Do you know this about the Tuawhenua....?

The history of the Tuawhenua Trust is set out below in extracts from the claims report for the Tuawhenua "Ruatahuna – Te Manawa o Te Ika, Part Two: a History of the Mana of Ruatahuna from the Urewera Dstrict Native Reserve Act 1896 to the 1980s", Tuawhenua Research Team, April 2004. The relevant chapter in this report is Chapter 10: Te Uruuru Whenua.

He Paihere ki Te Whenua

As the 1980s dawned on Te Manawa o Te Ika, the rangatira of Ruatāhuna wondered about the keys to recovering the well-being of their people. The milling industry had closed down, the landscape scarred by its activity. The farm was still in the hands of the Crown, managed by the Department of Māori Affairs with no hope of families becoming settler farmers on their lands. The rest of the lands about Ruatāhuna had been amalgamated for inclusion in the National Park, and negotiations on compensation for standing timber had gone nowhere. Ruatāhuna was populated by few people. The people of working age had left to make their living elsewhere, and only the very old and the very young remained. Some marae had fallen into misuse, one wharenui used to store hay, another to store the gear for occasional hunters. The school struggled on with a falling roll, and the people of Ruatāhuna made their homes in old shacks still standing from another time. Ruatāhuna had been stripped back to its lowest point. It was a test of rangatiratanga to find how to bring it back again…

Rangatira o Ruatāhuna – Hikawera Te Kurapa

Hikawera Te Kurapa was to play a major role in the developments in Ruatāhuna of te Uruuru Whenua. As the last living graduate of the whare maire at Hanamahihi, he was the

source of ancient knowledge and tikanga that he passed on to his people. As a chosen tohunga for the Ringatu Church, and the last of the old guard to live into the 1980s, he trained tohunga for the future and revived the following for the church. As the rangatira for his hapū, he led the claim by the people of Ruatāhuna to have the lands of the Tuawhenua removed from amalgamation.

Objection to the Amalgamation and Trust Orders

In the spring of 1978, Hikawera Te Kurapa, along with others of Te Urewera hapū and Ngāti Tāwhaki, had given his blessing to a proposed initiative in deer hunting and live capture to be based mainly at Hanamahihi, and to be serviced by helicopter. The initiative was spearheaded by Hikawera's nephew, Wharekiri Biddle. Some of Hikawera's sons, who had recently returned from trying city life, were to gain employment through the initiative. Wharekiri himself had returned from working in Wellington in the early part of the 1970s, to make a living as a possum hunter. By the latter part of the 1970s, he was ready, alongside others of Ruatāhuna, to try to set up businesses that could sustain some of the families of Ruatāhuna, or supplement their seasonal income from hunting and other sources. No sooner had Wharekiri's initiative for deer recovery started than the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board, as trustees for the Tūhoe Tuawhenua block, closed it down in December 1978.

The action of the Board raised for the hapū of Te Urewera and Ngāti Tāwhaki the question of who had control over the lands of the Tuawhenua – the owners of each block, who in this case had agreed to the initiative, or the Trust Board, who they had thought was only a general guardian for their lands. In January 1979, Wharekiri Biddle wrote on behalf of the owners of blocks along the Whakatāne River and at Pūkareao, asking the Registrar to identify the trustees for the Tūhoe Tuawhenua block and to supply the court minutes appointing the trustees. The Registrar explained that the land had been amalgamated in 1972, and vested in the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board. This was the first time that Hikawera Te Kurapa and Wharekiri Biddle had known that their lands at Ruatāhuna had been swept up, along with the other lands of Tūhoe, into amalgamated blocks under the control of the Board.

This knowledge set off a chain of events. It was simple for Hikawera Te Kurapa. He wanted his lands back under his control for his children to utilise for their living just as he had done in his working lifetime….

The muddle over the status of the Tuawhenua lands was revealed in August 1979 at a hearing before Judge Gillanders-Scott of the Māori Land Court for a trust order for the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board. Orders had been made for the former blocks since the amalgamation, as staff had not removed the title orders cancelled by the amalgamation from the court's binders. Objectors to the amalgamation had expected a rehearing of the orders in 1972, which had not been heard since that time. Wharekiri Biddle had been told this in answer to his letter of enquiry in January 1979. So it was at this hui that the case was put by Mr Wīhapi, for Wharekiri Biddle, that the Court allow certain owners to have their lands withdrawn from the amalgamation, and that the board's trusteeship be cancelled.

