

CHAPTER 12

IMPACTS ON NGATI TURANGITUKUA

12.1 INTRODUCTION

In the 1960s, when the Crown, principally through the agency of the Ministry of Works, embarked on the construction of the TPD and the Turangi township, there was no requirement to carry out any investigation of social, economic, and environmental impacts, and none was done. In 1972 Cabinet guidelines on environmental protection and enhancement procedures were promulgated and the Commission for the Environment was established. The first environmental impact statement and the first 'audit' by the Commission for the Environment were completed in 1973 for the Rangipo power scheme.¹ By this stage, Turangi was an established township of over 6000 people, and the principal concerns relating to the 'human environment' in these reports had to do with ensuring a sustainable level of local employment by proceeding to the Rangipo stage of the TPD.

During the 1980s, environmental impact assessment procedures were developed more fully, and greater attention was paid to the social effects of large development projects. The Tribunal has heard a submission from Mary-Jane Rivers, a consultant in social impact assessment and social policy analysis. She commented on the types of social effects which are likely to occur in a project such as the TPD, including visible alteration of the physical landscape, increases in population and employment opportunities, a new infrastructure, and various secondary spin-off effects.

Ms Rivers identified the key issues in any social impact assessment as:

- the rate and type of change to a community, arising from a combination of the characteristics of the project and the host community; and
- the knowledge, understanding, involvement, and agreement of the host community to the changes being introduced (A25:4).

Ngati Turangitukua were the 'host community' and, for many local people, the Ministry of Works and its bulldozers were uninvited and unwelcome guests. Now, in the 1990s, any assessment of the potential impacts of a development project is carried out in the initial planning phase, and is governed by legislative provisions, particularly those found in the Resource Management Act 1991. In the 1960s, the Crown, as developer, was not bound by the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1953 and its amendments. It was not until the Town and Country Planning Act 1977 that there was any legislative recognition of Maori concerns. One of several 'matters of national importance' to be taken into account was 'The relationship of the Maori people and their culture and traditions with their ancestral land' under section 3(1)(g). There was no mention of the Treaty of Waitangi and the Crown's obligations to Maori until 1991, when the Resource Management Act, which binds the Crown,

introduced at section 8 the duty ‘to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi’ in all aspects of the administration of the Act.

In May 1964, when Ngati Turangitukua were first confronted with the proposed TPD and the prospect of a permanent township at Turangi, a great deal of planning had already been done in the offices of the Ministry of Works, in consultation with other Government departments. On 20 September 1964, a second meeting was held, largely to review the plans with local people. The next day, Cabinet gave approval to begin construction.

The Ministry of Works had also consulted with the Taupo County Council, which, on 29 September 1964, resolved that changes to the operative district scheme (which made provision for the Turangi township and the TPD) should be publicly notified. By 1 October 1964, the Ministry, its contractors, and their bulldozers were on site in Turangi. There was minimal participation by Ngati Turangitukua in the planning phase of the development project. The second phase, the actual construction, was traumatic. In the next section, we review, in the words of the people who made submissions to us, how Ngati Turangitukua perceived the impacts on them. The third phase of a development project is the ongoing operation: the time when the impacts are fully realised, the costs and benefits are weighed up by the host community, and a considered appraisal is made. In 1994, three decades later, the Tribunal has been asked to review the impacts on Ngati Turangitukua of Crown actions in Turangi. In the absence of any detailed baseline information, which would have been available if any assessment of potential impacts on the host community had been carried out, we begin our review with the statements of Ngati Turangitukua themselves, which range from events within the construction phase to their assessment of the longer term impacts.

12.2 NGATI TURANGITUKUA PERCEPTIONS OF IMPACT

12.2.1 Introduction

In foregoing chapters, we have set out a narrative of what happened on the land during the construction of the Turangi township. In this chapter, we focus on the impacts on the people, Ngati Turangitukua, who were living on their ancestral land. In early 1964, a small, predominantly Maori, rural community was confronted with the prospect of a major hydroelectric power project and a township of possibly 10,000 people being built on its land. By the end of that year, township construction was well underway. The transformation from a rural to an urban environment was rapid, traumatic, and unprecedented. Coping with these changes was stressful and beyond the experience of local people, and this created tensions which few could have foreseen. Many local people felt that they had lost control of their lives, that the Ministry of Works had taken over completely, and that they were powerless against the bulldozers which were tearing up their land. In the following pages, we quote extensively from claimants’ submissions to the Tribunal, so that their feelings may be

expressed in their own words about how the Ministry's operations at Turangi changed their lives.

12.2.2 The meetings of 1964

It can be assumed that when the proposals for the TPD and the Turangi township were put to the local people at the first meeting on 24 May 1964 few would have appreciated the magnitude of the impending changes. By the second meeting on 20 September 1964, the Ministry of Works was ready to start up its bulldozers. Bill Asher, a member of the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board for the last 10 years, described how the prospect of a permanent township was conveyed to the local people in 1964:

Essentially the purpose of the two meetings was to inform us as to what would happen if the project was given the green light. The information took a long time to sink in. It was immediately apparent that we would have to give up a lot of land. . . .

The owners of the land certainly thought that they would be coming in for a lot of compensation if the scheme went ahead. . . .

Previous to those meetings I hadn't been aware that much of the land in the area was subject to mortgages to the Maori Affairs Department. I think that our people were very keen to see those mortgages paid off, and were under the impression that the compensation would enable them to pay off their mortgage debt, and still have plenty left over. There is no doubt that the money was a big drawcard for some of our people.

But the money was not a sufficient carrot for everyone. Many were weighing up the pros and cons for a long time. But looking back, I don't really think that those owners would in most cases have had any way of knowing what they were weighing up. A lot of our old people had no experience in commercial matters at all, although some of them would have had some involvement with the Tuwharetoa Trust Board. They had all lived their lives in a rural environment, and a predominantly Maori environment. The kind of place that Turangi has become today was entirely foreign to their way of thinking. I don't think they would have been able to imagine the extent of changes in store for our

rohe [district]. For that reason, I don't think they would have had any idea of the real consequences of the decision they were being asked to make.

