OFFICIAL

IN THE WAITANGI TRIBUNAL
KEI MUA I TE TARAIPIUNARA

WAI 1750
WAI 1092

UNDER	**The Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975**
CONCERNING	**The North-Eastern Bay of Plenty District Inquiry**
AND	**The Upokorehe claim brought by Sandra Aramoana, Wayne Aramoana, Wallace Aramoana, Lance Reha, Gaylene Kohunui and Kahukore Baker**

WAI 1092 AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM FOR WAI 1750 INQUIRY

Dated: 30 January 2024

RECEIVED
Waitangi Tribunal
31 Jan 24
Ministry of Justice
WELLINGTON

Counsel:

Bryce Lyall and Hannah Swedlund
Barristers
Lopdell House
Room 2F Level 2
418 Titirangi Road
Titirangi, Auckland
09 889 1835
Bryce@brycelyall.com and Hannah@brycelyall.com

Table of Contents

THE CLAIMANTS SAY:

Introduction

1. This Amended Statement of Claim ("**ASOC**") filed on behalf of Wai 1092, the Upokorehe claim, brought on behalf of Te Upokorehe Iwi by Sandra Aramoana, Wayne Aramoana, Wallace Aramoana, Lance Reha, Gaylene Kohunui and Kahukore Baker ("**Te Upokorehe**").

2. The purpose of this Amended Statement of Claim is to add further particulars to the claimants' claims following the Ngā Kōrero Tuku Iho hearings and release of the casebook. Te Upokorehe continue to rely on the statement of claim dated 29 August 2008 where noted.[1]

3. The founding claimant of the Wai 1092 claim was Charles Aramoana. Te Upokorehe wish to acknowledge Mr Aramoana as a leading kaumatua and rangatira of Upokorehe:

> E te rangatira, nau ra i whakatakoto mai i tenei kereme hei oranga, hei taonga hoki mo tatau Te Upokorehe. Ka nui rawa atu te mihi ki a koe e te pakenga, ahakoa kua riro koe ki tua i te arai, ki tou okihanga whakamutunga i te kopa o te ukaipo, aore tonu matau e wareware ana i tou mahi rangatira, ate wa hoki, ka puawai ou wawata me nga moemoea hoki mo te hapu. Kei te hotuhotu tonu te manawa e pa, kei te ta mokemoke tonu matau, no reira, haere, haere, haere atu ra koe e koro.

Sources and Written Evidence

4. Te Upokorehe submit that any reliance on sources in this ASOC is not acceptance of the entirety of the source itself. Existing historical narratives submitted for the Te Urewera and Ngāti Awa Hearings, and the various reports written for Whakatōhea are yet to be informed by Te Upokorehe kōrero. Te Upokorehe reject that such histories written without their input can provide a full or complete evidential picture.

---

[1] Wai 1092 #1.1.1.

5. This concern is heightened when reports refer to source material that is either drawn from other secondary sources, or from primary sources that are unreliable. Primary sources such as Native Land Court minutes or accounts from colonial officials are not objective records of history but written for an agenda–one that often sought to undermine Te Upokorehetanga.

6. In hearings, Te Upokorehe will rely primarily on evidence from oral tradition and from reports yet to be published that have been written by researchers who have worked with Te Upokorehe directly.

Te Upokorehe

7. One of the distinct principal descent lines of Te Upokorehe is that of Te Hapu Oneone. In Te Upokorehe tradition Te Hapu Oneone are a people distinct from Te Tini o Toi, and were here to welcome Toi when he arrived. Te Upokorehe speak of the name 'Te Hapu Oneone' as representative of a people, not of one ancestor.

8. Te Upokorehe whakapapa to the famous navigator Hape-ki-tuārangi who arrived on the Rangimātoru waka and settled at Ōhiwa and to Tairongo who arrived on the Ōtūrereao waka and settled there. Upokorehe aki kā roa in Ōhiwa has never been broken or extinguished.

9. Prior to arrival of the Mātaatua waka, Tairongo, captain of the Oturereao, intermarried with Te Hapu Oneone, as did the descendants of Hape Ki Tuārangi, captain of the Rangimātoru, when he settled in Ōhiwa. This is the Te Upokorehe whakapapa link to Te Hapū-oneone of Ōhiwa harbour, through which the tūpuna Ani-i-waho and Panekaha were born.[2]

10. Other principal tīpuna of Te Upokorehe include Kahuki (who held the mana of both Te Whakatāne and Te Upokorehe, cementing many historical place names in and around the Upokorehe boundary), Raumoa, (tipuna of Ngāti Raumoa), Te Rupe (who was the Upokorehe War Chief

[2] Wai 1750 #4.1.11 at 9.

in the battle of Maraetotara), and Wi Akeake (who signed Te Tiriti o Waitangi on behalf of Te Upokorehe).

11. Finally, following an incident at the Ōhiwa harbour, Ngāti Raumoa became known as Te Upokorehe.

12. By way of intermarriage, Te Upokorehe also share kinship ties to Mātaatua. However, this is not a principal descent line for Te Upokorehe.

13. Te Upokorehe have forged links by intermarriage with surrounding hapū including Ngāi Turanga and Te Whakatane of Tūhoe and to Rongowhakaata.

14. The principal whakapapa descent line for Te Upokorehe is through Te Hapu Oneone. The iwi does not consider its primary whakapapa lines place it under Te Whakatōhea,[3] and has always maintained a separate and distinct identity.[4]

15. Today the following hapū and marae comprise Te Upokorehe Iwi:[5]

Hapū of Te Upokorehe	Marae
Te Upokorehe	Roimata
Rongopopoia	Rongopopoia
Turangapikitoi	Turangapikitoi
Ngāi Tūranga	Kutarere
Ngāi Tamatea	Maromahue

The Fundamental Claim: Denial of Te Upokorehe Identity

16. Te Upokorehe say that from first contact, the Crown knowingly sought to appropriate the power and authority of the people of the claimant hapū and their rangatira. In doing so the Crown failed to provide for or take account of traditional hapū structures and refused to understand

[3] At [6].
[4] At [11]–[12].
[5] At [7].

and recognise the autonomy and authority of the rangatira and the whānau which made up Te Upokorehe as a hapū and tribe at that time.

17. The Crown failed to allow for the claimants to regulate their own affairs within their rohe according to their own tikanga and cultural and customary norms, and to continue to practice and develop their leadership and decision-making processes.

18. The fundamental allegation in this claim, therefore, concerns Te Upokorehetanga, or identity. Te Upokorehe say that since first contact the Crown has sought to undermine, misinterpret, and diminish the identity of Te Upokorehe in order to better achieve its own ends.

19. While the allegations of Tiriti breach outlined below are significant in their own right, each additional breach has caused cascading and compounding damage, hurt, and prejudice to the identity of all five extant Te Upokorehe hapū, and their ability to exercise their rangatiratanga in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand.

Te Matapono o te Tiriti o Waitangi / Principles

Te mātāpono o te tino rangatiratanga

20. The Wai 1040 Tribunal considered that Te Raki rangatira did not regard kāwanatanga as undermining their own authority. They regarded the treaty 'as enhancing their authority, not detracting from it'. [6] Te Tiriti strengthened tino rangatiratanga rights and responsibilities. While it permitted a new, limited Crown presence in New Zealand, Te Raki Māori understood it as an agreement that would sustain and guarantee those rights and responsibilities that their communities had possessed and practised for generations prior to the time of the treaty signings. [7]

[6] Waitangi Tribunal *Tino Rangatiratanga me te Kāwanatanga* (Wai 1040, 2023) at 59.
[7] At 58.

21. The Tribunal considered that those understandings must guide it in its interpretation of te mātāpono o te tino rangatiratanga in its assessment of subsequent Crown actions.[8]

22. The Te Rohe Pōtae Tribunal acknowledged Māori in the district exercised tino rangatiratanga prior to the signing of the Treaty. Tino rangatiratanga encompassed authority in a wide range of spheres – including political, social, economic, diplomatic, and military. It cannot be separated from mana.[9]

23. As there are anomalies between the text of the Treaty, guaranteeing rangatiratanga, and the actions and beliefs of the Crown, the Tribunal considered they must look to what the Rangatira of the district understood when signing. [10] Māori would have:[11]

> Understood it [the Treaty] to be a guarantee of their authority, autonomy, and independence. This encompassed their rights to maintain control of, use, and develop their lands, villages and other taonga. It also included rights to determine their own social, political, and institutional structures.