When Hikawera Te Kurapa decided that he wanted the hapū lands back under their control, some of the families of Te Urewera of Mātātua, Ngāti Tāwhaki of Pāpueru and Kākahutāpiki, and Ngāti Rongo of Ohaua, joined together in a petition to put to the Māori Land Court to withdraw their lands from the amalgamation and to remove the Trust Board as trustee. The petition had rapidly gathered momentum. Families of Ngāti Kurī of Te Waiiti joined in, then the families of Ngāti Tāwhaki of Ngāputahi. Tuawhenua owners living in

other parts of the Urewera, across the Bay of Plenty, in Gisborne, in Auckland and in Wellington and other parts of the country signed the petition. By August 1979, the petition had been signed by owners who together held significant or a majority proportion of shares in most of the blocks of the Tuawhenua.

At the hearing in August 1979, some of these owners, or their representatives, stated their concerns about the treatment of their lands by the Court. Steve Webster of the University of Auckland referred to the long introduction by Gillanders-Scott as the 'first two hours imposing you own highly respected views – a father figure'. William Doherty stated that his family of Ngāputahi had not had prior notices of meetings. Neville Jennings put forward the views of his wife's family of Te Wai-iti, to which he got a negative response. Jennings felt he was being 'attacked by the Court in trying to defend my wife's family land' and that he had been 'prejudged by the Court'. Jennings was told by the Court: "If Te Huia wants out, then apply for partition'.

The solicitor of the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board, Ken Hingston explained that the exchange lease proposals for the Tuawhenua had been rejected by the people and plans were being made for the blocks in other uses such as deer extraction. The Board sought limited powers to allow deer extraction. The issues raised by Wharekiri Biddle he considered could be overcome if he pleaded a special case to the Board. He noted that the Board had been requested to stop helicopters on Tuawhenua lands but then found that owners wanted their own helicopters to fly in.

Wi Hapi then produced the signed petitions to the Court which the Court referred directly to Mr Hingston, the solicitor for the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board. Mrs Aperahama Matete questioned the need to pass the petitions over to the Board solicitor, and then after a number of interjections, the Court saw counsel in chambers. The Court considered that the petitions were 'not proof of their own content but required to be established by proof'. The Court moved on, ordering the powers to the Trust Board to use and manage without power of alienation, and instructing Mr Wīhapi, Mr Jennings and Mr Doherty to file applications by September 1979 on their objections.

Essentially, the level of support for the objectors' case against the amalgamation and the trusteeship of the Board, represented by the petitions, had effectively been dismissed, and favour given to the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board to undertake operations on the lands of the Tuawhenua. Although Hingston had suggested that the objectors could work out a solution for 'special treatment' with the Trust Board, Hikawera Te Kurapa knew better. He had already put his case to the Trust Board, and the Trust Board had responded with the explanation that the amalgamation was not of their making, but had been ordered by the Māori Land Court. Therefore, the matter was out of the Board's hands. The parting comment to Hikawera on the matter was that it would take the law to put legal matters rights – 'Ma te ture anō te ture e whakatika'. As we have seen, this had been the advice of Te Kooti to Tūhoe in the 19th century in their dealing with Pākehā. It had become Tūhoe's approach to matters in the time of Te Whakamoana Whenua, but with mixed success. It seemed to Hikawera that this was a matter that the Trust Board could have resolved, and that forcing him to take a pathway through courts of law to regain his lands simply showed that the Trust Board did not want to give his lands back.

High Court Action

As the objectors, jilted by the Trust Board and by the Māori Land Court, considered their next move, Gillanders-Scott panicked at what had become an untenable situation over the

Tuawhenua lands. In November 1979, he recommended that legislation be passed to retrospectively amend the situation, but this was opposed by the Department of Māori Affairs. Gillanders-Scott argued that 'at the present moment all concerned are sitting ducks if any owner chose to launch a proceeding in the Supreme Court for a declaration as to the validity of a particular order or alienation'. Ten days later Gillanders-Scott resigned. Gillanders-Scott's worst fears had been realised. Proceedings for review by the High Court of the orders by the Māori Land Court for amalgamation and trusteeship over the Tuawhenua lands had been commenced on 15 November 1979. Hikawera Te Kurapa, Tangitawhiti Biddle, Tīkina Noema, Ngāhirata Jennings, Aperahama Matete, and Kāhui Doherty, representing whānau and hapū of Ruatāhuna as owners in the Tuawhenua lands, had joined together as plaintiffs in a common claim to have the amalgamation of titles and the appointment of the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board as trustee quashed.