And it should be remembered too, that they were being subject to a pretty high-pressure sell-job by the Ministry of Works. The people who came to speak to us were skilled communicators, and their fast-talking persuaded our people that the benefits of what would come would outweigh the disadvantages. When we were told that the town would go to Rangipo if we said 'No' some people then became concerned that we were in danger of losing out on an opportunity. That is what we were supposed to think of course. There is no doubt that people were attracted to the prospect of better housing, to having facilities at their doorstep, work opportunities, and to the novelty of it all. (A12(2):2-3)

Arthur Grace made similar comments, making it clear that he and his mother, Te Reiti Grace, had been opposed to the township proposal if it meant the loss of their farm land and livelihood:

But the other owners – and especially some of the more influential older people – had been swayed by the eloquence of Mr Gibson, who was spokesperson for the Ministry. Mr Gibson was a powerful and persuasive speaker, and our old people were very impressed by him. He told our people that only the land absolutely required for the project would be retained once the project was built. Everybody envisaged the people getting most of the land back after the construction period, and they saw themselves having the benefit of a new town as well. This was why they were not keen to see the town being built at Rangipo – which was the other alternative – because they saw many advantages coming to them. (A21(1):5-6)

John Asher, Jack Asher's son and his successor as secretary of the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board, gave his view of the attitude of Ministry of Works officials:

I was in a good position to know what was going on because initially I was on the Tuwharetoa Trust Board, and then later I was a member of the Taupo County Council. But because of the breakdown of communication as between the Maori Liaison Committee and the Ministry of Works, there was no consistent flow of information to the local Maori people as to the Ministry's intentions. The Ministry of Works were a power unto themselves. It was useless trying to talk to them and negotiate with them. They just fired ahead and did what they thought was right. They were philistines with bulldozers, and Maori people and their land didn't mean a thing to them. They had the all-powerful Public Works Act to fall back on, and basically they didn't need to negotiate. And they just didn't.

To begin with, there had been vehement objections in the meeting house. The Ministry of Works must have been afraid early on that the plan would be compromised to meet the requirements of the Maori owners. They did everything they could to allay

people's fears by verbal assurances. But those assurances weren't worth the breath with which they were uttered, because once they were established there was no going back for the owners, and as far as the Ministry was concerned the gloves were off. (A12(1):4-5)

John Asher was particularly concerned at the Ministry of Works' failure to honour an assurance given about the leasehold of the industrial area and the way the Crown's land acquisitions exceeded earlier estimates:

I remember attending meetings on this issue with the Ministry of Works in the late 1960s. I was there in a listening capacity as an owner of land in the area. As a member of the Tuwharetoa Trust Board, I had been instructed [by the board] not to play an official role in the negotiations because the Trust Board wanted to retain their independent status in relation to the Turangi activities. But I remember the completely uncompromising attitude of the Ministry of Works representatives and the government, which I thought at the time was very unreasonable. Warren Gibson, a Project Engineer, was a law unto himself. He wasn't a man to negotiate and compromise if he could possibly avoid it. (A12(1):6)

Terewai Grace, Arthur Grace's wife, recalled how the proposed development created uncertainty, ambivalent attitudes, and anxiety for local people:

I remember that we were told by the Ministry of Works men that this town would be built for us on a permanent basis. This was contrasted with the situation at Mangakino, which I gathered had not proved satisfactory because it was built only on a temporary basis. This new town was certainly an exciting concept, especially when we were told that when the Ministry left, the town and all its amenities would be left for us.

It emerged in the discussion that some were hesitant or unsure about the benefits to us of such a town being built. We were told that if there was not complete agreement about the town being built at Turangi, a temporary town would be erected at Rangipo which would be removed at the conclusion of the project.

I remember feeling really torn because I loved the farm life, but Arthur's family was only one among many owners of the land we leased. The other owners would have to make decisions based on what they thought would most benefit their families. I personally felt that a permanent town would be the best option, but by this time I was really worried about where we stood in the overall plan. (A21(2):4-5)

12.2.3 Social impact

Terewai Grace summed up her views on the social impact of the construction of the Turangi township:

The emphasis in my evidence is on the human dimension of what took place in Turangi in the 1960s, and on the consequences of the enormous changes that took place. The change was so sudden that all of us who lived here were taken by surprise. In a way

I think we lived in a state of shock for quite some time. No one sitting in the meetings at Hirangi Marae in 1964 when the whole thing was in contemplation could have said what it was going to be like. I wonder now whether those who were in favour of the project coming to our rohe would have said 'yes' if somehow they could have been given a glimpse of what they were letting us all in for.

I don't blame those who were in favour of the town in the slightest. They weren't to know how it would turn out. Like me, they were probably naive and trusted the Crown to make things happen like they said they would in the beginning. A lot of us felt pretty stupid afterwards, because we'd been so trusting. Our old people were especially trusting, and accepted at face value the assurance offered them by these authoritative Pakeha men who came to speak to us. They had no experience of the cut and thrust of the business world. When those dignified, persuasive men told them how it would be, and that it would be a good thing for us, they simply believed it. . . .

The Crown certainly didn't present the whole picture to our people. And we had no outside help at all to cope with the dramatic changes to our lives. Not only did we not get help, but in fact the Ministry of Works made it all much harder to take because they treated us so poorly. There were one or two exceptions, and I would mention in particular Mr Gardiner [Gardenier] and Mr Bennion. But for the most part we were consistently denied the respect and consideration due to people who had given up their land and their way of life in the interests of developing an electricity resource that would benefit the whole country. (A21(2):19-21)

12.2.4 Lack of information and misinformation

Arthur Grace summed up the feelings of many Ngati Turangitukua, who told the Tribunal that they did not know what was going on. As to compensation, they did not know whether or to whom compensation was paid, whether it was adequate, or even which lands compensation moneys were being paid for:

The lack of information about what really happened has always been a source of real frustration to me. We didn't know how to find out who got paid for what and when. In preparation for this claim, our lawyer has got information from the [Maori] Land Information Office about what really happened in terms of payment of compensation. All sorts of things have come out of the woodwork. You will see from the evidence that our people will give that a lot of this information came as news to them, because for years none of us has really known who got paid for what and when. People would come to me for help and information, and I wasn't able to tell them much because I didn't know myself.

The situation was considerably complicated by the fact that the Ministry did not gazette the land they were taking in one lot. Instead, there were dribs and drabs of land that would appear in the newspaper as 'proclaimed' as having been taken. When our people complained about the delays in payment, they were told that they couldn't be paid their compensation until the taking of the land had been legally proclaimed. And then we were told that the delay was down to the Maori Trustee's office. Admittedly, the Maori Trustee's office had a hard job on their hands. But still, the effect was that the whole town was built on land that for the most part was not paid for until

afterwards. That didn't seem right to us, and it was certainly not what was expected when the people agreed to have the town at Turangi. I believe that some people had big deductions made from their compensation for back payment of rates, as well.

