they have gone abroad to seek work for themselves. Also the people of Maranaki are in the same unfortunate condition in not being able to come to you. Had they had means they would have come here to see you and welcome you, but I thank you, as you are the first Minister who has come here. The reason I came was this—that I thought you would be unable to go to the Taieri. There are a number of people who are in trouble there, who are living without adequate sustenance. There are a number of men and also children who are really without sufficient means.³

At the hui, Cadman dismissed claims that promises made to Ngāi Tahu under the Otago Deed 1844 remained unfulfilled. The main goal of his tour was to test whether there was appetite for what was to become the South Island Landless Natives Act (SILNA) 1906, which involved the provision of Crown land, often in isolated spots, for 'landless natives'.

The Taieri people had good reason to be writing to Cadman. Their reserve, one of three areas exempted from the 1844 Otago purchase, was inadequate to support them. Located south of Dunedin, the reserve is an area of 2310 acres situated on the northern bank of the Taieri River. A shore whaling station had operated from Moturata Island between 1839 and 1844, and many of its residents were descendants of marriages between Māori women and sealers, whalers, and other early colonists. After the first Scottish settlers arrived in 1848 the Taieri Plain was slowly occupied for farming, and was opened up for further settlement from the 1870s through the drainage of the Taieri wetlands, which deeply affected Ngāi Tahu access to mahika kai. Indeed, encroachment of settlers' holdings and the stocking of the river with trout competed significantly with the native tuna resource.⁴

Today, no Ngāi Tahu families live on the reserve. In earlier decades, though, it was a lively and sizeable community, engaged in the wider tribal polity. However, their economic situation, as Kona told Cadman in 1892, was one fraught with difficulty. As the work of Atholl Anderson, Harry Evison and Bill Dacker illustrates, as well as the extensive evidence presented in the Ngāi Tahu Claim before the Waitangi Tribunal, every Ngāi Tahu community experienced the effects or impacts of colonisation in similar ways.⁵ Many struggled to survive on small or poor-quality reserves, experienced long-term poverty, and were forced to live a subsistence lifestyle relying on seasonal labour for survival. This was also the situation of the Taieri families in 1892.

Although a culturally and economically significant site, the reserved land was not appropriate for permanent residence. Prior to formal colonisation, Otago Ngāi Tahu migrated to the Taieri on a seasonal basis to obtain winter food, as it was rich in tuna, and a centre of duck-hunting and weka-hunting, and of tī-sugar production.⁶ The Taieri River and the inland lakes were abundant with fish life such as pātiki and īnaka.⁷ As a reserve, the land was mostly steep and of poor quality; the small low-lying area available for occupation and cultivation, known as Maitapapa, was subject to regular flooding, thus not viable in the long term. Nonetheless, the

families did attempt to make a living from their land based on a combination of subsistence agriculture, a continued reliance on traditional, but diminishing food sources, such as ducks, tuna and fish, and an engagement with the cash economy in the early 1860s.⁸ By 1868, they were described as having a few acres under cultivation as the remainder of the reserve consisted “of steep hillsides, and broken ground, only adapted for grazing.”⁹

On 20 May 1868 the Native Land Court sat to decide the ownership of the Taieri Native Reserve, dividing it into three blocks (A, B and C). Block A was the largest of the three, but due to its steep terrain just the 68-acres was available for the kāika, effectively reducing the area available to resident families for cultivation, and exacerbating the problems associated with living on reserve land that was inadequate for their future maintenance. The situation of the Taieri whānau exemplifies that of Ngāi Tahu generally in the 1860s, attempting to negotiate two different economies, living off poor quality reserve land, while maintaining access to mahika kai sites.¹⁰ Indeed, when work was scarce “the Kaik people would often go to the lakes to spear eels”.¹¹

In an 1891 report on native reserves in the South Island, Taieri was listed as the fourth largest in size, but it was the only one of the four to be classified as inferior land.¹² That year, according to the 1891 census, eleven families, with from three to fifteen children each, along with several single men, constituted the total population of the reserve, which was recorded as totalling 158, comprised of 125 persons resident at the kāika, and a further 33 persons of mixed descent recorded in the general population and living on the margins of the reserve.¹³ There was not enough viable land for the families to survive. Some tried to farm their sections, but agricultural and seasonal employment were the main forms of income. Thomas Brown, who was born in 1885 to William Brown and Margaret Davis “in a cottage on the banks of the Taieri River at Henley”, remembered that his father “was working hard [in] those early days, [doing] contract work, and was often away shearing.”¹⁴ Thomas’s grandfather was Robert Brown, lead signatory on the Taieri letter. He was a first-class pit sawyer, shearer, carpenter, as well as a skilled blacksmith.¹⁵ While the men were ‘abroad’ engaged in seasonal work, women managed the family properties, children assisting by ‘milking a few cows’, with the product sold to the local dairy company.¹⁶