Crown officers were thrown into some confusion by the court action to quash the amalgamation. But they were confident they could avert the issue. In March 1980, Crown Counsel, after meeting with Hingston and Buddy Nīkora, the secretary of the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board, informed the Secretary of Māori Affairs that 'it appears to be possible that the pleadings can be challenged on the ground of jurisdiction,' and he suggested that the defendants 'join together in moving the proceedings be dismissed on the basis that there is no jurisdiction to make the orders sought.' He considered that this would be 'a convenient way of disposing of the matter if it proved to be the case that there is no jurisdiction to make the orders sought'. Although the claim made by the plaintiffs was based on a number of grounds relating to the decisions of the Māori Land Court rather than the implementation of the orders, Crown Counsel considered that 'it does appear from the facts as I know them at present that had the orders been implemented within reasonable time of them having been made, there would be no basis for the present applications for review whatever.'

The Crown counsel had already been given an impression of the plaintiffs by the Trust Board's representatives. He went on to comment on that view:

> *The apparent motivation of the plaintiffs, who represent a small family group within the body of the owners of the Amalgamation forming the Tūhoe Tuawhenua Trust, is that if the Plaintiffs are not bound by the Amalgamation then they can see some prospect of vast fortunes to be made from deer recovery operations on what was originally their land prior to the amalgamation.*

These comments demonstrated ignorance of the whānau and hapū representation of the plaintiffs, their motives in job creation for the unemployed returning from the towns to Ruatāhuna, and the extent of the shareholding and numbers of owners that had petitioned the Land Court on the matter. But ignorance was commonly about at the time it seems.

By November 1980, Tīkina Noema, one of the plaintiffs, had died unexpectedly. In that month, the Crown Solicitor of Rotorua described his contact with Hingston in an appearance before the Court and in a meeting afterwards, and his reference to the death of the plaintiffs:

> *We appeared the next morning. Hingston took the jurisdictional point, argued it very badly and appeared to have given it no preparation at all. He filed his motion that morning and of course it had not been served and the Judge was not very impressed with that…*
>
> *Mr Hingston tells me that the plaintiffs are now divided among themselves and that they are dying off with great rapidity. He suggested that delay would be to his advantage, and as an aside I asked him what would be the effect of an appeal against (Judge) Greig's*

order to the Court of Appeal. He seemed quite taken with that idea and I took no further part in the matter. If such an appeal is made I think that is going to push Tompkins (acting for the plaintiffs) towards a rehearing in the Māori Land Court.

Thus, despite later assurances to the contrary, the solicitor for the Trust Board was apparently showing a definite interest in the outcome of the case, and was keen on any tactic to help defeat the plaintiffs' case. By December 1980, the Registrar P W Patrick was trying to play down the risks for the Māori Land Court and the Department. He explained to Head Office that 'the owners who reside at Ruatāhuna are only a handful in comparison to the many who live elsewhere and spread throughout New Zealand'. Tūhoe concepts of ahi kā meant nothing anymore for these government agencies.

As matters progressed into 1981, an amended motion was filed on 31 July of that year. The grounds were fourfold: that the orders for amalgamation and vesting were made without jurisdiction, as there was no evidence before the court that the land could be better worked or dealt with if amalgamated; that the 1972 order had been made without the owners being given a reasonable opportunity to discuss the amalgamation or the appointment of trustees, (and that this was a breach of natural justice); that the court did not have the relevant information on the relative interests of the owners before it when the order was made; and that the owners were not given notice of the application or the time and place of hearing. The defendants were identified as Kenneth Gillanders Scott, first defendant; the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board, second defendant; and John Rangihau and Piki McGarvey, the original applicants for the amalgamation, third defendants.