So what happened was quite different from the expectations of our old people who were making the decisions at the time. The situation with the Maori Affairs mortgages, and the fact that deductions would be made for rates arrears, was never properly explained. Then there is the issue of whether the landowners' interests were properly valued. There was a very strong feeling around at the time that the valuations went against the interests of Maori owners all the way. [Emphasis in original.] (A21(1):13–14)

While many complained about not being informed of what was going on, sometimes misinformation was fed back to the community. Bill Duff explained how his father, Haukino Duff, had strenuously opposed the taking of the Tokaanu B1J block for the oxidation ponds because there was a wahi tapu on the site:

Dad wasn't getting anywhere with the Crown, so a neighbour, Mr Usher who lived in Tokaanu, was called in by my father to help him. Mr Usher went to the Council in Taupo and voiced his views there. Mr Usher told my father that the Council in Taupo said that the land had been taken because my father had not been paying his rates. Mr Usher asked if compensation was paid. The Council said no compensation was paid because the money would be used to pay the arrears of rates. As far as my father was concerned, the lessee [Ned Church] was responsible for the rates, so he couldn't understand how this happened. (A16:3)

Mr Duff explained that he now knew that compensation had been paid and that 'the Ministry of Works took the land' by proclamation, not the Taupo County Council (A16:3; C). 'But we do not know what amount was outstanding in rates, or whether the arrears were deducted from compensation we were paid for the land.'

Sometimes stress was caused by proposed works, or rumours of them, that did not eventuate. Te Hononga (Hono) Lord commented:

I remember, for instance, that the Ministry of Works came and surveyed a portion of our land along Hirangi Road. They told my father that there would be a housing subdivision along there, and the houses would be situated on our land alongside Hirangi Road. I remember my father [Nganangana Te Rangi] being 'hopping mad' about what the surveyors were doing, wandering around his land as free as you please, and planning to take it from him. As it turned out, the plan didn't eventuate, but Dad still had to go through the trauma of thinking it would happen. (A13(3):6)

12.2.5 Traditional authority tested

Bill Asher described the tensions created by the arrival of large numbers of new residents:

Our community changed overnight. I was very much aware of that, even though I wasn't living at Turangi at the time. I didn't move back here to live until 1972, when I returned [from Kuratau] to take up a job with the Ministry of Works as a carpenter. By then there had been significant migration into the area of people who followed Ministry of Works projects around the country. Quite frankly, many of those people left a bad taste. A lot of them were Maori, but quite insensitive to our tikanga. Somehow, they had been brought up in a different way, and had a pushy and demanding attitude. That didn't go down too well with the local people. A lot of the older Maori migrants understood where we were coming from, but there was this particular category who were bombastic, and quite offensive in a Maori way. For instance, they cleaned out our hunting areas, trespassing on Tuwharetoa land without our permission. It was the sheer weight of numbers that enabled them to get away with behaving badly. Ngati Tuwharetoa have always opened their doors to Maori people coming to our district, but there is no doubt that privilege was abused in Turangi. It got to the stage where some of us wanted to reject those types altogether.

Some of that element has moved on since the Ministry of Works left town. Most of those who have stayed behind have had to learn to fit in, and they are welcome at any of our marae. (A12(2):4)

Others also commented on how the traditional authority of kaumatua was undermined or ignored. Kahukuranui Te Rangi, Nganangana Te Rangi's eldest son, described the impact of the project on his grandfather, Topia (Makiwhara) Te Rangi:

My grandfather was 81 when he died in 1969. He was a very trusting and humble man who was not easily angered by anything, but he was very annoyed with the way the Ministry of Works went about things and what they did to our whanau lands. He was particularly opposed to the sewer line and stopbank going through our land [Waipapa 1D2A and 1D2B3B and Tokaanu B1H]. He tried personally to persuade Mr Gibson, the Chief Engineer, not to proceed with these works, but he was totally ignored. Initially, he had trusted the Ministry of Works would not do the things they did, but by the time he died, he felt personally betrayed by what had happened. He was also deeply affected by the desecration of ancestral urupa and the bulldozing of bones, which seemed to be going on all the time. (A13:1, p 1)

Hono Lord, Kahukuranui Te Rangi's sister, also described the stress on kaumatua:

The old people were also very concerned about the desecration to our wahi tapu that was going on all around us once the project got underway. I remember my Grandfather and Uncle Peter Rota going out in the mornings to see where the bulldozers were heading that day so that they could move the tupapaku before the bulldozers got to

them. This situation caused great anxiety amongst our people, and especially amongst our old ones who were already under great pressure from the works affecting their lands. (A13(3):6)

12.2.6 Grace whanau experience

In 1959 Arthur Grace took over his father's farm, a well-established leasehold unit of some 743 acres. The farm had been part of the Tokaanu development scheme and was still subject to mortgages administered by the Department of Maori Affairs on behalf of the Board of Maori Affairs under Part XXIV of the Maori Affairs Act 1953. The Grace farm lease, which had about 30 years to run, was taken over by the Ministry of Works, and farm operations ceased in October 1964. As Mr Grace explained:

As far as I was concerned, losing that farm was a disaster. In the time since I had taken over the running of the farm, I had been fortunate enough to make a lot of progress. The result was that I had been paying off the mortgage to Maori Affairs at a good rate. My stocking levels were such that Wrightsons had indicated to me that I would be able to borrow money from them against the security of my stock, and I foresaw being able to pay off the Maori Affairs mortgage altogether within a year or two. This made me very happy, because I felt that I was really getting somewhere on that land.