By the late nineteenth century a regular economic cycle was in place at the kāika. In the spring and summer, the families engaged in shearing and harvesting of wheat. They also fished in the summer, and over October and November went whitebaiting. In the autumn potatoes were harvested. Winter work consisted of labouring, such as erecting and maintaining fences on local farms, but they went also rabbiting, duck shooting, mutton-birding, with smoked fish as their winter food.¹⁷ The families thus engaged in a mixture of subsistence agriculture and wage labour. There was also “plenty of fish and game in the river and swamplands.”¹⁸ During the 1890s, access to local food sources were critical to survival throughout a period marked by poverty and population growth.¹⁹

Identity

The Taieri letter is significant for what it reveals about how the signatories framed their identities. Some used the term ‘half-caste’ to describe themselves, reflecting the reality of a long history of intermarriage as a result of the shore-whaling industry, which was prominent in Otago and Southland in the 1830s and 1840s. The fact that the original letter was written in Māori demonstrates that te reo was the lingua franca of the community, despite the long history of cross-cultural interaction. Yet, the community self-identified in different ways. For instance,

my great-great grandfather and a few others placed the term “Halfcaste” after their names, whereas other signatories described themselves as “Maori”, “Wahine”, “Tangata”, and “Native”.

The use of ‘half-caste’ not only reflects the reality of a long history of Pākehā-Māori unions, particularly at Taieri, but also the word’s widespread use in government reports, census data and land legislation.²⁰ The term also reveals that within Ngāi Tahu and colonial society in the 1890s, people of mixed ancestry represented uncertainty in the economic, political and social world in which European and “native” were clearly determined. Nowhere was this more obvious than over the question of land rights, where Māori communities, with growing populations and small reserves, were under economic pressure. Ngāi Tahu leaders argued that the Crown ought to provide additional land for the growing number of people of mixed ancestry. As Atholl Anderson has pointed out, land transactions in Canterbury, Otago and Murihiku did not make provision for those of mixed descent, who were not included in the terms of purchase.²¹ Pressure on land at Taieri, with its large population, was intimately connected to the history of intermarriage because by the 1890s the Taieri was one of the Ngāi Tahu settlements with the highest rate of mixed marriages: its residents were primarily of Ngāi Tahu-Pākehā ancestry.

In 1869, a government committee reported on the “obligation on the part of the Crown to make provision out of the lands ceded by the Natives in the Ngaitahu and other Blocks in the southern portion of the Middle Island for the half-caste families resident thereon at the time of cession”.²² The committee suggested that Crown lands could be used to fulfil obligations, and on that basis recommended that the Native Reserves Commissioner for the Middle Island be instructed to investigate the economic and social circumstances of “half-caste” families in Otago and Southland.²³ Alexander Mackay reported to the Native Department in October 1869, suggesting that if large blocks of land could be found, these families could be located on their own individual sections, which “would prevent quarrelling amongst them [the mixed descent families and Ngāi Tahu] in time to come.”²⁴

Between 1877 and 1888, four acts were passed to provide “half-castes” with land in the Middle (South) Island.²⁵ Crown grants were set at just ten acres for men and eight acres for women with restrictions upon alienation. As in contemporary native land legislation, if the owner wished to sell, they had to apply to the Native Land Court to have the restrictions removed; those individuals who had been granted land without restrictions had to apply to the Trust Commissioner for approval to sell, who “had to be satisfied that the Natives possessed other lands” for their maintenance.²⁶