24. The Wai 898 Tribunal considered that the right of kāwanatanga was also granted to the Crown – but this was a power that was equal to rangatiratanga. [12] As such, more discussion was needed between the parties as to how their respective forms of power would co-exist and overlap.[13] Tikanga is central to tino rangatiratanga. Tikanga underpinned how 'tino rangatiratanga' was exercised as it was relevant to Māori land tenure, the environment, social and political relationships, and generally to the Māori way of life in Te Rohe Pōtae. Tikanga mediated

---

[8] At 59.
[9] Waitangi Tribunal *Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report on Te Rohe Potae Claims* (Wai 898, 2023) at 155.
[10] At 155.
[11] At 155.
[12] At 156.
[13] At 166.

relationships between people and taonga, and was therefore an integral aspect of tino rangatiratanga. [14]

25. Because the guarantee of rangatiratanga was a promise of protection for Māori autonomy, the Crown was obliged to respect Māori tikanga as a system of law, policy, and practice. As such, the guarantee of tino rangatiratanga encompasses the exercise of tikanga.[15]

Te mātāpono o te kāwanatanga

26. The Wai 1040 panel concluded that Te Raki rangatira expected the authority of the Kawana would be confined to his own sphere, and that the Treaty required the Crown to engage with Te Raki rangatira on matters that might impact the respective spheres of each of them. [16]

27. Within te Tiriti, the crucial guarantee in the Rangatira's own language was that of their tino rangatiratanga over their whenua, their kāinga, and all their taonga. The Crown's treaty obligation was accordingly to foster tino rangatiratanga, not to undermine it. The Tribunal considered, in the context of Te Raki that: [17]

> When tensions arose with Te Raki Māori after its proclamations of sovereignty, it must refrain from coercing them into submission to Crown authority by the use of force, or the threat of force – an obligation which was greater when kāwanatanga was newly established, and the Crown was aware that Ngāpuhi prized their independence and were apprehensive about Crown actions.

28. In the absence of such exceptional circumstances, such as war, or in the interests of public safety, or in matters involving the national interest, the

---

[14] At 157.
[15] At 182.
[16] Waitangi Tribunal *Tino Rangatiratanga me te Kawanatanga*, above n 6, at 59.
[17] At 59.

Crown had and has no right to impinge on the rights of Te Raki hapū and iwi to make their own decisions.[18]

Te mātāpono o te houruatanga

29. Previous reports have found that the principle of partnership meant that Crown has the overarching authority to govern, make and enforce law, qualified by the requirement to give effect to Treaty guarantees.

30. However, the Stage Two Tribunal broke from this understanding and found that as Te Raki rangatira made no cession of sovereignty the authority that was granted to the Crown was not superior to that held by rangatira. The Crown's authority in Te Raki was expressly limited to its own sphere. Alongside it, and equal to it, was that of tino rangatiratanga.[19]

31. Therefore, the partnership requires both parties to co-operate in matters of governance. The scope and effect of these dual spheres of power, and how this is to be managed when such power overlaps, is for both the Crown and Māori to negotiate.[20]

32. These findings were made in relation to Te Raki Māori. However, in January 2024, the Wai 2180 Tribunal reviewed recent reports and remarked that the Tribunal has increasingly viewed the exchange between kāwanatanga and rangatiratanga as generally signifying a relationship between equals with separate spheres of authority, with partnership being relevant in areas where these spheres overlap.[21]

33. Upon review of the authorities, the Tribunal considered that the Crown had an obligation to enable Taihape Māori to exercise tino rangatiratanga in their sphere of authority.[22] The Tribunal noted that article 2 makes it clear that this obligation means the Crown must ensure that Māori have

---

[18] At 61.
[19] At 61.
[20] At 61–61.
[21] Waitangi Tribunal *He Whenua Karapotia, He Whenua Ngaro* (Wai 2180, 2024) at 71.
[22] At 73.

possession of and authority over their lands for as long as they wish to retain them.[23]

34. The Wai 2180 Tribunal also considered that recent jurisprudence on the nature of authority means duties of 'consultation' understate the importance of gaining Māori consent for intrusions into the realm of tino rangatiratanga.

35. The direction of the jurisprudence should be followed by this Tribunal.

Te mātāpono o te whakaaronui tētahi ki tētahi

36. The Northland Tribunal considered that mutual recognition and respect are vital qualities in the treaty relationship. As a principle, the Tribunal considered they flow from the treaty itself and the expectations of those who entered into the agreement. They were expectations that for Te Raki Māori were grounded in their experience of Pākehā who had come to trade or to settle. That relationship was underpinned by Te Raki Māori enthusiasm for western technology, for the extent of international trade and transport networks that opened to them and the array of shipping that visited their ports, and by their aspirations for future development, with Britain as an ally.[24]

37. Initially, the Tribunal considered that relationship at least had the basis of recognition and respect for each other's values, beliefs, laws and institutions.[25]

38. The Tribunal considered that it was the duty of the Crown at the outset to recognise and respect mana, tikanga, kawa, mātauranga, kaitiakitanga, and te reo Māori. At the heart of Māori values and the Māori way of life was and is tikanga. The Crown must recognise and respect tikanga Māori values and Māori systems of law.[26]

---

[23] At 71.
[24] Waitangi Tribunal *Tino Rangatiratanga me te Kāwanatanga*, above n 6, at 63.
[25] At 63.
[26] At 64.

39. For the Crown, its recognition and respect of hapū communities, their authority over their lands and waters, taonga (including awa, maunga, and ngāhere), and their values, rights, and spheres of authority, should be evident in the importance it places on the treaty guarantee of tino rangatiratanga.[27]

40. In the 19th century, this meant the:[28]

> Duty of the Crown, as the coloniser, to understand the take by which Te Raki Māori held land and resources; recognition of the relationship between rangatira and their community, and the importance of that relationship to decision-making in Māori communities; recognition of the responsibility to be transparent in dealings with land, as being essential to community well-being ; respect for kaitiakitanga; respect for sites that should be protected in course of land transactions, in particular wāhi tapu; and understanding of Māori relationships with their waterways.

Te mātāpono o te matapopore moroki

41. The Te Raki Tribunal accepted that this duty of active protection is widely understood and utilised, and that it had and continues to have an important role in the context of Treaty claims and settlement processes.[29] However, the Tribunal considered "protection" to be problematic as it misunderstands the fundamentally separate, equivalent spheres of authority that were recognised by the treaty and understood by Te Raki Rangatira. The Crown cannot paternalistically 'protect' what it has no authority over. The Crown, after all, had guaranteed through the treaty that it would not take steps to undermine or usurp Māori autonomous control over their people, land, resources, and taonga.[30]

---

[27] At 64.
[28] At 64.
[29] At 66.
[30] At 66.

42. Therefore, the Tribunal considered that the principle of active protection was not a duty arising from the Crown's sovereign status, as it is often articulated. Instead, it is an obligation on the Crown to help restore balance to a relationship that became unbalanced. Because the Crown expanded its sphere of authority far beyond the bounds originally understood by Ngāpuhi in February 1840, this duty is heightened so long as the imbalance remains.[31] However, partnership, not active protection, is the framework for governance of New Zealand.[32]

43. Upon reviewing recent reports, the Wai 2180 Tribunal commented that, in lands-based reports, the Tribunal has firmly established the Crown's duty to actively protect the right of Māori to exercise rangatiratanga in respect of their lands. It has identified various practical dimensions of this duty, including the need for the Crown to ensure Māori retained sufficient land of good quality for their present and future needs and to ensure local government and other bodies involved in land administration operate in a treaty-compliant way.[33]

Te mātāpono o te whai hua kotahi me te matatika mana whakahaere

44. The Wai 1040 Tribunal considered that Te Raki Māori expected that they would benefit from the Treaty relationship with the Crown.[34] Māori also had the right to develop as a people and to develop their properties. The Treaty guarantee of full rights in properties (including taonga to which British law did not recognise a property right) and of tino rangatiratanga over them included a right to develop them if Māori so chose.