It soon became clear that I had no chance of keeping the farm. Our family had two levels of involvement in that farm, firstly as joint owners of the land with many of the other families, and secondly as leaseholders. We had to be compensated by the Ministry of Works in both capacities. I am very critical of the arrangements for compensation that were reached both with the owners of the land and with me and my family in respect of that farm lease and our house. (A21(1):6)

The Grace family were in for a period of difficult negotiations. Not only had their farm and livelihood been taken away, but the Ministry of Works wanted them out of their house, because it was on the route of a proposed new road in the township. There was also a problem with the title, because the one-acre site on the 'papakainga block' adjacent to Hirangi Marae had not been partitioned out by the Maori Land Court. Mr Grace told the Tribunal that, 'as far as the old people were concerned, that house and the single acre on which it sat belonged to my Dad and now belonged to me' (A21(1):7). Legally, however, that one acre was part of Waipapa 1A,

which the Ministry of Works intended to take, and Mr Grace had to buy back his house site:

The Ministry asked nearly \$4,000 for the site. The way it turned out was that I received compensation for the loss of use of the farm land of about the same amount. They more or less cancelled each other out. The stock on the farm was sold, and the returns from that used to reduce the debt on the Maori Affairs mortgage.

One of the things that upset me and my wife was that there was a rumour that went round among our people that we had been greatly enriched by the Ministry of Works coming to town. That's how it appeared to a lot of people, because the town was being located on our farm. In fact, of course, the opposite was true. Whereas previously we had a life to look forward to, with plans to develop the land, and a livelihood, now we were left with virtually nothing. I remember that my wife bought a car at that time out of money she had earned by teaching at the local school. But a lot of people pointed to that car as something we had got out of the Ministry. I hated to be in that situation, where everything was going so badly for us, and yet we were being resented by some of our own people. (A21(1):7-8)

It was perhaps inevitable that there would be a personal toll to be paid in coping with such traumatic changes in one's life. Mr Grace, under the heading 'Emotional and financial stress', summed up the impact on his family and the personal pressures he faced:

The battles that my family and I have had to fight with the Ministry over the years have cost us a great deal of time and money. It was often necessary for us to enlist the help of our lawyer, which didn't come cheap. We were always having to pay out to our lawyer to support us on one issue or another. I didn't mind paying him, because I honestly feel that we wouldn't have managed to win the few victories we did without a solicitor in our corner. But we shouldn't have had such an uphill battle on our hands with the Ministry of Works when all we were wanting was a bit of common justice. I think you really needed a lawyer to keep your head above water, actually. The Ministry would fight you on every point, and wouldn't accept your word for it. And then it seemed there were new rules and regulations springing up every day that they would quote at you, and the ordinary person just couldn't keep up with it. Also, I saw those relations of ours who didn't know how to put up a fight being walked all over. The Ministry could really do what they liked with those people. They were innocent and law-abiding people, but they felt completely powerless to do anything against what was happening to them. I tried to do what I could to support them, but we were all trying to live our lives and keep our families going, so there was a limit to what you could do. The whole situation really got us all down.

It was under the stress of all this that I developed an alcohol problem in the 1960s. . . . This had a very bad effect on my family, and things got to a bad state before I got the hard word from my doctor and I pulled myself together. . . . But I think that problem was a reflection of the sort of stress that we were living under. When I look back I think that my wife and me, and my mother and all our family really, went through a terrible time during those years. Our sense of personal dignity suffered,

because we were treated as though our lives and our homes were of no importance. We felt out of control of our own futures: we didn't know what would happen tomorrow, but the Ministry of Works did. They were pulling the strings. That was a very bad feeling.

Having a town at Turangi was always going to change our way of life. But I still think that the Ministry of Works could have made the process of change much less painful than it was. If they had treated us like the tangata whenua of this place, instead of like inconveniences who were getting in the way of their plans, we would have come through it all more easily. (A21(1):25–26)

Terewai Grace also described the stresses she and her family suffered:

I can't actually recall whether the model that the Ministry of Works had at the meeting [24 May 1964] showed our house and the other houses just up the road from us. I don't think I realised at that early stage that the Ministry's plans involved moving our house. It was when representatives of Maori Affairs and the Ministry of Works came to our home to discuss repayment of the Maori Affairs mortgage and compensation for loss of the lease that the whole thing became clear to me. The Ministry of Works plan showed a street running through our kitchen, and the rise that our house was on was to be flattened.

At this time we were still living in our house, but our farming days were effectively over. Our farm animals had all gone, and the fences and trees had been pulled up. Getting rid of the farm animals was very traumatic for the children. They were farm kids, and they found the changes very hard to accept. Earthworks were taking place all round with a great deal of noise and dust as the streets were laid out. It was all happening at tremendous speed, and yet no agreement had been reached with us on what compensation we were to be paid. Obviously they did not need our agreement or consent before going ahead. Dealing with us was a mere formality from their point of view. It didn't feel as though we were in a very strong position.

This was a terrible time for me. My husband did not want the town in place of his farm, and he was hurting. He argued so bitterly with the Ministry of Works and with Maori Affairs that I was reduced to tears. A feeling of hopelessness had begun to creep in, and I was afraid that if Arthur fought the people in charge, we would be left with nothing. I remember sitting in the bay window of our house crying because I felt so distressed and worried. I felt like a displaced person, not allowed to remain in my home and with no home to go to.

Because the Ministry of Works wanted us to agree to leave our house, they actually offered us a new house anywhere in the town. But by this time the new houses had started arriving, and we were not impressed. They were on such very small sections, and the houses themselves were on the mean side. The Ministry then offered to move our house to a section close to the marae, but my husband had become adamant that we should be allowed to stay where we were. This was our family home on Ngati Turangitukua papakainga, and it was our right to remain there.

Eventually we were allowed to remain, and a new plan was drawn up which had the street encircling us instead of going straight through our property. The area where we were was labelled 'The Grace Retention Area'. The workmen tried to make us feel guilty because that Retention Area hadn't been in their original plans, and caused them extra work. I remember them telling us that we would just have to put up with work going on all around us, making for difficult access to our house and houses dotted all around the perimeter of our section. Their attitude was that whatever disruption or

inconvenience they inflicted on us, we had asked for it by not going along with their wishes. I don't think it really sunk in quite what that meant. The main thing as far as Arthur was concerned was that he had saved the family home. (A21(2):5-7)

Mr Grace commented bitterly on his battle to retain the family home:

A lot of what went on made me angry. I felt that our people had been sold down the river. Their [the Ministry of Works'] whole attitude towards us was insulting. I felt it didn't matter what I said, their plans came first. Their plans had a road running through our kitchen, and that's what mattered to them. If it was a choice between our kitchen and their road it was no contest as far as they were concerned. But I wouldn't give in. I stuck to my guns and finally they put a ring around our house on the map and called it 'the Grace Retention Block'. It was a very hard-won concession, and the Ministry people always seemed to resent it after that. They were so used to being top dogs and having everything their own way, that they really couldn't stand it when anything or anybody stood in their way. (A21(1):8-9)