A small group of men and women at Taieri were provided with land in the 100-acre Clarendon Block, which was reserved as ‘half-caste’ land under the 1877 Act. Sections were awarded to Elizabeth Crane (née Palmer), Robert Brown, Tiaki Kona, Sarah Palmer, Ann Williams, James Williams, Mary Kui (née Palmer), Ann Owen, Jenny (Jane) Palmer and Hannah Palmer. Within several years the grantees laid complaints about the allocation of sections. In 1879, two years after the Clarendon land had been set aside under the 1877 Act, Tiaki Kona wrote to Commissioner Mackay asking: “I wish you would try and get the ground I was speaking about for the children of the Tairei [sic].”²⁷ He wrote to the South Island parliamentarian, W.J. Stewart on behalf of the community in 1885 stating that “if we had got it [Clarendon] at the First we Would have some Benefit of it [sic].”²⁸ The following year he sent a letter to the Native Department outlining the poor state of the land. Kona pointedly stated that “the halfcaste land

[at] Taieri the piece that Mr McKie blocked of for us is no good at all i wish we could have it in some other place [sic].”²⁹ Kona’s statement reflects the inferior nature of the initial awards of land. The 1883 Act allowed the granting of larger sections to individuals within their original blocks listed under the 1877 legislation in recognition that all the original lands granted were of “inferior quality” and “not sufficient for their support.”³⁰

Due to the high associated fees, a minority of the Clarendon claimants at Taieri had their sections surveyed in order to secure Certificates of Title. Problems over the lands at Clarendon continued, with officials attaching little urgency to their remedy on the behalf of the owners. As late as 1893 Robert Brown requested that the Crown grants for the land awarded to him and his wife Jane at Clarendon be issued.³¹ When the owners agreed to the sale of the Clarendon Block in the 1950s for scenic purposes, they discovered that only five of the eleven owners had been granted title.³²

Robert Brown, William Sherburd, and Ani Wellman (née Williams) likely added “half-caste” next to their signatures to further highlight the Crown’s obligations to them under the 1877 legislation. They used terminology that had purchase and meaning in political circles. Terms like “half-caste” have their roots in the context of nineteenth century theories of racial hierarchies at a time when social scientists, officials and the wider public were interested in the implications of the crossing of the “races”. In the colonial world, racial categories were used for quantifying and measuring the changing ethnic dimension of the population through the national census. The Taieri people leveraged a “half-caste” racial status in the public domain as a political tool to gain land. Within their own community, they based their identity on whakapapa, the foundation of te ao Māori. As their letter reveals, these “official” racial categories sat uneasily with their other stated identity “as members of the Ngaitahu and Ngatimamoe”. However, in a world underpinned by whakapapa one could be of mixed ancestry *and* Ngāi Tahu.

By 1892, then, a culmination of factors informed the creation of the Taieri letter. First, the poor quality of reserve land unable to sustain the population, combined with large families, meant having to travel for work. Second, the population was primarily of mixed ancestry; in an era when colonial racial categories defined entitlements, the Taieri people utilised them to stake their claim for government assistance, particularly as the land awarded under earlier legislation was not usable. It is not surprising that many families were struggling to survive given the size of population, placed at 170 by Kona in 1893.³³

The letter was not a one-off. Other forms of political action were built into community life at Taieri, including the establishment of a rūnanga, or a committee, in the 1890s, presenting evidence before Royal Commissions and government inquiries into land grievances, extending to attendance, and most significantly, speaking roles at major hui. The rūnanga and individual families also contributed money to Te Kēreme, a fighting fund established in 1879 to press for the investigation into land grievances.³⁴ The kāika families also corresponded with Mackay and with the Native Minister on a wide variety of matters. In 1892, Kona drew attention to “the sickness that is prevalent among the Natives of this district at present, and they (the Natives) are so poor that they cannot afford to employ a doctor, and can only get medical advice if I become responsible for the doctor’s fees, which I cannot afford to do.”³⁵ Poor health was compounded by poor sanitation and inability to access clean water. The residents repeatedly requested water tanks for the kāika houses “as the water in the river is not fit for use for

domestic purposes, as when it rains the water is muddy, and when not raining the tide comes up and makes the water salt.”³⁶

Having participated in government enquiries, the families were keen to ensure they would not be forgotten if the “landless natives” legislation was to proceed as Cadman had hinted in 1892. The question of “landless natives” arose out of Alexander Mackay’s Middle Island Native Land Claims Commission 1891, which had investigated the adequacy of the reserves set aside for Ngāi Tahu for their maintenance and support under the succession of land purchases from 1844 to 1864. At every community he visited Mackay heard personal stories of poverty and hardship, of the poor quality of land and the necessity of having to survive off seasonal labour. He found that the reserves were inadequate for the needs of Ngāi Tahu families.