45. To this end, they expected (and the treaty promised) that they would retain enough lands and other resources to ensure their current and future economic well-being. The Crown's duty was to ensure that Te Raki hapū each retained the lands and resources that they wished to retain or would need to engage with the new economy and benefit from

---

[31] At 66–67.
[32] At 67.
[33] Waitangi Tribunal *He Whenua Karapotia, He Whenua Ngaro*, above n 21, at 75.
[34] Waitangi Tribunal *Tino Rangatiratanga me te Kawanatanga*, above n 6, at 67.

the treaty and from colonisation. The Crown was required to make specific efforts to help Māori become 'equal in the field' with settlers.[35]

Te mātāpono o te mana taurite

46. Through Article III of the Treaty, Te Raki Māori were guaranteed equitable treatment and citizenship rights and privileges, and the Crown undertook actively to promote and support both. Equity requires the Crown to focus attention and resources to address the social, cultural, and economic requirements and aspirations for Māori.[36] The principle required the Crown to act fairly as arbiter between Māori and settlers; it could not advance settler interests at the expense of Māori.[37]

47. This has important implications for Māori political representation in national, provincial, and local bodies that make laws or by-laws expected to apply to Māori. It also applied to Māori voting rights.[38] The Crown had a further duty to ensure that Māori land titles were equitable, especially as the basis of new titles was imported from a very different legal and social context. Its duty, therefore, was to ensure that titles provided to Māori under the Crown's Native Land regime were both culturally and legally appropriate.[39]

Te mātāpono o te whakatika

48. Substantive redress is an important step in re-establishing the mutual recognition and respect embodied in the Treaty relationship, for restoring the honour of the Crown, and providing a renewed opportunity for giving effect to the treaty's guarantee of tino rangatiratanga and, ultimately, te mātāpono o te houruatanga.[40]

Good Governance

---

[35] At 67.
[36] At 67.
[37] At 67.
[38] At 67.
[39] At 68.
[40] At 69.

49. The Wai 898 Tribunal considered the principle of good governance means that the Crown must keep to its own laws and not act outside the law. The Crown should be accountable for its actions in relation to Māori and subject to independent scrutiny.[41]

First Limb of Claim: Rangatiratanga, Political Engagement, War and Raupatu

Te Upokorehe and Te Tiriti

50. A copy of Te Tiriti o Waitangi was signed by seven rangatira on 27 and 28 May at Ōpōtiki. It was Te Upokorehe Rangatira Wi Ake Ake, who signed Te Tiriti on behalf of Te Upokorehe.

51. Prior to signing, Wi Akeake underwent a hīkoi across the motu to speak to Te Upokorehe whanaunga about te Tiriti o te Waitangi. There is kōrero of Wi Akeake travelling as far as Te Waipounamu on this hīkoi. After recieving the blessings of the people he spoke with, Wi Akeake signed.[42]

52. Despite the care taken in seeking support, it is not known how Te Tiriti was explained to the rangatira who signed. The reports generated of the signing do not give detail of the speeches made or explanations given.

53. Te Upokorehe say that when Wi Akeake signed Te Tiriti o Waitangi, he could not have intended ceding sovereignty to the Crown.

54. Te Upokorehe signed Te Tiriti to establish a partnership with the Crown, where both entities hold distinct and equal authority over their peoples. Where those spheres of authority would overlap and how this was to work in practice was intended to be an open conversation.

Building to War

55. Prior to the invasion, Ōpōtiki and its surroundings had become an important settlement for trade, with a number of hapū cultivating crops

---

[41] Waitangi Tribunal *Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report on Te Rohe Pōtae Claims*, above n 6, at 189.
[42] Wai 1750, 4.1.11 at 186.

and undertaking production and refinement of goods for trade. By the 1860s, the north-eastern Bay of Plenty was home to a thriving economy.[43]

56. By 1863, various conflicts were taking place over the motu with the advent of Pai Mārire through Te Ūa, and the Kīngitanga movement.[44] Reverend Carl Sylvius Völkner was the third resident missionary in Ōpōtiki, and arrived on August 1861.[45]

57. During Völkner's visit to Auckland in January 1865, two Te Ūa emissaries arrived in Whakatāne and travelled to Ōpōtiki. En route, Kereopa and Patara's party of about 40 Pai Mārire and 150 Ngāti Awa were joined at Ōhiwa Harbour by an estimated 10 Whakatōhea, including Mokomoko. On their arrival in Ōpōtiki they placed a blockade on the Ōpōtiki Harbour.[46]

58. Völkner had been informing Grey of actions of local Māori and had failed to condemn the killing of Te Aporotanga. This made some suspicious of the reverend. The Pai Mārire believed Völkner was a spy for the Crown and that missionaries were attempting to secure land from Māori. Völkner returned from Auckland in March 1865, despite warnings from Nikora and Mihiterina that he would not be safe in Ōpōtiki.[47]

59. As Völkner's schooner docked, it was boarded and taken over by the Pai Mārire group. There are no reliable accounts of how it was decided that Völkner would be killed or of who was involved in making that decision. However, during these discussions it was decided that Völkner would be hanged the next day, while Grace would be kept as a prisoner until the return of Patara.[48] That following afternoon on the 2 March, Völkner

---

[43] Tony Walzl *War and Raupatu 1840 – 1871 Report* Wai 1750 #A30 at 15.
[44] John McLellan *Raupatu and Compensation in the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty 1865-1874* Wai 1750 #A3 at 24.
[45] At 20.
[46] At 25.
[47] At 26.
[48] At 27.

was killed.[49] The other two Pākehā who were captured were unharmed, and eventually escaped with the assistance of local Māori.

60. News of the killing of Völkner reached the Crown officials at Maketū and Tauranga on 6 March and Governor Grey on 14 March 1865. Most of the Pai Marire delegation left the rohe after the killing of Völkner.

61. Further skirmishes with Pai Marire adherents included the killing of James Te Mautaranui Fulloon in the Whakatāne River in July 1865.[50] Smith, as Civil Commissioner of Maketū, first learned of the Fulloon killings on 29 July. A week later, on 2 August 1865, Smith issued a warrant for the arrest of those persons allegedly involved.[51] News of the killing of Fulloon increased demands from the colonial press for a military response to Völkner and now Fulloon's killings.[52]

The invasion

62. On 2 September 1865, a 'Proclamation of Peace' was issued by Grey. The proclamation gave amnesty to Māori who had previously taken up arms against the authority of the Crown. However, it explicitly excluded those who were 'concerned in' twelve murders, the named victims of which included Reverend Völkner and James Fulloon. It stated for those involved in the killings:[53]

> If they are given up to justice the Governor will be satisfied; if not, the Governor will seize a part of the lands of the Tribes who conceal these murderers, and will use them for the purpose of maintaining peace in that part of the country and of providing for the widows and relatives of the murdered people.

63. On 5 September 1865 the Gazette published the Proclamation of Peace and also proclaimed a martial law over the districts of Ōpōtiki and

---

[49] At 28.
[50] At 34.
[51] At 35.
[52] At 36.
[53] At 38.

Whakatāne. Martial law provided the Commander of the Military Forces with 'summary authority' and allowed those suspected of the killing of Völkner and Fulloon and those suspected of aiding and abetting them to be tried by court-martial.[54] This was criticised by other colonial officials at the time.

64. Colonial forces arrived in Ōpōtiki just three days after the proclamations were published, on 8 September.[55] The Colonial Defence Minister instructed the forces to land at Ōpōtiki, and seize those who had murdered Fulloon and Völkner. The Minister directed that if there was resistance 'no opportunity should in that case be lost of inflicting summary and effective punishment on the attacking force'.

65. When the force of 516 colonial troops and officers arrived in the Ōpōtiki Harbour and began landing, they made no move to communicate the terms of the peace proclamation.[56] The invasion forces lead with violence on their arrival, with the indiscriminate bombardment of a village using canons and firearms and shooting at unarmed local Māori. Many locals fled into the hinterland from the colonial forces.

66. By day two of the occupation there had still been no apparent communication that the force had arrived 'ostensibly' to capture those involved in the killing of Völkner. According to Gilling there is no evidence of the colonial forces attempting to communicate their terms with local Māori or Pai Mārire adherents until 17 September - day nine of the occupation. Even then it appears to have only occurred following the initiative of local Māori after a messenger.[57]

67. The landing of troops was completed on day four, 11 September 1865. Upon landing, troops exchanged fire with a group of local Māori. The Patea Rangers pursued them around the estuary to the village of Pākōwhai to a pā. The pā was seized, and Native Contingent razed

---

[54] At 38.
[55] At 39.
[56] At 42.
[57] At 40.

surrounding whare before returning to the village.[58] Once the local Māori population and Pai Mārire adherents had fled into the bush, the colonial forces began fortifying and establishing their base at Ōpōtiki.[59]

68. The colonial forces had only been supplied with limited rations due to the limited space in the transport vessels.[60] The troops ate many of the stored goods in the kāinga they occupied, as those on the ground describing eating "six meals a day" and living off the land. Material goods were either stolen or destroyed.[61] The forces secured as many as 130 horses.[62]

69. By 4 November, the commanding officer had arrested Paora Taia for Völkner's murder. On 30 December 1865, after receiving the Attorney General's opinion, the Crown released a memorandum on Courts Martial. The Crown stated that, as "peace and the authority of the law" had been restored, those accused of the murders of Volkner and others should be tried in the Supreme Court, rather than in Courts Martial. However, the Crown did not lift martial law from the district until January 1867.