Mr Grace also had to cope with other problems, including finding alternative employment, having further arguments with the Ministry of Works over his licence to undertake cartage contracts (his mother was also having arguments with the Ministry over metal extraction on her leasehold land), and so on. The negotiating environment had become adversarial, and clearly defined between 'us' and 'them', as Mr Grace indicated in the following comment:

The Ministry's attitude to dealing with us really got under my skin. I felt so powerless to do anything about what was happening, even though I knew the way they were treating us was wrong. In my heart I knew that standing up to them wouldn't make much difference, but I felt that I couldn't just sit there and let them trample all over me and my family, so I did fight back as much as I could. I don't know whether it did much good in the long term, but at the time I felt that was all I could do if I was to live with my conscience. (A21(1):12)

12.2.7 Other whanau experiences

There were others who also fought back in their own way. Hono Lord described the response of her uncle, Tutemohuta (Sonny) Te Rangi, when some of his land was taken. He and Elwyn Grace had been settled on farm units in the Tokaanu development scheme in 1957, but each had voluntarily relinquished his lease in 1960 when a Department of Maori Affairs review suggested that their units were

uneconomic (B12:16–17). Sonny Te Rangi had continued to work for wages on the scheme in the hope of eventually being able to lease a farm unit when further land development work was completed, a hope which was based on a Maori Affairs promise. In 1964 he was living on a one-acre rectangular section, Ohuanga North 5B1D3C1, which fronted on the old SH1. In 1966 part of the section was taken.² Hono Lord described it:

The land to the north of Sonny's section was owned by his brothers and sisters. This land had been partitioned by my paternal Grandmother and gifted to her children. In 1965 Sonny and his family were the only members of the family living on the family land. During the period of the Tongariro Power Project works my husband and I built our house on a nearby block (5B1C2B3) gifted to me by my family. We are still living there.

Sonny gardened all of his and parts of the family sections extensively. He grew large quantities of potatoes, kamokamo, and corn and had several fruit trees. He also grazed some sheep and kept pigs on these sections. He grazed some horses on the property too, as he and his sons hunted extensively over the Tuwharetoa lands bounded by Tongariro and Kaimanawa Range. He had a large extended family who benefitted from his generosity, and also there were informal barter systems that operated. In total, Sonny would have had about two acres in cultivation.

Our family blocks used to be on the main road, although Sonny's house would have been a hundred yards or so back from the road. His house was screened from the road by trees. But when the Ministry of Works came, the main highway changed and an access road [Arahoi Street] had to be put through. . . . This was part of the area where Sonny had his gardens. Sonny was totally opposed to the road being situated so close to where he was living. He loved the outdoors and was a very private person who valued the open space and tranquillity of the area where he lived. He and his family were very upset with the thought that their peace and privacy would be shattered by vehicles and pedestrians in such close proximity to their home. He would never accept that the road should go through his property but eventually resigned himself to the inevitability of the situation. He didn't like the way they went about it, particularly the fact that the Ministry of Works bulldozed straight through a good fence he had along the boundary of the garden, demolishing it and the bulk of their orchard.

After the road was put in Sonny found out that the Ministry of Works were also taking the rear half of his section. He didn't understand why they needed to take half of his section, and none of us could understand it either. It seemed very odd, because Uncle Sonny was living on the side of the new highway [SH1] opposite from where the town was being developed. No one gave him the courtesy of an explanation.

Sonny was very distraught and angry about the fact that the back of his land had been taken. He felt that his privacy was being further eroded, and he felt powerless to do anything about it. This move seriously reduced the land he had available for his gardening and grazing activities. He was a traditionalist and a fighter and felt he had been dealt a gross injustice. He refused absolutely to have anything to do with the

compensation that was offered. He refused to sign any of the papers that the Ministry of Works wanted him to sign. Eventually he just received a cheque in the mail, with a note attached which he was supposed to sign and send back. When it arrived he took one look at that cheque for \$225.00 and went over to the coal range to throw it into the fire. I grabbed it from him. He was so angry but I knew it was important to keep documentation. . . . so I took the cheque home with me, and then later on when Sonny had cooled down I went back to see him about it again. (A13(3):1-3)

The land taken from the rear of the section was not used for the township but was offered for sale later for motel purposes. This provoked Hono Lord into lodging a complaint with the Ombudsman. As outlined in chapter 5, an area of land was returned to Sonny Te Rangi's family some years after his death. He never did get a farm unit of his own in the Tokaanu development scheme either. Some of those lands south of Arthur Grace's farm were used for the industrial area, for temporary camp sites for construction workers, and, later, for the Turangi Golf Course.

Hono Lord also commented on the impact on other Maori families:

I remember this old kuia who lived next door to Sonny. She was a really old lady, in her mid seventies. Te Arai Paurini was her name. She came to my house one day to see me. She was very upset. She had just found out that her back piece [of land] had been taken too. I remember her waving a piece of paper, saying 'Kua haringa aku whenua e te kawana' [The Government has taken away my lands] as she came up our drive. I took her inside to give her a cup of tea. I explained to her what the paper was about, and got in touch with her eldest son so that he knew what was going on too. The whole thing had a very bad effect on the old people in particular. That old kuia had no idea what was going on.

That land that was taken from the backs of people's sections just sat there for many years growing broom.

The way the Ministry of Works went about doing what they did caused great agony to people and affected their lives very deeply. The damage to our old people's happiness and health can never be compensated for. What makes me particularly resentful is that I don't believe that there was any necessity for the Ministry of Works to take that land from the backs of people's houses, and the road taking and survey could have been located elsewhere to the many acres where no one lived. Another anomaly is that the rest of that area . . . was never used for the development of the township; it was just sold off. (A13(3):3-5)

Tuatea Smallman summed up the effects of the hydro development on his family:

By severing the lands from the Maori title, the Ministry of Works has alienated the owners, our grandmother and her children, from the land. Younger members of the whanau have been denied their land. Loss of land to us means a loss of dignity, pride, and a distancing of whanau members through alienation to a feeling of mokaitanga [dependency, like being slaves]. We have lost our values, and our esteem, and a rift between families has developed. We fear our children will leave their turangawaewae. (A23:10–11)

Hono Lord stated:

It is difficult to know exactly what should be done to rectify the many injustices that have occurred. The Ministry of Works at the time were totally insensitive to anything our people said and treated us with disdain and contempt. Over the years their experience has led many of us not to expect any favours and we have tended not to ask for any. Nowadays we just want to get on with life and forget the pain of the past. (A13(3):6)

It is clear from the statements made to us that the ‘pain of the past’ has not been forgotten. The resentment and feeling of grievance felt by those who lived through the stresses of the construction period are being transmitted to succeeding generations. For those who made submissions to us, it was painful to relive the traumatic experiences of the construction period and even more painful to realise that any long-term benefits have been far outweighed by the human costs, the loss of land and resources, and the denial of any real participation by Ngati Turangitukua in the economic benefits of development on their lands.