When Mackay’s Commission sat at Henley to hear evidence from Taieri reserve families, Tiaki Kona spoke on their behalf. He detailed the insufficiency of their lands, from which they were unable to make a living and as a result were dependent upon work from local settlers at shearing and harvesting to earn a small income.³⁷ This situation was compounded by the poor quality of land at the Taieri Native Reserve, as it was not only unproductive but too precipitous to use. The only part of the reserve that was fit for cultivation was a few acres of low-lying ground around their dwellings, while the rest of the block was let at a low rent to the nearby Henley Estate.³⁸ The ability of some to work was restricted by illness and age, while “others were just able to live and that was all.”³⁹ At the Ōtākou hui attended by Cadman in December 1892, Māori related the same situation outlined by Kona to McKay’s Commission the previous year. Official records demonstrate the validity of their concerns; in 1892 several families, including that of William Sherburd, a signatory to the Taieri letter, were listed as indigent and receiving aid from the government.⁴⁰

At Taieri, Mackay found that twenty-four adults had no land, ten of whom were women; that twenty were “insufficiently provided” with land, eleven of whom were women; and only six individuals owned land over 50 acres.⁴¹ Overall, 88 percent of people at Taieri were either landless or owned insufficient lands for their sustenance, comparable with the wider Ngāi Tahu rates which hovered around 90 percent.⁴² Mackay’s investigation revealed that many landless Ngāi Tahu were also of mixed ancestry, which aligns with the signatories to the Taieri letter who self-identified as “half-caste”.

In 1906, the South Island Landless Natives Act (SILNA) was passed. It formalised a process that was already under way, awarding crown grants to landless Ngāi Tahu. Like the Half-Caste Crown Grant Acts of the 1870s and 1880s, the land awarded was of a varied nature, often inaccessible and unsuitable for settlement.⁴³ From the 1890s, Taieri families took a keen interest in the awarding of these lands, sending representatives to examine the parcels set aside. Tiaki Kona wrote to Tame Parata, the Southern Māori M.P., in 1899:

How are you getting on with the Land for the Maoris, that land down at the Waiau is too far. In allowing 50 acres in these outlandish places it is only equal to about 4 or 5 [acres] close to their homes, & besides as the old people [are] dying off it simply means that the rising generations will go [to] this land to earn a living thus leaving the old kaiks to die out. Besides this land at Caitlins the Natives will not be able to get any return for years & years. It would have been better if the Govmt has given the Maoris 2 or 3 acres in one of these estates they are always buying. Try and get it fixed up at once [sic].⁴⁴

In his forthright criticism of the government's choice of land and his recommendation that other locations be chosen, Kona identified how awarding lands in remote areas compounded the difficulties that small communities such as those at Taieri faced. Any attempt to keep the community viable was undermined by land grants situated in remote areas in combination with the loss of kaumātua, the poor nature of their reserve land, and the work of the Native Land Court in breaking up ownership through succession.

To maintain community links the Taieri families wanted land to be allocated in family groups. In 1893, the rūnanga resolved:

We, the people of Taieri, who are not provided with land are willing to accept the land the Crown is giving, as indicated in the plans at Waiau, Rotohapa, Tautuku, and other localities, and Wanaka. If there is not enough to satisfy each man, woman, and child's share, we will absorb all those lands. A delegate from the Taieri Runanga has been to inspect those lands, and in his opinion they are of a fair character. 1. We, the persons who are unprovided with land (list attached), would ask the Government to allot the shares in equal proportions for each man, woman and child, so that the share will not be less than those allotted to male adults, because owing to the character of the land they cannot be supported by a less quantity. 2. We apply to Government to block out the land for the Taieri people, who are unprovided with land, that each family may have their land together in the Waiau, Tautuku, Rotohapa, and Wanaka Blocks.⁴⁵

With "plenty of good creeks" and "easily divided into fair sized sections for families" the community preferred the Tautuku land.⁴⁶ The importance of family allocations is a reflection of the demographic nature of this community, one consisting of large families living on a small reserve. In discussions of allocations, the community sought a better deal for young families objecting to the acreage allotted "as they considered that young married men with families ought to have as much land as old people; men, say from twenty five to thirty years of age with families should come in as old people and have their fifty acres."⁴⁷