70. From Crown breaches relating to the invasion and war of the North-eastern Bay of Plenty, Te Upokorehe suffered the following prejudice:

    a. The number of casualties from the invasion was a significant percentage of the population of local Māori. An 1866 census put the Whakatōhea population at 531.[63] Therefore, there was a casualty rate of almost ten per cent. Many of those killed included warriors, leaders, and future leaders, exacerbating the

---

[58] At 44.
[59] At 45.
[60] At 50.
[61] At 52.
[62] At 51.
[63] "Upokorehe" was named as a Tribe in the 1870 Return giving the names of the Tribes of the North Island. In the 1874 and 1878 Census of the Māori population Upokorehe was named as a Hapū of Whakatōhea. In the 1881 Census, following the Waimana Re-Hearing, Te Upokorehe is named as a Principal Tribe of the Ōpōtiki District.

harm.[64] Scores more were killed in the ensuing skirmishes in the region until the 1870s. While these numbers undoubtably include Te Upokorehe, there is no differentiation made in these census figures, and the inclusion of Te Upokorehe in various censuses from Crown officials is contested.

b. Much of the proceeds of the local economy was lost during the occupation of colonial troops.[65] The destruction of this economic base would have reverberating impacts in coming years, as local Māori faced landlessness, a lack of capital to further develop any land remaining, and in times of sickness.

Raupatu

71. Confiscation was implemented in the Bay of Plenty under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863. The Bay of Plenty District was proclaimed under this Act, on 17 January 1866, after action by local Māori, considered to be 'rebellion'.

72. For land to be declared under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863, the Governor needed to be satisfied that 'rebellion' had occurred by the Māori whose land was to be taken.[66] Although there was no definition of what 'rebellion' constituted in the Act, McLellan considered that, looking to how the Act defined persons not eligible for confiscation:[67]

> A 'rebel' was anyone considered to have fought against the Crown, or who had encouraged or facilitated opposition to the Crown, or been involved in an attack on others or the property of others, since 1 January 1863.

73. The Peace Proclamation pardoned all acts of rebellion prior to 5 September 1865. This means the qualifying 'rebellion' by Te Upokorehe

---

[64] McLellan, above n 44, at 47.
[65] At 50.
[66] At 76.
[67] At 76.

must have occurred in the confiscated lands between 5 September 1865 and 17 January 1866, when the land was declared.[68]

74. However, in the conflict that took place within this time, Te Upokorehe did not act in rebellion. Crown troops had arrived on their shores and almost instantly opened fire without any context. The terms of engagement for the Crown's presence were not announced until nine days after the troops arrived.[69] As found in the *Ngāti Awa* report, there was no organised resistance to overthrow the New Zealand government from the north-eastern Bay of Plenty. Te Upokorehe were acting defensively to protect their people and whenua against what was an invasion by the Crown.

75. The New Zealand Settlements Acts Amendment Act 1866, passed in September, provided that the taking of 440,000 acres of land was 'completely valid' and incontestable. How 'rebellion' had been defined, when it was implemented in the Bay of Plenty, and whether this was justifiable could no longer be contested in court.[70]

76. The confiscation of vast swathes of land under an extremely shaky legal premise, and one only legislatively validated post-raupatu, is clearly a breach of the Treaty.

77. Nevertheless, any land owned by, in the possession of, or occupied by those iwi, hapū, or individuals could then be declared a district under the Act and confiscated for settlement. The confiscated lands could be allocated to military settlers to settle the lands and preserve the peace.[71] In total, approximately 440,000 acres were confiscated.[72]

78. Following the raupatu, the Confiscated Lands Act 1867 allowed the Governor to create reserves on the land confiscated under the New Zealand Settlement Acts and issue confiscated land as compensation

---

[68] At 77.
[69] At 77.
[70] At 78. .
[71] At 75.
[72] At 75.

outside of or in addition to the Compensation Court process. These reserves of land could be issued to either 'friendly Natives', 'surrendered rebels', or dedicated to schools or other educational institutions for Māori or the general population. The Governor could also introduce specific conditions, restrictions or limitations on the awards provided.[73]

79. Most of the compensation in the inquiry district was allocated through sessions of the Compensation Court or through private negotiations between Special Commissioner J A Wilson and Māori claimants. As Special Commissioner of the Bay of Plenty district, Wilson was responsible for arranging the surveying of the confiscated lands in the area, as well as determining which of these lands would be retained by the Government, which would be set aside for military settlers or returned to Māori.[74]

80. By June 1867, from the original 440,000 acres of confiscated land:

a. 87,000 acres was awarded to Te Arawa for their assistance in the arrest of Fulloon's killers. Much of this land was in the rohe of Te Upokorehe, around Waiotahe and Ōhiwa.

b. A 57,000-acre block east of Ōpape had technically been 'abandoned' by the Government in an area where the confiscation had failed to be enforced.

c. 96,000 acres had been awarded back to 'rebels'.

d. 442 acres had been awarded to claimants or abandoned.

e. 38,000 acres remained to be arranged.

f. 151,558 acres was retained by the Government. About half of these 151,558 acres were provided as sections for military settlers.[75]

---

[73] At 91.
[74] At 88.
[75] At 92.

81. The New Zealand Settlements Act 1863 specified that land could only be confiscated to provide land for military settlers who could occupy it and offer protection against insurrection and rebellion and had to be fit for this purpose.[76] As little as 76,558 acres of the 440,000 acres taken had been allocated to military settlements by June 1867.[77]

82. From this, only 23,461 acres of the 440,000 acres confiscated were actually used to set up a military settlement. This is because the land that was taken was largely unsuited for military settlement, being rough hill country, bush, or marshes.[78] The *Ngati Awa* report concluded this excess land was taken for the purpose of Pākehā settlement over time – despite there being no allowance for land to be taken for this purpose under the Act.[79]

Compensation Court

83. Four sessions of the Compensation Court were held in the Bay of Plenty between March and December 1867. The Compensation Court was one of the mechanisms through which the eligibility of claimants to receive awards of land or payment as compensation for the loss of land under the New Zealand Settlement Acts 1863 was determined.[80]

84. The conduct of the Compensation Court fell short of the Treaty standard in many regards. It conducted business while the Crown's invasion continued. Although the day-to-day conduct of the Compensation Court is difficult to assess, as there is limited documentation around decisions, a theme of cavalier or unscrupulous Crown conduct is clear.[81] Te Upokorehe say that the Court acted in accordance with its own bias, and was not impartial.

---

[76] At 75.
[77] At 81.
[78] At 75.
[79] At 75.
[80] At 103.
[81] At 112.

85. Where it did make grants, the whenua was returned to individuals with the customary title purporting to be extinguished.

86. Initially, the Crown failed to appoint an experienced Judge at the commencement of the first sitting of the Ōpōtiki Compensation Court, with a single Judge presiding for most of its first sitting.[82]

87. Little time was allowed for claims to be filed. The Compensation Court sessions were often held under short notice, in areas remote from the lands claimed and the residence of many of the applicants. Sessions were also often held during times of harvest or in the midst of ongoing hostilities.[83] Members of the Upokorehe Tribe did not receive adequate notice, and had difficulty travelling to the Compensation Court sittings. This meant sittings were missed and Te Upokorehe often incurred costs.

88. During the Maketū sitting, for example, the minutes make no mention of a legal representative for Māori claimants.[84]

89. The standards the Court applied for the return of land appear to be arbitrary. McLellan notes that despite 'surrendered rebels' being eligible for awards of land it appeared admitting involvement with Pai Mārire still often led to claims being dismissed.[85]

90. Wilson's position as both Special Commissioner and as Crown Agent compromised the independence of the Compensation Court process. Holding both positions allowed Wilson to exert an influence over the Court process which 'directly prejudiced both the claimants and the nature of the inquiry itself'.[86]

Out of Court Arrangements

91. Wilson began making arrangements for out-of-court settlements in early 1866, continuing to do so during the Bay of Plenty district Compensation

---

[82] At 105.
[83] At 107.
[84] At 110 and 115.
[85] At 112.
[86] At 130.