In her opening submission, Crown counsel conceded that:

The Tribunal has already heard several families give evidence of their personal histories and the Crown does not dispute that the change from a rural lifestyle in a small village to a busy tourist township over a matter of a few years was for most unsettling and for some traumatic. (B1:1)

For those whose homes were physically moved, or in some cases demolished, the trauma was exceptionally painful. We consider their case histories in the next section.

12.3 THE REHOUSING OF NGATI TURANGITUKUA FAMILIES

12.3.1 Introduction

At the 24 May 1964 meeting, the fate of existing houses occupied by Ngati Turangitukua families was at the forefront of questions put to Ministry of Works officials. As already discussed in chapters 3 and 4, Dick Lynch told the owners that houses would have to give way to the town plan where the two conflicted, but the Ministry's intention was that 'the owner should be left as well off as he was previously' and it would 'avoid as far as possible disturbing people unnecessarily' (A7:182). At the 20 September 1964 meeting, a clear message was given that separate negotiations would be undertaken with the owner or owners of each piece of land. Warren Gibson said that arrangements would be made with the individual owners, who would 'have the opportunity of doing what they wish' (A7:182).

By mid-January 1965, 'assurances' had been given to a number of residents which involved either the modification of the boundaries of an existing house site, and/or the shifting of the house, or the allocation of another section. The general policy of the Ministry of Works, where practicable, was to allocate sections on family holdings to members of the owners' families who required building sites. The Ministry felt that the 'numbers of Maoris who will be asking for such allocations is

not expected to be significant' (B2(a):316). This policy was probably workable when a single owner of a house and section was involved but, even so, there were complaints.

12.3.2 Rehousing of families living on the old SH1

The people living on the old SH1 had been assured at the 24 May 1964 meeting that 'present holders would not be interfered with'. In the previous section, we have referred to the lands taken, including the gardens and orchard of Tutemohuta (Sonny) Te Rangi and the land belonging to Te Arai Paurini, as well as the upset this caused, especially because they had assumed from the plan presented to them that their homes, which were east of the realigned SH1, would not be disturbed. The Hallett family also lived on the old SH1, on the western side, near the Turangi Bridge. Joyce Hoko told the Tribunal about the freehold property (about half an acre fronting on the old SH1) which her father, Te Hikoinga Hallett, had purchased in 1962. He was approached several times by Ministry of Works officers in 1965 because part of the land was on the route proposed for the new SH1:

My father didn't want to move his house, but the Ministry of Works threatened compulsory acquisition. Because he was worried about them taking his land, my father agreed for the house to be moved forward to the front of the section. (A17:1)

The property was on two levels, with a large garage on the lower level which was used to service the tour buses that her father operated. The garage was

demolished (compensation of £150 was subsequently paid) and the house was moved at the Ministry of Works' expense. The land was taken for SH1 in 1966 (A17:2; B) but it was not until 1973 that compensation was finally assessed. The compensation included 16.4 perches, formerly part of the old SH1, being added to the residual title.

According to Ms Hoko:

It is useless – people use it as a foot path. My father always said that extra land was useless because he couldn't do anything with it. Our next door neighbour was given a section down the road in compensation for the part of his land that was taken. This discrepancy seems to me to be an injustice. . . . We think it would make more sense for the 16.4 perches to be given back and made into a proper footpath, and for us to be given the land next door which is used as a reserve.

My father never wanted compensation. What he wanted was land on the neighbouring site to keep the same sized property. The Ministry would not agree to this. Now this neighbouring site is a reserve. (A17:2)

12.3.3 Wade whanau experience

The older houses along the old SH41 were targeted for demolition because it was not possible to move them. Raymond Wade described what happened to the home of his mother, Nehi Miria Wade, where she and his three sisters were living in 1964:

At the time when the project came, my mother was one of the landowners involved. She knew that they were taking her land, which was where the high school is now. . . . However, she did not know how much was being taken or what she would be paid. We were never given a breakdown of the situation. She asked the Maori Affairs of the day if she could have a proper explanation, but it was never forthcoming. She didn't know how much land she had left, nor what she had been paid for what. She was very unhappy with the whole transaction. . . .

My mother was living right next door to the high school . . . Her house was nearly bowled over by the bulldozers. They had actually already flattened the orchard, which was made up of about 15 trees. They were approaching the house while she was still inside. I don't think they knew she was inside. I don't think my mother could have been given notice that they were coming to demolish her house, because she was an educated woman and she would have taken steps to try and stop them. She certainly wouldn't have just sat there in the house. Anyway, when the bulldozers came, she ran out of the house to stop them. She was in her forties, but very ill with asthma. She was very worried about her family home which she wanted to protect. The home had belonged to our great-grandmother, Paehoro Te Noni Hariata Kamekame Te Haeata Ipukai.

Although my mother stopped the bulldozers that day, a couple of years later the house was demolished anyway. Efforts were made to get the house preserved, but the Ministry of Works would not agree to that after my mother died. By then there were

Impacts on Ngati Turangitukua

only younger members of the whanau left, who did not have enough influence to stop the Ministry's plans.

After my mother died in June 1966, we remained living in our house until it was demolished a couple of years later. (A20(2):1-2)

Both Mr Wade, who had returned to Turangi from Wellington and was employed as a labourer by the Ministry of Works, and one of his sisters tried to obtain sections on part of their mother's land. They chose sites, but for some reason the arrangements fell through without explanation. Mr Wade refused an offer to go and live at the Ministry of Works' staff quarters:

I was virtually homeless and was forced to leave Turangi. My sister eventually got [purchased] a house on the fourth section from the school on the whanau land.