They were determined to remain a community. The foundation and strength of the reserve lay in its families who were led by confident and able leaders and who were aligned with the Ngāi Tahu polity. Large gatherings were often a feature of important social and cultural events such as weddings and tangi. Key to these events was the hosting of visitors and provision of hospitality by the matriarchs of the community such as Jane Brown, Mere Kui and Elizabeth (Lizzie) Garth. Growing up at the kāika in the 1890s, Thomas Brown remembers that his grandparents Robert and Jane "always had visitors from other pah" at their home.⁴⁸ Visiting and hosting were one of many ways in which to maintain kin links and access to resources. Magda Wallscott stayed at the Taieri with her aunt Ripeka Martin (formerly Karetai) where she was taught to weave flax.⁴⁹ From the late 1890s the community began to plan for a hall for political, religious and social gatherings. When the community established the Committee for the Native Hall on 20 June 1900 at Henley, many of the whānau of signatories to the Taieri letter supported this kaupapa by becoming members.⁵⁰ They were William Palmer, George Brown and William Brown, sons of Robert and Jane, Thomas Garth married to Lizzie Brown, James Tanner husband of Mere Kui, Robert Bryant, Ani Wellman's children, John and William Wellman, and John Brown, grandson of Robert and Jane, and my great-grandfather. Tiaki Kona donated the land for the hall.

Unfortunately, some of the signatories to the Taieri letter did not live to see Te Waipounamu Hall opened in 1901. Korako Mātene died in 1896, Robert passed away in 1898, outliving Jane

by three years. I imagine they would have been proud of their thriving community and their role in enabling the reserve's families to bring their aspiration to fruition in the form of a meeting space. Over the next two decades the community held church services and social events at the hall. The families also used it to organize politically, such as campaigning to protect fishing rights to Tatawai.⁵¹ William Sherburd died in 1903, but Ani Wellman (d.1913) and Lizzie Brown (d.1924) fully participated in the life of the community, as did Korako Mātene's wife and sons, all of whom were signatories on the Taieri letter. Teone Mokokoko died at Christchurch in 1927, having settled at Tuahiwi in Canterbury decades earlier.⁵²

Resonance

Small places and slight documents, like the Taieri letter, reveal big stories about land, politics and identity. Robert Brown and his co-signatories were participants in local and iwi-wide political action, and in 1892 added their voices to a mountain of Ngāi Tahu letters and petitions housed in Archives New Zealand's Wellington office representing thousands of signatures. Indeed, the Taieri letter was one of many forms of collective action at the local level, and sustained over decades. Letters also contributed to iwi aspirations, supporting petitions from numerous Ngāi Tahu communities to the government appealing for the land sales to be investigated. Letters, which have been the most popular genre of Māori writing since the 1840s, have a less deferential tone compared to petitions which generally adhere to an established formal structure. As a more active form of writing, Māori letters tend to be more direct in tone. As the Taieri letter shows, letters were also collaborative, the product of several hands, but also many voices. Compared to petitions, collective letters could be crafted with speed making them a popular form of communication. This is attested to by the fact that the Native Minister received letters on a regular basis containing appeals for assistance in gaining redress, or relief, on a wide range of topics.⁵³

Focusing our attention on place-based and kin-based histories, like that of the whānau who lived at the Taieri Native Reserve, provides many advantages. First, they bring greater specificity to Ngāi Tahu histories, showing how ordinary families contributed to iwi politics and the advancement of whānau. This is an aspect of Ngāi Tahu history that has gained greater attention in recent years with the publication of *Tangata Ngāi Tahu*, two volumes of biographies of historical tribal figures.⁵⁴ Although not analytical in approach, *Tangata Ngāi Tahu* does offer the foundation for a new phase of Ngāi Tahu historiography that is attentive to the myriad small stories that constitute the social dimension of iwi history. Second, iwi histories have often been narrated through significant tribal manuscripts, which were often the purview of the tribal elite, but letter writing was a practice available to anyone, as the Taieri letter shows. Indeed, this letter prompts us to ask what would Ngāi Tahu histories look like if we focused our attention on the written archive produced by people from Taieri, Taumutu, Bluff and Riverton? An amazing archive of letters written by Ngāi Tahu people of all backgrounds is available at Archives New Zealand, meaning it *is* possible to tell the multiplicity of Ngāi Tahu histories in our own words.

A mark or signature (a tohu) is a record of authority, symbolic of presence, and a political act. In signing their names to the Taieri letter of 1892, Robert and Jane Brown, and their daughter Lizzie, Korako Mātene, his wife Mere Hinehou, and their sons John Walter Martin and George Martin, Teone Mokokoko, William Sherburd, Hariata, Mary Kui and her son James, and Ani Wellman, left an archival memorial of a community struggling to bring about a just future for the generations to come.