By February 1982, Hikawera's son Nīkora had died unexpectedly at Mōtu. That month the case made headlines 'Māoris sue to recover land' in the NZ Times. The newspaper reported that 'One of the families' elders has claimed that the recent death of his son was necessary for the land's return and further deaths would occur until the land was given back'. At Ruatāhuna the people mourned the loss of their son, and the elders referred to the whakatauākī 'Ma te whenua, ma te wahine, e mate ai te tangata – It is for land and for women, men would die'.

The NZ Times found that the case was very sensitive for Gillanders-Scott. When the newspaper contacted him, he said the NZ Times was running a 'grave risk of very stringent action if it printed anything about the case.' The paper quoted him:

You will find in this case that nothing has been opened up to the public…I intend when I put his phone down to get in touch with your principals.

Joe Doherty told the NZ Times that his family group did not find out until 1976 that their land had been amalgamated with other blocks and was being administered by the trust board. To retrieve their lands at Ngāputahi they would need to quash the amalgamation order for all the lands of Tūhoe Tuawhenua. He explained: 'A lot of the people still hold their traditional attachment to the land and feel their mana is threatened now it is out of their hands'.

In July 1981, Judge Greig of the High Court had directed the Registrar of the Māori Land Court to produce a record of proceedings to date on the Tūhoe Tuawhenua block. The hearing of the case lingered as the file was prepared and finally delivered in February 1982. Gillanders-Scott was outraged at the file submitted by the Department and wrote to the Secretary of Māori Affairs

With respect, not by the wildest stretch of imagination can it be said that the two High Court orders have been fully complied with by your Department, and to my way of thinking such is against the interests of all concerned on the application which must be resolved upon the whole of the res gestae and no less, whatever the outcome.

Gillanders-Scott estimated that the papers filed to the court 'would not approximate even one third' of a 're-constructed' file which he had seen in July 1981. Further, that 'reconstructed' file he considered was only a small part what had been before the Māori Land Court in 1972.

During 1983, G D Fouhy, the Chief Registrar was sent from Wellington to investigate Gillanders-Scott's claims that certain papers had not been filed with the court and that the 'omission was deliberate effort on the part of departmental officers to undermine the course of justice'. Fouhy's investigation found that at first there had been 'no deliberate attempt on the part of anyone to deceive'. But then he found some discrepancies. All the staff interviewed were 'well aware' of the existence of a particular minute book Whakatāne MB 58 (Tūhoe). The minute book's last entry was in 1975. The book had not been submitted to the High Court. Although there were no other specific Tūhoe minute books in existence, there were other sources of minutes and information that had not been submitted. Further the office had not made contact as instructed with Crown Law on these matters, and their records had not been 'kept tidily'. Head Office now felt it should direct the Rotorua office on these matters. Thus, Fouhy's investigation found clearly that there was substance in Gillanders-Scott's claims about the conduct of the departmental officers.

Fouhy was quick to emphasise the need to look at the 'practical problems of looking after this land'. John Rangihau had talked to the Deputy Secretary and himself, and Finn Phillips, the lawyer for the plaintiffs, had also talked to him about some of the 'practical problems'. He asked for a report on the people's support for the amalgamation, use of the land and relevant housing matters.

The report came from H P Martin of the Rotorua Office in March 1984:

I believe that the majority of the people are in accord with the amalgamation and I can say that the Trust Board was and still is in favour. I anticipate that the final list will contain in the vicinity of 5,000 beneficial owners and the known objectors are few.

Most of the land is steep country in virgin native bush or bush which was selectively logged during the late 1950s and early 1960s. There are some grassed areas within the Ruatāhuna Farm which are occupied by owners as mentioned in 'C' below, and there are other river flat and road side areas on which Māori people still graze horses, pigs and other domestic animals. I guess that most of the land will remain in its present state as an adjunct of the Urewera National Park, and there is little prospect of any intensive farming.

I doubt that many (or any) of the owners understood that the Papakainga areas which had been reserved to them during the Ruatāhuna amalgamation had been included in the Tūhoe Tuawhenua amalgamation. Certainly that is now a major bone of contention. I understand that the Tūhoe Trust Board (as Trustees) was taking steps to remedy the position and restore the status quo as to these areas, but of course the High Court proceedings stopped any further action. We have two bonafide Māori housing applicants wishing to build on the areas formerly reserved for housing near the Uwhiarae and Mātātua Maraes. The land is physically suitable and I believe we could obtain local authority consent.