I am sure the trauma of all the events surrounding the coming of the Ministry to the town badly affected my mother's health. She was so worried about what would happen to her and to our family home. The Ministry really confused the owners, and our mother didn't speak to us much about what had happened.

Eventually my three sisters and I received compensation . . . although I am not sure what interests I have been paid for because the notices from the Maori Trust Office did not specify. My uncle always said he was not paid. I don't really know exactly what land of my mother's was taken, and I don't think my mother did either. (A20(2):2-3)

In January 1965, a Ministry of Works report on Mrs Wade's house on Waipapa 1E1A noted that one section west of the house was to be reserved and that the house itself was 'to be left undisturbed for reasonable time to enable replacement house to be built' (B2(a):316). On 27 June 1966, Mrs Wade signed an agreement acknowledging that compensation money due to her for her interests in various blocks and payable by the Maori Trustee 'will be reduced by the sum of £725' in payment for the section to be vested in her by the Ministry of Works. 'I also acknowledge that the price of £725 is reasonable for this section,' her agreement stated (B2(a):334). On 27 July 1966, however, Mrs Wade died, and in September Dick Lynch reported this to Gibson:

This section allocation is now cancelled. The present occupants of the cottage have no legal rights of occupation. I understand that they are neither willing nor able to secure

other accommodation. Perhaps you could check with the Maori Welfare Officer in this regard.

Eviction of these tenants will probably be a problem unless you have alternative accommodation to offer. There is nothing more I can do the matter is now in your hands. (B2(a):335)

A Ministry of Works officer in Turangi, J Davis, visited the Wade home and spoke with Raymond Wade, advising the district officer of Maori Affairs, J E Cater, in November that:

He was adamant that he had a right to be in the house and was under the impression that his mother had subdivided her share of the land so that he was entitled to live in the existing homestead. I requested permission to enter the house to enable a Housing Inspector to measure the square footage so that a suitable house in the Township could be rented by him in exchange. This permission was refused. On my second approach, he requested that I contact Mr Lang Grace who would act on his behalf. (B2(a):336)

The Ministry of Works requested Maori Affairs to investigate whether a housing loan to finance a new house would be made available to Miria Edwards (Raymond Wade's sister), who was living with her de facto husband and a young child, because rental accommodation did not appear to be a solution. Maori Affairs' response in April 1968, delayed by the need 'for a considerable amount of research', illustrates the financial situation faced by displaced families in Turangi:

The maximum housing loan to which she would be entitled is \$5,300. She has only one child which will be one year of age in July and the maximum capitalisation of family benefit for this child is \$940. This would represent the bulk of the finance available, apart from any funds built up by the operation of the de facto husband's wage assignment of \$6 per week and the assignment of Mrs Edwards' rents and royalties.

To build a normal three bedroom house at Turangi would cost not less than \$7,200. Under existing policy it would be necessary for Mrs Edwards to find the difference between the loan limit and the cost of the house, plus 10% of the cost of the section (say \$140), together with legal and supervision fees of approximately \$100. The present financial position could be summarised as under:

Maori Housing Loan	5,300	Cost of House	7,200
Capitalisation of Family Benefit	940	10% of section	140

Impacts on Ngati Turangitukua

Cash savings, say	100	Legal fees	100
Deficiency	1,100		
	\$7,440		\$7,440

Mrs Edwards is one of the three children of the late Mrs Wade and will be entitled to certain compensation for lands taken. . . . Of this amount Mrs Edwards' share would be \$900. (B2(a):338–339)

Even when the calculation included some funds 'in Mrs Wade's housing deposit account' (although 'an application to the Court will be necessary to determine who is entitled to this money'), there was still a shortfall in meeting the requirements for a Maori Affairs housing loan.

In May 1968, Davis advised the District Commissioner of Works that it was his 'intention to have the residence . . . demolished as soon as eviction is effected' and suggested that he 'notify the Department of Maori Affairs and the parties affected' (B2(a):340). On 5 June 1968, a 'notice to quit' giving one calendar month's notice from the date of receipt was issued to Raymond Wade and Miria Edwards on 'the grounds that you have not right, title or license to occupy the said premises and land' (B2(a):341). The Commissioner of Works was asked to 'obtain the necessary Warrant for this office to proceed under section 334 of the Public Works Act 1928 and section 31(d) of the Magistrate's Court Act 1947' (B2(a):342). The commissioner immediately requested further information about why the house had to be demolished, the alternative accommodation for the occupants that had been offered, and whether children were involved (B2(a):343). The project office in Turangi reported in July 1968 that it was desirable that the house be demolished and the sections cleared as soon as possible, because the house and outbuildings 'appear as sub-standard structures in an area of good residences' and the house 'is built over the boundary of two sections tying up both'. No alternative accommodation was available for Ms Edwards. It was noted that Mr Wade could be housed in the single men's quarters, but that he intended to leave his employment with the Ministry of Works soon (B2(a):344–345).

The Commissioner of Works responded at the end of July 1968, saying that the proposal, in essence 'to evict a woman and child for the purpose of demolishing a substandard house not required for any other purpose', was such that the Ministry 'could not face the criticism to which it would be subjected if the eviction took place in these circumstances'. The commissioner noted that the Department of

Maori Affairs had asked the Ministry to stay its hand for the time being, and he considered that this ‘would make our position even weaker if debated in the House’. He concluded that ‘No action can at present be taken’ (B2(a):346).

In the meantime, Dick Lynch, on behalf of the Ministry of Works, had notified the solicitor acting for the Maori Trustee that he would withhold the payment of compensation money for Waipapa 1E1A ‘until full possession is secured’ (B2(a):347). The Department of Maori Affairs investigated the case further and, by November 1968, was ‘making urgent arrangements for the erection of a new house’ on one of the sections. In December, Ms Edwards signed an agreement ‘to vacate the old cottage . . . as soon as the new house is ready for occupation’ (B2(a):349–350). The ‘old cottage’ was subsequently demolished.

12.3.4 Eru whanau experience

The house belonging to James Eru, and one next door occupied by his father, Tewe Eru, were also in the way of the Ministry of Works’ plans for Turangi. James Eru’s son Joe explained to the Tribunal how 12 acres fronting on the old SH41 had been partitioned by Rangūita Waaka in 1942 into four sections (Waipapa 1L1, 1L2, 1L3, and 1L4) for house sites for his own and his brothers’ and sisters’ children:

On the twelve acres were two houses. One belonged to the Eru family, my family, with four children still remaining at home. The house was built on about 2¼ acres, Block 1L2, given to my Dad by his mother and his 2 aunts . . . It was a Maori Affairs house, built in 1950. We grew up there. It was our family home. This land and our home were very important for my Dad, and me.