¹ This article draws from Angela Wanhalla, “Transgressing Boundaries: A History of the Mixed Descent Families of Maitapapa, Taieri, 1830-1940” (PhD, University of Canterbury, 2005) and Angela Wanhalla, *In/visible Sight: the mixed descent families of southern New Zealand* (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2009).

² Robert Brown to A.J. Cadman (translation) 13 December 1892, MA1 1892/2250, Archives New Zealand, Wellington (ANZ-W).

³ “Native Meeting at Otakou”, *Otago Witness*, 15 December 1892, 13.

⁴ Minutes of evidence, 26 February 1891, p. 16, MA 72/1 (ANZ-W).

⁵ Bill Dacker, *Te Mamae me te Aroha, The Pain and the Love: A history of Kai Tahu Whānui in Otago, 1844-1994* (Dunedin, University of Otago Press, 1994); Harry Evison, *The Long Dispute: Maori Land Rights and European Colonisation in Southern New Zealand* (Christchurch, Canterbury University Press, 1997); Atholl Anderson, *The Welcome of Strangers: An Ethnohistory of Southern Maori A.D. 1650-1850* (Dunedin, University of Otago Press, 1998).

⁶ Atholl Anderson, *Otakou Evidence for the Ngai Tahu Claim before the Waitangi Tribunal*, November 1987, (Wai 27), 6-7.

⁷ Gail Tipa, *Environmental Performance Indicators: Taieri River Case Study* (Wellington: Ministry for the Environment, 1999), 6.

⁸ Win Parkes and Kath Hislop, *Taieri Mouth and Its Surrounding Districts* (Dunedin: John McIndoe, 1980), 19.

⁹ Alexander Mackay to Native Minister, 7 February 1868, *A Compendium of Official Documents Relative to Native Affairs in the South Island*, Volume II (Wellington: Government Printer, 1873), 148.

¹⁰ For an overview of the establishment of the reserve and its division see Angela Wanhalla, “‘My Piece of Land at Taieri’: Boundary Formation and Contestation at the Taieri Native Reserve, 1844-1868”, *New Zealand Journal of History* 40, no. 1 (2007): 44-60.

¹¹ Thomas Brown, “The Life of Thomas Brown (and memory of others) 1885-1974,” MS, undated, unpaginated (Private Collection).

¹² “Middle Island Native Claims (Further Reports by Mr. Commissioner Mackay relating to)”, *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, G-7A (1891), 11.

¹³ *Results of a Census of the Colony of New Zealand taken for the night of the 5th April 1891* (Wellington, Government Printer, 1892), 10, lix.

¹⁴ Brown MS, unpaginated.

¹⁵ *Otago Daily Times*, 24 February 1898, 3.

¹⁶ Brown MS, unpaginated.

¹⁷ Brown MS, unpaginated.

¹⁸ Brown MS, unpaginated.

¹⁹ On the importance of the river, lakes and wetland see Angela Wanhalla, ‘Living on the Rivers’ Edge at the Taieri Native Reserve’ in *Indigenous Communities and Settler Colonialism: Land Holding, Loss and Survival in an Interconnected World*, eds., A. Lester and Z. Laidlaw (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 138-57.

²⁰ Kate Riddell, “‘Improving’ the Maori: Counting the Ideology of Inter-marriage,” *New Zealand Journal of History* 34, no.1 (2000): 80-97. On Ngāi Tahu, the census and colonial racial categories see Angela Wanhalla, “‘The Politics of ‘Periodical Counting’: Race, Place and Identity in Southern New Zealand” in *Making Settler Colonial Space: perspectives on land, place and identity*, eds., P. Edmonds and T. Banivanua Mar (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 198-217.

²¹ Atholl Anderson, *Race Against Time: The Early Maori-Pakeha Families and the Development of the Mixed-race Population in Southern New Zealand* (Dunedin: Hocken Library, 1991), 28.

²² “Papers relating to survey of Native Reserves in the provinces of Otago and Southland, including claims of Half-castes at Stewart’s Island”, *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, D-20 (1870), 3.