Court sittings in 1867.[87] Both 'friendly' and 'rebel' Māori were eligible for these Crown grants, as long as they 'understood they lived under the laws of the Queen'.[88] Wilson established eight Native Reserves for hapū and rangatira across the Bay of Plenty district.[89]

Ōpape

92. Members of Te Upokorehe primarily lived at Ōhiwa, Waiotahe, and inland from those sites.

93. In April 1866, Wilson organised the reserve at Ōpape to be set aside for the 'surrendered rebels' of Whakatōhea.[90] This was to include Upokorehe members who were relocated onto the Ōpape reserve.[91]

94. The reserve was 20,290 acres in size and rated at 'best' second class land.[92] The question of how the Ōpape Reserve would be distributed or shared was not addressed by the Government until 1879.[93]

95. Te Upokorehe were given access to Ōpape, based off the flawed assumption that they were a hapū of Whakatōhea, despite having little historical connection to that land.[94] The Government, in effect sought to give Te Upokorehe the whenua of others.

96. Evidence from Te Upokorehe oral history will be presented, that Upokorehe whānau from Waiotahe were included in the original 'herding' of people to Ōpape, but soon returned to their lands. Thus, it is very likely that those few Upokorehe individuals who were put into the Ōpape Reserve along with Whakatōhea, were those who had inter-married with Whakatōhea, or who may have been visiting at the time.

---

[87] At 91.
[88] At 91.
[89] At 129.
[90] At 96.
[91] At 97.
[92] At 97.
[93] At 98.
[94] At 99.

This influenced the following census counts of Te Upokorehe and undermined the evolution and identity of the five Te Upokorehe hapū.

97. Te Upokorehe at Ōpape were eventually treated as just one of the six hapū of Te Whakatōhea and allocated partitions of Ōpape Reserve on this basis in Wilson's subsequent partition of Ōpape Reserve in 1880. However, only a few were recognisably Te Upokorehe from Waiotahe and Ōhiwa. Further, lack of Upokorehe as an entity in the Ōpāpe Reserve is seen in the inaugural report of 1871, which omits the name "Upokorehe" from those listed. [95]

98. This contributed to the Crown undermining Te Upokorehe as an iwi identity separate from Te Whakatōhea, which has reverberated through until today.

Hiwarau and Hokianga

99. In December 1866, Wilson negotiated a reserve of the lands at Hiwarau and Hokianga Island in Ōhiwa Harbour for the 'Loyal Natives and Returned Rebels' of Ūpokorehe.[96] Hiwarau reserve was 1073 acres, and Hokianga Island constituted just over 13 acres. These areas will be addressed further below. Te Upokorehe continue to rely on the statement of claim dated 29 August 2008 on this issue.

Delayed Awards

100. The final sitting of the Compensation Court was in 1867. Awards were not made until far later. Wilson reported in 1873 that "award schedules had been misplaced and confusion had arisen where titles had not been issued but lands had still been sold or resold without the official deeds."[97]

---

[95] Jane Luiten *Nineteenth-century Land Alienation and Administration within the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty Part One: Raupatu Lands* Wai 1750 doc #A12 at 82, Footnote 190.
[96] McLellan, above n 44, at 99.
[97] At 117.

101. It wasn't until the end of 1874 that an initial 32 schedules of awarded lands had been presented to the House and published in the New Zealand Gazette.[98] The first grant was not issued until 1874.[99]

102. Te Upokorehe was not able to deal with their land or have their land finalised for multiple years following confiscation, difficulty which continues to the present day.

103. Hokianga Island and Hiwarau were gazetted in 1874, to be granted under Sections 4 and 6 of the Confiscated Lands Act 1867.

104. The wording of these grants belies the colonial administration's confusion in relation to Te Upokorehe identity. Hokianga Island was granted as a reserve to 'the Members of the Upokorehe Hapū'. Hiwarau was granted as a reserve to "the Members of the Upokorehe Tribe".

105. Only a small proportion of Hiwarau Reserve was capable of cultivation. The Crown reserved the best land for itself. The resulting poverty and difficulty cropping was, in part, responsible for outbreak of disease and famine that struck Te Upokorehe in the later part of the 19th century and into the 20th century.

106. Many people who were not Te Upokorehe were included in these lists of trustees and owners of Hiwarau and Hokianga reserves lists, setting in place future opposition and difficulties when the land came before the Native Land Court and in two petitions. Objections were raised by Te Upokorehe in years following but these were ignored or undermined by the Crown.

Second Limb of Claim: Land Loss Following Raupatu

Early Land Sales

107. Approximately 35,500 acres was returned to Māori within the Inquiry District, out of a total of 288,213 acres of land returned to Māori within

---

[98] At 118.
[99] At 119.

the Bay of Plenty confiscation district.[100] Much of the confiscated land included the flat land suitable for European-style settlement, cropping, and farming, and some of the area's most promising routes for inland and regional communication. Little of this good quality land was ever returned to Māori.[101]

108. Te Upokorehe lost much of their land base. McLellan notes that the land the government agents deemed 'good' almost certainly refers to the area around Ōpōtiki and the Ōhiwa Harbour.[102] Te Uretara Island is a site of significance lost at this time.

109. The Crown, during the compensation court process, gave much of Te Upokorehe's traditional land to other hapū and iwi. The Crown granted lands surrounding the Ōhiwa Harbour region to individuals who were not Upokorehe and who had been members of the Crown troops, along with the granting of removal of restrictions on sale.[103] Areas of the Waiotahe block were partitioned then allocated to individuals from Te Arawa following the confiscation of Māori land, from 1879 to 1881.[104] Most of these blocks were then on sold.[105]

110. Te Upokorehe will lead evidence that following return from the hikoi undertaken by Wi Akeake to determine whether to sign Te Tiriti o Waitangi large portions of his whenua had purportedly been alienated, in particular his lands at Waiotahe.

Native Land Court and Surveys

111. The Crown, in breach of its duties, established the Native Land Court. to investigate and extinguish Māori customary title and to convert traditional modes of Māori ownership into individual titles derived from the Crown.

---

[100] At 125.
[101] At 82.
[102] At 84.
[103] Luiten, above n 95 at 271.
[104] *Block Narratives North-Eastern Bay of Plenty Inquiry District* Wai 1750 #A17 at 393.
[105] From 391.

112. The Crown developed and manipulated the Native Land Court process to acquire land from Te Upokorehe, arbitrarily imposing significant costs on them while depriving them of their whenua.

113. The Court, its processes, and its establishing legislation failed to adequately recognise and protect the customary rights and interests of Te Upokorehe.

114. The legislative framework put in place by the Crown enabled interests in land to be awarded to individuals, and then partitioned and alienated without recourse to Te Upokorehe.

115. The Crown's 1866 land confiscation targeted the arable part of the inquiry district, where people lived. What lay outside the confiscation boundary was largely inland broken and forested high country,[106] with the notable exception of the whenua of Rongopopoia Marae.

116. The provisions of the Native Lands Acts laid out a scheme where Māori claiming to have customary interests in a defined land block could apply to the Native Land Court for title determination. Later legislation allowed for the Crown to also apply.

117. Title investigation required the land to be surveyed. Those found to be the rightful owners under custom by the court were to be awarded a certificate of title to the block. No more than ten owners could be ordered for any one certificate. Any such certificate of title could then be transmitted to the Governor, to have a Crown grant for the land issue.[107]

118. 'Ownership' post-title investigation amounted to what was essentially an undivided share held in tenancy in common in freehold land. Land that had 'passed' through the Court was deemed to be freehold land. This meant it was no longer managed through customary law, but land

---

[106] Jane Luiten *Nineteenth-century Land Alienation and Administration within the North-Eastern Bay of Plenty Part Two: Lands 'a waho'* Wai 1750 #A25 at 9.
[107] At 23.

conferred by Court order and Crown Grant that could be freely mortgaged, sold and leased.[108]

119. The Crown introduced the Native Land Court system to the claimant's rohe without the claimant's consent and without consultation.

120. The Crown enacted Native Land Court legislation that caused the individualisation of Māori title to customary land and undermined how land was traditionally held under tikanga.