In the Manawa-o-Tūhoe and Pae-o-Tūhoe amalgamations, the Court carried out a 'refining process' to provide titles for house sites, maraes, and owner-occupied farming land. I see no reason why the same exercise should not be undertaken successfully in Tūhoe Tuawhenua, once the High Court proceedings are at an end.

What Martin failed to add was that the specification of lands of papakainga, cropping and other lands to be excluded from the amalgamation or any arrangements made by the Trust Board for the Tūhoe Tuawhenua block had been a known issue from 1974, and the matter had not been resolved by the Board, the Department or the Māori Land Court in 5 years before the proceedings in the High Court began. This sort of performance by these agencies gave the owners little reason to believe that they would get back their papakainga, cropping and other lands for their own survival from the amalgamation through any other means than by quashing the amalgamation and the trusteeship of the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board.

Despite the gaps found in the file submitted to the Court, no more material was submitted by court staff. In September 1984, Gillanders Scott submitted a memorandum outlining the history of the case and his involvement. He referred to the missing amalgamation minute book and stated he was 'unable to accept' that the material lodged with the court constituted the record upon which he had the order under review. He explained that the Māori Land Court staff had simply not done their work. Owners who searched the Māori Land Court titles and the County Council Rates registers found only the old title references but no references to the amalgamated block, Tūhoe Tuawhenua. He put the problems of the Māori Land Court down to understaffing of the court and title sections, and the employment of 'too many juniors'.

In November 1984, High Court Judge Savage found in favour of the plaintiffs, accepting that many of the Land Court rules had not been complied with, that the orders were made without jurisdiction, and that the Court failed to give the owners opportunity to be heard on the order. These failures constituted a breach of natural justice, thus the amalgamation and vesting orders were a legal nullity. The orders of the Māori Land Court were therefore to be quashed.

This was a momentous decision for the people of Ruatāhuna. It had been against all odds it seemed, that Hikawera and the other plaintiffs had taken their case to the High Court. And now they had won. The people had stayed united upon 'te whakāro kotahi' – 'of one mind'. Hikawera Te Kurapa had underpinned that unity of purpose with a humble but determined resolve, and kept the whole kaupapa cloaked with the spiritual guidance and strength of te whakapono – the Ringatu. The lands had been returned but not without costs to the leaders that took the case, as we have seen. People had died along this journey. And as the people of Ruatāhuna prepared for a meeting of the Tuawhenua owners in December 1984, Hikawera Te Kurapa, his job now done, relinquished his role of leadership for the kaupapa and as an old man not far from his death, he succumbed to senile dementia.

The Owners' Perspective on the Tuawhenua Case

The people of Ruatāhuna reflected on the results of the High Court action. It had been a difficult thing to call their own tribal Trust Board and respected leaders of Tūhoe, John Rangihau and Piki McGarvey, as defendants in the case. But the system of court law demanded that these defendants be called, so that just as they had been parties to the formation of the amalgamation, they also became parties to the considerations regarding the request to quash it. Wharekiri Biddle summarises the thoughts in the minds of the plaintiffs

at the time, and their understanding of the significance of the decision made by Justice Savage:

> *Koi ra tāku titiro ko te whakakotahi hanga i te, te mea hanga kia whakakotahi hia ngā taitara o ngā whenua o Te Tuawhenua. E pā i te mea he kēhi e whakahē ana iā tātau tonu, i tō tātau poari. Ko to tātau poari i te marama rātau ki te kaupapa ki te whakakotahi iō tātau whenua, i te hiahia rātau ki tēra kaupapa. Engari ko ngā ture ā whakaoti ki te whakakotahi whenua, kāre rātau i mōhio. Ko te kāwana anake te hunga kai te mōhio ki ngā whakakotahitanga o ngā whenua. Na nā rōia kē hoki mātau i korero anei kē te whakakotahi, anei kē ngā āhuatanga o te whakakotahi whenua. Na rātau ngā ture ra i hanga mai ne, kāre i eke ki ngā ture ngā rātau i whakatakoto mai, ka whakaotia e rātau i roto i te kooti whenua Māori, ka whakaotia. Koi ra te kēhi o te Tuawhenua, ā mutunga atu ka raruraru nei ko te tīāti koia hoki te kai whakatau i ngā āhuatanga, he aha ngā kēhi a ngā Māori ā mo te kēhi o Te Tuawhenua na te tīāti ra tēra whakatau e kua oti kē iā ia te whakakotahi.*
>
> *Engari no te rangahau hanga he aha i taea ai e ia tēra, ka kitea iho e kāre i oti tika te āhua o ngā mahi o te whakakotahi i ngā taitara o Te Tuawhenua. No reira te raruraru hanga mai ka whakakorehia nei te whakakotahi o ngā whenua o Te Tuawhenua. E pā i te mea i hinga ko to tātau poari, kāo ko ngā ture kē a te kāwana i uta ki runga, koi ra kē te kai patu i te āhua o te whakakotahi iō tātau whenua, he kore i tika ko te mahi kia eke ki ngā ture i whakatakotohia e rātau.*
>
> *[That's how I view the amalgamation of the Tuawhenua titles. It was not a case about condemning our own, the Trust Board. Our Trust Board understood the purpose of amalgamating our lands, and they wanted this approach. But the laws for putting an amalgamation in place they did not understand. The government was the only party that understood the amalgamating of lands. It took the lawyers to explain to us this is what an amalgamation is about, these are the implications of an amalgamation. The laws were put in place, then they did not fulfil the laws that had been laid down, then they finished things off in the Māori Land Court. That was the case of the Tuawhenua, and in the end it was the judge that fell into trouble, as he was the one who made the decisions. That was the case of the Tuawhenua, that the judge made the decisions to form the amalgamation.*
>
> *But when it was researched how he had been able to do that, it was found that proper procedures were not fulfilled for the amalgamation of the Tuawhenua. It was for these reasons that the amalgamation of the Tuawhenua was quashed. It is not as if our Trust Board was defeated, not at all, it was the laws of the Crown that were the undoing of the amalgamation of our lands, because the procedures to address those laws laid down by them were not followed properly.]*

…

Reclaiming the Lands of the Tuawhenua

The return of the lands of the Tuawhenua lands to their original blocks came at a high cost – personal as well as financial. After application by the plaintiffs' lawyer, the government accepted to pay much of the lawyers' fees, but other costs of holding hui and conducting research were covered by the plaintiffs and their whānau. Collections from supporters raised $2,000 which went to legal fees.

The owners of the Tuawhenua lands established a Steering Committee to investigate land use and administration options in December 1984. The Committee researched projects for economic development including seed potatoes, native timber extraction, deer recovery and tourism. These proposals, as well as options for managing the land, were considered by

owners in meetings in May and August of 1985. The Steering Committee also took their work to the Minister of Māori Affairs in 1985 and 1986. The Minister committed the assistance of his department to the Committee when it was ready to progress its proposals.

The Committee took its proposals for establishing a 'composite' trust to the Māori Land Court in April 1987. The Committee had questioned the potential for bias by the presiding judge Hingston as he had been the solicitor who had represented the Trust Board in the High Court action for the Tuawhenua lands. But Hingston had dismissed the question as he could see not potential bias.

When the committee put its proposals before the Court and the owners, Hingston allowed members and representatives of the Trust Board and officers of the Department of Māori Affairs to disrupt the presentation, to monopolise the hearing time, to attack the credibility of the proposed trustees, and to disagree with everything proposed by the Steering Committee despite the support it had gained from the owners. Judge Hingston then allowed members and representatives of the Trust Board to put counter proposals for the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board to be reinstated as the trustee, even though this proposal had been rejected by previous owners' meeting. In his decisions, Judge Hingston only included blocks in the new trust where the owners had unanimously agreed for this to occur. Twenty-two blocks went into the new trust. Eight blocks returned to the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board as trustee. And fifteen blocks were not placed under any trust. Judge Hingston rejected the list of 20 people selected by the owners and proposed by the Steering Committee as the trustees for the new trust. Instead, on his own initiative, and against the requests of the Steering Committee and the owners' meetings, he selected three members of the Tūhoe Waikaremoana Māori Trust Board and three people from the list of 20 as trustees for the new trust.

For the original plaintiffs and the Tuawhenua Lands Steering Committee, the victory of the High Court action in 1984, had suddenly gone hollow…

If you want more information on this kaupapa then refer to the claims report or contact us at the Tuawhenua Office.