-
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Alexander Mackay to Under-Secretary, Native Department, 6 October 1869, *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, D-20 (1870), 4.
- ²⁵ See Angela Wanhalla and Kate Stevens, "'A Class of No Political Weight': Interracial Marriage, Mixed-race Children, and Land Rights in Southern New Zealand, 1840s-1880s", *The History of the Family* 24, no. 3 (2019): 653-73.
- ²⁶ *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates* 7 (1892), 53.
- ²⁷ John Connor to Alexander Mackay, 7 January 1879, MA-MT/6/15 (ANZ-W).
- ²⁸ John Connor to W. J. Stewart, 29 July 1885, MA/13, Box 20, 13[a] (ANZ-W).
- ²⁹ John Connor to Native Department, 11 February 1886, MA/13, Box 21, 13[c] (ANZ-W).
- ³⁰ The Middle Island Half-Caste Crown Grants Act 1883, *New Zealand Statutes 1883*, 151.
- ³¹ Robert Brown to Native Minister, 8 May 1893, MA 1/1892/2250 (ANZ-W).
- ³² Memo Department of Lands and Survey to Maori Affairs Department, 7 December 1951, MA/1/78 5/5/89 (ANZ-W). Waitangi Tribunal, *The Ngai Tahu Ancillary Claims Report 1995* (Wellington: Waitangi Tribunal, 1995), 219.
- ³³ John Connor to Native Minister, 21 March 1893, in Supporting Papers to Evidence of David Armstrong, Vol. 9, Part 1, Document 14, Crown Papers (Wai-27).
- ³⁴ List of contributions and monies collected from the Taiari Runanga, 27 March 1892, 145OS/53, Box 22, Taiaroa Papers, Canterbury Museum (CM). Arama Pitama Papers, 61, 65, 66, 67, 69 (Personal Collection).
- ³⁵ John Connor to Cadman, 30 December 1892, pp. 47-48, Box 2, Folder 15, No. 15, W. A. Taylor Papers (CM). Medical attendance at Kāi Tahu settlements was discussed in *New Zealand Parliamentary Debates* 76 (1892), 428.
- ³⁶ Ibid. Connor requested tanks for the settlement as early as 1885 in a letter stating that the Taieri River water was "not fit to drink", MA 3/16 (ANZ-W).
- ³⁷ Minutes of Evidence, 26 February 1891, MA 72/1 (ANZ-W).
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ Ibid.
- ⁴⁰ 'Indigent Natives, Middle and Stewart Islands (Return of expenditure on), for the last three years', *AJHR*, G-5 (1892).
- ⁴¹ 'Middle Island Native Claims (Reports by Mr. Commissioner Mackay relating to)', *Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives*, G-7 (1891), 16, 20, 23, 25, 30-31.
- ⁴² Dacker, *The Pain and the Love*, 73-74.
- ⁴³ Stephen McAuslin, "Colour Legislation in New Zealand? The South Island Landless Natives Act, 1906" (BA (Hons) Research Essay, University of Otago, 2001), 1.
- ⁴⁴ John Connor to Tame Parata, 23 July 1899, LS 1/41749 (Box 398) (ANZ-W).
- ⁴⁵ Report from the Taieri Runanga to the Minister for Native Affairs, 25 April 1893, p. 53, Box 2, Folder 15, No. 15, W. A. Taylor Papers (CM).
- ⁴⁶ John Connor to Native Minister, 21 March 1893, in Supporting Papers to Evidence of David Armstrong, Vol. 9, Part 1, Document 14, Crown Papers (Wai-27).
- ⁴⁷ Connor to Cadman, 29 December 1892, pp. 46-47, Box 2, Folder 15, No. 15, W. A. Taylor Papers (CM).
- ⁴⁸ Brown MS, unpaginated.
- ⁴⁹ Magda Wallscott, Bill Dacker Oral History Collection, Dunedin Public Library.
- ⁵⁰ Henley Maori Kaika Minutes, 20 June 1900 (Private Collection).
- ⁵¹ See Wanhalla, "'Living on the Rivers' Edge at the Taieri Native Reserve'".
- ⁵² *Star* (Christchurch), 31 December 1927, 6.
- ⁵³ On petitions and letter writing see Lachy Paterson and Angela Wanhalla, *He Reo Wāhine: Māori Women's Voices from the Nineteenth Century* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2017).
- ⁵⁴ *Tangata Ngāi Tahu* Vol. 1 (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2017) and *Tangata Ngāi Tahu* Vol. II (Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, 2022).