121. The Crown did not protect the interests of Te Upokorehe in their land as a collective. Instead, the Native Land Court explicitly operated to fragment Māori interests in land.

122. Through this, the Native Land Court facilitated Crown and private purchasing of great tracts of land in the district.

123. The Crown required surveys under successive land legislation for title determination in the Native Land Court. [109] The Crown required claimants to arrange and pay for the surveys.[110]

124. Surveyors could apply to the Native Land Court to obtain a charging order for any unpaid survey charges. This was tantamount to a mortgage, and could be registered against the title with interest of 5 percent per annum. [111] The NLC could order a survey under this legislation without the request of native claimants but solely with the sanction of the Surveyor General.[112]

125. The Crown policies and practices around surveying meant land was taken from the claimants without consent.

Waimana Block

---

[108] At 23.
[109] At 49.
[110] At 49.
[111] At 52.
[112] At 52.

126. The Waimana block, of 10,491 acres, was first before the Native Land Court in 1878 at a hearing held at Opotiki.

127. In 1880 the Native Land Court issued a memorial of ownership in favour of the Urewera tribe but granted interests to Upokorehe as a hapū of that tribe. Upokorehe however had claimed distinct rights as descendants of Raumoa, but the court failed to recognise this as an independent right.

128. The Native Land Court transformed Te Upokorehe's customary interests into a title held by seven individuals as undivided shares of the whole block.

129. The persons named as Upokorehe on the Waimana memorial of ownership should have been recorded as trustees, holding the land for their hapu to prevent the land being sold, but in fact they held their shares as absolute owners.

130. The individualised shares in the block meant that individuals could be targeted for purchase.

131. Much of the 320 acres of the Parish of Waimana blocks that were not allocated to Māori as part of the compensation process passed through the Native Land Court in the 20th century and then subsequently out of Māori ownership. Only 45 acres remained Māori land in 2021.

<u>Tahora No.2</u>

132. The conduct of the Crown in acquiring and surveying Tahora No. 2 did not meet the standards of the Treaty of Waitangi.[113]

133. In January 1887, the Assistant Surveyor General declined approval for a surveyor's request to survey the Tahora No.2 block. The surveyor, Charles Alma Baker, proceeded regardless without the appropriate statutory authority and against the wishes of the owners of the block who complained about the clandestine nature of the survey

[113] See Peter Boston and Stephen Oliver *Tahora* Wai 894 #A22.

134. The Native Land Court dismissed the survey when it was considering a title investigation for Tahora No.2. The surveyor lobbied the Native Department for retrospective authorisation of his survey. The request was initially declined. However, eventually, the Native Department granted retrospective authorisation.

135. Despite unified opposition at the subsequent Native Land Court hearing from Māori applicants, the Native Minister did not intervene, and the presiding judge allocated title to individual members of a number of iwi and hapū.

136. On 12 April 1889, the surveyor applied for costs of £1887.7.11. Despite unified opposition again, the Native Land Court placed a lien for this sum over the Tahora No.2 block. It was eventually adjusted to £1600, and the Crown took 6291 acres of Tahora No.2 for repayment.

137. Further allegations will be added following the receipt of research on this block.

Hiwarau Reserve

138. Hiwarau was included in a schedule of Bay of Plenty Native reserves and eventually granted to be held in trust for 78 men, women and children of "Te Upokorehe Tribe." Seven trustees of the land were appointed at the same time.[114]

139. The Native Land Court held in its 1898 judgment on Hiwarau that confiscated land returned to individuals did not involve an investigation into ancestral title. This judgment was followed in subsequent hearings and quoted in petitions seeking to determine interests and succession to the block. This led to the continued inclusion of non-Te Upokorehe people in owners list and undermined Te Upokorehe identity.

140. Hiwarau was partitioned by the Native Land Court on 22 March 1904 into Hiwarau A and Hiwarau B. The partitioning included two burial

---

[114] *Block Narratives North-Eastern Bay of Plenty Inquiry District*, above n 104, at 7.

reserves (Onerau and Oparaoa). [115] On 27 November 1940, the remaining land in Hiwarau A was partitioned into 12 parts.[116] On 9 December 1913, Hiwarau B was partitioned into four parts.[117]

141. In 1971, Hiwarau B1C comprising 19 acres 6 perches was declared European land under part 1 of the Māori Affairs Amendment Act 1967.[118] Almost 497 hectares (1,228 acres approximately), remain Māori land in 2021.[119]

142. The journey of Hiwarau through the Native Land Court meant that the block was partitioned and vulnerable to sale. Te Upokorehe had to fight in the Court to amalgamate their block to protect it from sale.

143. Then claimants continue to rely on the allegations set out in the amended statement of claim dated 29 August 2008 concerning Hiwarau and Hokianga.

Waiotahe

144. Of the lots allocated to Māori excluding Te Arawa and Te Waru Tamatea following confiscation, only a small number remain Māori land today, having passed through the Native Land Court.

Land administration

Crown Purchasing

145. The Crown's legislative framework for purchasing land deliberately alienated claimants from their lands. In particular, the law required that title was fragmented and individual, with relative land interests defined, before land could be sold. [120] This undermined tikanga ways in which land was held by Te Upokorehe.

---

[115] At 7.
[116] At 8.
[117] At 9.
[118] At 12.
[119] At 15.
[120] Luiten, above n 106, at 54.

146. The Crown failed to ensure that Te Upokorehe retained sufficient land for their needs and failed to provide adequate resourcing to retain and develop their lands.

147. In breach of good faith and the rights of Māori as equal citizens under Article 3 of Te Tiriti, Te Upokorehe were discriminated against in respect of land development assistance, contrasted with the assistance provided to non-Māori landowners, veterans, and farmers.

148. The Crown did not impose restrictions on sale, in its favour for purchasing large land blocks. The Crown enacted provisions that meant the Native Land Court's confirmation of alienations did not apply to Crown purchasing.[121]

149. The Crown did not establish fair purchase prices for much of the claimants' lands.

150. During the pre-emption period, Crown purchasing was based on a 'land fund' model for the colonisation of New Zealand. The Crown relied on profits earned from selling land acquired cheaply from Māori to settlers at an increased price to fund immigration and development of the colony. Māori were promised 'collateral' benefits would accompany land sales to the Crown through the development of their remaining lands and increased settlement within their rohe.

151. As the Crown's assertion of pre-emption introduced limits on how Māori were able to utilise their lands, it imposed reciprocal obligations on the Crown. The Crown itself recognised its obligation to ensure that Māori wanted to sell the lands purchased, and that sufficient lands were retained for the future. In the absence of any negotiation over pre-emption, the Tribunal has considered it was more incumbent on the Crown to recognise and protect Te Raki Māori tino rangatiratanga.[122]

---

[121] At 54

[122] See *Tino Rangatiratanga me te Kāwanatanga*, above n 6, at 881–893.

152. The Tribunal has previously found that such a land fund model could only work if Māori were quickly delivered real economic benefits from settlement in exchange for parting with their lands. However, the Crown barely met its own standards in dealing with Te Upokorehe land, let alone the standards of a Te Tiriti partnership. The benefits promised did not flow and Te Upokorehe were left without an adequate land base or capital for their development.

153. The Crown did not consider the needs of Te Upokorehe Tribe as a collective before buying land from individuals.

154. Crown purchasing peaked in 1893 to 1897, as the Government had both the funds and monopoly to re-embark on large-scale Māori land alienation.[123] This peak coincides with Gill's purchasing within the inquiry district, at over 600,000 acres.[124]

155. The Māori land on both sides of the Waioeka Gorge, in the Tahora and Oamaru blocks, was obtained by the Crown through large scale Crown purchases.[125]

156. Numerous Waiotahe Parish lots were on sold to the Crown by the Te Arawa grantees.[126] Only 115 acres remained while over 894 acres was sold to a mix of Crown and private purchasing interests.[127]

Private Purchasing and land boards

157. From 1907 – 1992, a total of 10,951 acres was purchased from Māori landowners in 114 separate purchases.[128]

158. The land that was purchased privately was generally very economically productive and concentrated around the coastal strip rather than the

---

[123] Luiten, above n 106, at 54.
[124] At 55.
[125] Heather Bassett and Richard Kay *Public Works Issues 1870s–2010* Wai 1750 #A29 at 113.
[126] *Block Narratives North-Eastern Bay of Plenty Inquiry District*, above n 104, at 439–442.
[127] At 442.
[128] Bruce Stirling *Twentieth Century Land Legislation and its Impacts* Wai 1750 #A32 at 133.

hinterland. This was land that was more intensively occupied and arguably more important to be reserved for future generations.[129]

159. The Crown did not enact any law or policy to protect the remaining Māori land from private purchasing in the district.

160. The Crown enacted law and policy that undermined customary title, fragmented ownership and facilitated private purchasing.

161. The Crown created and appointed Māori Land Boards without the claimant's consent or with consultation. These boards facilitated land alienation to private purchasers with little to no involvement from Te Upokorehe.

162. The Crown did not ensure that the Māori Land Boards followed the conditions established for the confirmation of Māori land alienation.

Consolidation Schemes

163. Consolidation schemes exchanged individual fragmented interests across partitions or adjacent blocks. Through such exchanges, individual owners or small whanau groups could amass sufficient interests to merit the partitioning out of those interests as a properly surveyed and individualised title. This facilitated the subsequent development of that land as an economic unit.[130]

164. The Crown enacted these schemes without regard to owner's desires to deal with their lands, but to facilitate development of the land. Consolidation schemes ended up with land blocks that bore little relation to the customary basis of the original rights to the land.

165. Consolidation schemes were also unworkable for many claimants. The land titles would further fragment through death and succession. Survey costs were often imposed and met through taking of land. Consolidation

---

[129] At 133.
[130] At 212.

was also a protracted and administrative-heavy process and the Crown provided few, if any, resources for claimants.

Land development schemes

166. There was a continued lack of any Crown assistance in the development of the few lands remaining with Te Upokorehe. In particular, the lack of development finance available hindered their land development. This was despite the Crown providing many forms of assistance to Pākehā farmers, through various loan and other development schemes.

167. The land that did remain with Te Upokorehe often required significant investment to be productive, as the land that was economic to develop had been confiscated or on sold.

168. The Crown provided some finance for individual Māori through the Native Land Trustee. These funds were limited and not available to collectives. When funds were given, they were often in the form of mortgages attached to land. This meant default ended up with land sales. The Land Boards also did not have sufficient funds available to facilitate development.

Local Government & Rating

169. The Crown failed to consult with Te Upokorehe about the establishment of Local Governments within their traditional rohe.

170. The Crown failed to incorporate the Treaty guarantees into legislation delegating powers to Local Government.

171. Only freehold owners of land could be appointed to hold office in Local Government. Te Upokorehe, who held land in common, were excluded.

172. The Crown failed to ensure that the Claimants had sufficient resources to participate in Local Government.

173. The Crown failed to ensure that rating was applied fairly, leading to loss of land.

Public Works Takings

174. Due to the raupatu of vast tracks of the most desirable land, the claimant's rohe was left relatively unscathed by public works takings. However, there were still some lands taken, many without compensation.

175. The Crown failed to adequately compensate claimants for the lands that were taken.

Ōhiwa Wharf/Ruatuna Road

176. The road was initially only formed through sections which were in Pākehā ownership at that time.[131] The Ōpōtiki County Council did not legalise the road at the time because of the demands by some of the Pākehā landowners for compensation. The Māori reserves were mostly 5 acre lots on the point opposite Hokianga Island.[132]

Ōhiwa Harbour

177. Due to prior confiscation of land around the edge of the Ōhiwa harbour, any landing reserves and wharves established by the Crown were on confiscated land. Public Works legislation was not used to acquire Māori land for these purposes.[133]

178. The Crown used land it had confiscated by the claimants to build infrastructure within the rohe. This was done without consent or without consultation with Te Upokorehe.

179. Allotments were vested in the Crown or Local Government for wharves, preventing their return or purchase by claimants.

Kutarere School

180. Te Upokorehe gifted land for a Native School near Kutarere, but it was never used for that purpose. The site was on Hiwirau Road four miles north-east of Kutarere township and was commonly referred to as

---

[131] Bassett and Kay, above n 125, at 124.
[132] At 125.
[133] At 153.

'Punawai'.[134] It had the status of 'European land owned by Māori' when the 3 acres were offered to the Crown for a school.[135]

181. The proposed school at Punawai did not eventuate. The Crown did not consider returning the land when it was initially aware the land was likely to be used.[136]

182. The Crown was not advised the land was surplus to requirements until over 50 years later, in October 1961.[137]

183. The land still was not given back, despite a nominal price being paid initially. The Crown instead offered to be sold to Henare Aramoana for thirty pounds. The sale did not proceed.[138]

184. The Crown continued to hold the land until 1975 when the Commissioner of Crown Lands considered that despite consideration paid the land was effectively a gift and recommended its return. It was re-vested in descendants after a 1977 Māori Land Court hearing.[139]

Scenic Reserves

185. In 1911 the Scenery Preservation Board recommended the Crown acquisition of 40 acres on the north-eastern bank of the Nukuhou River that fronted the main inland Whakatane to Ōpōtiki Road. The land was to be taken from two native reserve sections, Hiwarau A (Section 189 Parish of Waiotahi) and Rakuraki (Section 183 Parish of Waimana).[140]

186. A total of 58 acres 12 perches of the Hiwarau A block was taken under the Public Works Act for the Hiwarau scenic reserve.[141] The first taking was in 1912.[142] Individuals protested too much land was being taken and

---

134 At 231.
135 At 231.
136 At 237.
137 At 237.
138 At 240.
139 At 243.
140 At 312.
141 *Block Narratives North-Eastern Bay of Plenty Inquiry District*, above n 104, at 8.
142 At 8.

that the land that was taken had good quality timber on it.[143] This complaint was investigated, with the Undersecretary of Lands reporting that no further changes needed to be made.[144] Another objection was lodged against the smaller area to be taken from Section 183 Parish of Waimana.[145]

187. While payments were made on request, the Lands Department was not proactive about distributing the unclaimed compensation amounts.[146] Almost 30% of the compensation had not been paid out, 14 years after the portions of land were taken, and was only distributed on inquiry from the Māori Land Board.[147]

188. More land from Hiwarau A was taken in 1938. In September 1937, the Native Department reported that the Registrar had said 'the owners are agreeable' to the land being taken under the Scenery Preservation Act. However, there is little information about any consultation with the owners outside of this.[148] Only nine or ten notices were able to be served to the owners. 9 acres 3 roods 12 perches was taken from Part Allotment 189, Parish of Waiotahi.[149]

189. In 1939 the Valuation Department valued Part Allotment 189 at a capital value of £5, with no improvements on the land.[150] During the subsequent hearing to determine compensation, Mahaki Tuhoe, on behalf of the owners, objected to the amount of compensation saying £5 for nine acres was too low. The Judge awarded £10 due to legal access issues to the land.[151]

190. Māori land on both sides of the Waioeka Gorge (Tahora and Oamaru blocks) was obtained by the Crown through large scale Crown purchases.

---

[143] Bassett and Kay, above n 125, at 315.
[144] At 316.
[145] At 316.
[146] At 318.
[147] At 319.
[148] At 320.
[149] At 321.
[150] At 323.
[151] At 323.

Between 1933 and the early 1970s, various parts of the blocks were subsequently reserved for scenic purchases.[152]

191. Te Uretara Island is of special significance for Te Upokorehe. This island was taken during the raupatu and not returned. Today it remains a scenic reserve managed by the Department of Conservation.

Third Limb of Claim: Te Taiao[153]

Undermining Rangatiratanga Over Te Taiao

192. Te Upokorehe exercise rangatiratanga over te Taiao and fulfil their kaitiakitanga duties.

193. The Crown has since 1840, in breach of its duties, usurped and undermined the mana, the power and authority of the five Te Upokorehe hapū by enacting legislation asserting Crown ownership and control over the use, development and exploitation of their whenua and taonga katoa and failed to protect Te Upokorehe interests in their environment.

194. In addition, the Crown has devolved and delegated powers of management and control over the use, protection, development and exploitation of the environment and its resources to its agencies and local authorities, without regard for Te Upokorehe rangatiratanga and kaitiakitanga.

195. At 1840 Te Upokorehe exercised exclusive control over their environment and the resources within it, these were ngā taonga katoa and fundamental to their wellbeing.

196. Following the raupatu, and with the increase in Pākehā settlement the claimants rohe was subject to increased environmental impacts including the use, extraction and degradation of resources such as water, waterways and their fisheries, harbours including the foreshore and seabed areas

---

[152] At 312.

[153] The Wai 1092 Statement of Claim dated 28 August 2008 is relied upon on the issues raised under this limb (Wai 1092 #1.1.1(a)).

and their customary saltwater fisheries, timber, forests, flora and fauna and minerals.

197. As a result, Te Upokorehe have suffered from loss and degradation of their taonga, and from the destruction of the environment to the extent that their management and kaitiakitanga has been severely compromised and their economic opportunities destroyed.

Foreshore and Seabed

198. From 1840 the Crown asserted ownership and control of the foreshore and seabed. Te Upokorehe has protested the Crown assumption of ownership and control of the foreshore and their kaimoana beds and mahinga kai.

199. In breach of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, the Crown has enacted legislation to bolster claims to ownership including:

a. The Harbour Boards Act 1878 and 1980, which prohibited reclamation work on the foreshore without an Act of Parliament;

b. Harbours Amendment Act 1910 allowed the Crown to issue licenses to occupy the foreshore for up to 21 years and by later amendment allowed leases able to be freehold;

c. The Public Works Act 1908;

d. The Native Land Act 1909;

e. Harbour License Act 1923;

f. The Territorial Sea and Exclusive Economic Zone Act 1977;

g. The Foreshores and Seabed Revesting Act 1991;

h. The Resource Management Act 1991;

i. The Foreshore and Seabed Act 2004;

j. The Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2010.

Native and Exotic Birds

200. The Crown assumed ownership and control of native birds and imported exotic species without regard to Te Upokorehe ownership and customary practices through specific legislation including:

a. The Protection of Certain Animals Act 1861;

b. The Wild Birds Protection Act 1864;

c. The Protection of Animals Act 1867;

d. The Wildlife Act 1953.

201. The legislation undermined kaitiaki obligations of Te Upokorehe who were, in some instances, unable to practice traditional hunting and access traditional food sources.

Native Fisheries and Introduced Fish

202. The Crown assumed ownership and control of the freshwater fisheries within the Upokorehe rohe without reference to the ownership and traditional uses and practices of the five Te Upokorehe hapū.

203. The Crown passed legislation to enable:

a. Game fishing;

b. The introduction of exotic species into water ways to the detriment of native species;

c. The use of water ways for timber floating and extraction, thereby destroying or damaging the habitat of eels and traditional harvesting methods of the hapū.

204. The Crown failed to protect customary fishing areas including fishing traps and weirs.

Water and Waterways

205. From 1840 the Crown sought to control the use and management of water and waterways.

206. The Crown failed to recognise the ownership of the five Te Upokorehe hapū and their customary practices in respect of their waters and waterways, many of which contain wāhi tapu.

207. In addition, the Crown failed to protect the waters and waterways, including harbours from destruction, damage, and pollution.

208. The Crown assumed ownership and control of the waters and waterways of claimant hapū by enacting legislation and delegating authority to river boards, drainage boards, and local authorities including:

a. The Public Works Acts of 1876, 1908, 1928;

b. The River Boards Act 1884;

c. The Coal Mines Amendment Act 1903;

d. The Land Drainage Act 1908;

e. The River Boards Act 1908;

f. The Soil Conservation Act 1941;

g. The Resource Management Act 1991.

Minerals

209. The Crown failed to protect Māori ownership and control of valuable mineral deposits including, coal, limestone and clays, copper, mercury and silver, hard rock, Crown minerals, and other resources.

Ōhiwa Harbour

210. The Crown, through its actions and inactions have undermined the ability of Te Upokorehe to act as kaitiaki over Ōhiwa harbour.

211. The Crown and local government have not adequately or appropriately supported Te Upokorehe in their role as kaitiaki of Ōhiwa harbour.

212. The Crown and local government management of Ōhiwa harbour has degraded the moana and taonga within the moana.

213. Te Upokorehe have been prevented from engaging in traditional kaimoana kaitiaki management practices due to Crown restrictions.

Ngāhere

214. Through its actions and inactions, the Crown has degraded the ngāhere within Te Upokorehe's rohe.

Taonga Species

215. The Crown has not provided adequate or appropriate protection of taonga species within the rohe of Te Upokorehe.

216. The Crown has harmed taonga species and the wairua of te Taiao through the introduction of pest species.

217. The Crown did not consult or partner with Te Upokorehe when introducing pest species to te Taiao.

218. The Crown has not adequately partnered with Te Upokorehe when it undertakes remediation efforts to regenerate te Taiao.

Wāhi Tapu and Heritage

219. Crown heritage management have not been adequate or appropriate to facilitate the exercise of Te Upokorehe kaitiakitanga over wāhi tapu and heritage sites.

220. Through Crown action and inaction, wāhi tapu have been insufficiently protected.

Fourth Limb of Claim: Management, Social and Economic Issues and Harm to Cultural Identity

Pa Sites and Co-Management

221. The Crown has failed to protect or adequately partner with Te Upokorehe over the maintenance of pā sites Onekawa and Te Mawhai.

222. The Crown continues to own the land where these pā sites are. Te Upokorehe are relegated to a management role over their whenua.

Te Reo

223. The Crown has ignored or actively undermined the claimant's use of Te Reo Māori through its policies and practices.

224. The Crown has failed to sufficiently resource Te Upokorehe to pass down their Reo Māori.

Marae

225. Te Upokorehe have five marae, though only three currently have whare nui: Roimata, Kutarere and Maromahue.

226. The Crown has failed to fund or resource Te Upokorehe to maintain and refurbish their marae, and to reestablish Rongopopoia and Turangapikitoi Marae.

227. The Crown has failed to partner with the marae as bodies that represent the community's interests.

Tikanga

228. Through the provision of schooling, the Crown has intentionally tried to assimilate Te Upokorehe into Pākehātanga. This has the effect of undermining Te Upokorehetanga.

229. The Crown, through its policies and practices, undermined the value of mātauranga Māori of Te Upokorehe kuia and koroua and traditional knowledge holders.

230. The Crown, through its policies and practices, has undermined the traditional tikanga-based social structures of Te Upokorehe.

Economic Harm

231. Through successive policies and practice, the Crown has failed to ensure that Te Upokorehe have a sustainable economic base.

Inequitable Health Outcomes

232. The Crown failed to deliver adequate, or at least equal to Pakeha, health services to Te Upokorehe.

233. Through its policies and practices the Crown has undermined the hauora of Te Upokorehe.

Social Issues and Dislocation

234. Through successive policies and practices the Crown pushed urbanisation on Te Upokorehe communities. This undermined the traditional rohe and ahi kā roa of Te Upokorehe.

Statutory Boards and Authorities, Agencies and Companies in Crown Organisations

235. Te Upokorehe Iwi has been marginalised where representation on Statutory Boards and Authorities, Agencies and Companies in Crown Organisations.

RELIEF

236. The claimants seek the following from the Tribunal:

a. A finding that their claim is well-founded.

b. A recommendation that the Crown apologise to Te Upokorehe specifically for the prejudice created through Crown breaches of te Tiriti.

c. A recommendation that the Crown provide measures which actively recognise the rangatiratanga and autonomy of Te Upokorehe.

d. A recommendation that the Crown return land within the claimants rohe that is vested in local authorities or Māori trustee, to Te Upokorehe.

e. That the Crown protect and preserve wāhi tapu and sites of significance within the claimants' rohe.

f. A recommendation that compensation be paid directly to Te Upokorehe.

g. A recommendation that the Crown make provision for equitable participation of Te Upokorehe Iwi on all statutory boards and authorities, agencies and companies in Crown organisations which operate with their rohe to ensure that the role and mana of Te Upokorehe is not undermined within participation and voting processes on these bodies.

h. A recommendation that the Crown provide funding for Te Upokorehe Iwi to hui on further relief that would be appropriate.

i. A recommendation that the Crown, working with the claimants, establish a forum for the claimants to work collaboratively with the Crown and its institutions on issues that affect the claimants, such as water, the provision of social services, and forestry.

j. Any other relief the Tribunal deems appropriate.

Dated: 30 January 2024

Bryce Lyall
Counsel for the claimants

Hannah Swedlund

Bryce Lyall, Barrister, acts for the claimants on the basis of direct instructions.

The address for physical service on the claimants is Lopdell House, Room 2F Level 2, 418 Titirangi Road, Titirangi, Auckland.

Documents for postal service on the claimants may be posted to PO Box 60649 Titirangi Auckland, or may be emailed to: Bryce@brycelyall.com