Next door on Block 1L4 lived our koroua and kuia [grandparents], with Taima, Thomas and Josephine, their whangai [adopted children], who were like brothers and sisters to us. Their house actually belonged to Maata Wikitoria Te Rangiita, but was occupied by my grandparents, Kiekie Manawa and her husband Tewe Eru, who had adopted Maata's daughter Taima Rangimarama [Bell] from birth. (A14(1):1-2)

As Joe Eru put it, 'Things started happening when I turned 15. My Dad told me the town was coming.' The family land was included in the lands taken for the township:

Our house was moved forward on our section so that most of the site could be taken. We were left with only a very small section. When they moved the house, it twisted so that none of the windows and doors fitted any more. The foundation work was not done properly, and the house still looks crooked. . . .

Our Dad was given no choice as to whether the house was shifted. They had us over a barrel. I remember my Dad saying 'You can never beat the Pakeha'. We were left with only a small part of our 2¼ acre section, 5.7 perches (about 140m²). (A14(1):2)

Because the house was still subject to a mortgage to the Department of Maori Affairs, the work was to be done by the Ministry of Works under the supervision of the Maori Affairs building supervisor, J W James. He had discussed the matter with a Ministry of Works engineer, J Gardenier, and reported to J E Cater, the district officer in Wanganui, on 27 October 1964 that the Ministry appeared 'only too pleased to comply with our requirements in this matter'. However, he noted that the requirement to shift the house 20 feet forward on the section was urgent, and that the 'general condition of the dwelling can be classed only as fair'(B2(a):326-327). The house was shifted over 29 and 30 October 1964. It had been shifted forward by the middle of the first afternoon but this was not its final position. James reported on 4 November that a decision had been made in conjunction with the Ministry of Works engineer to 'slightly twist the building so that it would thus lie better on its new site and at the same time obviate the need to re-plan the Turangi Township Subdivision'. He noted that:

Impacts on Ngati Turangitukua

Friday the 30th of October saw the house settled once more on its foundations, new chimney erected, new septic tank, new effluent disposal soakage, new drains installed . . . By 5 pm the house was again ready for Eru's occupation. (B2(a):328)

There was still some finishing work to be done the following week, and fencing could not be done until a survey of the section was complete. James wrote in his report that he had 'discussed the completed job with Mrs Eru before I left on Friday evening and she stated that she was more than satisfied with the work' as well as 'the Ministry of Works treatment' in agreeing to pay the family '£10 compensation for the night away from their home' (B2(a): 328). There was no report on how the family felt about the move afterwards.

The older house and land next door to James Eru had been occupied for many years by Tewe Eru and his wife and adopted children. Waipapa 1L4 was included in the land to be taken and no effort was made to retain a house site or the buildings. James reported on 27 October 1964 that the buildings consisted of an 'Old shack', which was 'generally extremely sub-standard' and had 'demolition value only' of £80; a detached wash-house with demolition value only of £15; a motor shed with demolition value only of around £15; and 'Outbuildings and [an] earth closet' with demolition value only of £10 (B2(a):330).

James stated that he discussed the disposal of the material from the demolition of the buildings with Tewe and James Eru, and the suggestion was made that it 'could be disposed of at Korohe Pa where they will make use of it for fuel'. The report concluded with the comment that a house site for Thomas Eru, Tewe Eru's adopted son, was also discussed and it was to be located in the vicinity. Tewe Eru was to be housed with Thomas Eru when the new house had been built. As yet, however, no section had been allocated (B2(a):330).

On 29 October 1964, Tewe Eru's home was demolished, but James's report, written on 4 November, made no reference to where Eru and his family were going to live in the meantime. Instead, James reported that debris suitable for firewood was transported to Korohe Pa, with the balance burnt on site or dumped at the Ministry of Works' depot for burying. James recorded that the buildings were in fact in a much worse state than first realised, the 'old shack' having been 'jerry built and . . . in extremely poor condition'. James also reported that:

There was a bit of an upset during demolition with some members of the Eru family who thought that the old shack was going to be re-erected at the Pa. However, they were informed that the County would not grant a permit to re-erect such old and defective material and once this was explained to them they were quite happy. (B2(a):331)

James's report focused solely on the physical structure of the house, which was probably typical of many built in the 1940s, when building materials were in short supply. Whatever its physical shortcomings, it was a family home. Taima Bell explained to the Tribunal how she perceived the demolition of the house she had been brought up in:

At the time when the Ministry of Works came to Turangi, I was living in the house owned by my mother with the people I called my grandparents. . . . The people I lived with, Kiekie Manawa and Tewe Eru, were actually first cousins of my mother, and I was their whangai [adopted child]. The house where we lived had been built in 1942 by my father, who was a builder with the Maori Affairs Department. . . . my mother came down from Auckland to see us because she had received notice that the Ministry of Works were going to take her house, where we were living, for the hydro project. My mother told my grandparents that they would have to find somewhere else to live, and she wanted me to go and live with her in Auckland. My grandparents had nowhere else to go. My mother went back to Auckland, and we remained living in the house. We didn't know exactly when the Ministry of Works were going to come and take the house away. So we just stayed there, because as far as we could see there was no alternative. (A14(2):1)

Ms Bell went to Wellington to find work, returning some months later for the tangihanga for her grandmother:

After my grandmother's funeral I went back to Wellington. I only stayed another two months in Wellington because I was so unhappy. I then went up to live with my Mum in Auckland. I called into Turangi on my way up to Auckland, to find that my grandfather was still in the house. He was refusing to leave. He didn't want to live with any of the rest of the family because their houses were all full, and anyway he didn't approve of alcohol or cigarettes so he didn't want to be around any of that. I tried to get him to leave the house and move in next door with the Erus, but he would not listen to me. I was very depressed and lonely, and so I left to go up to my mother in Auckland, hoping that I would be able to mingle in with her family up there. I stayed with my mother for about another 9 months, then we got a call in 1965 telling us that my grandfather had died. I came back to Turangi for his funeral.

When I came back for the funeral, I found out what had happened. I was told by Arthur Grace that my grandfather was still in the house when they came to bulldoze it down. I don't know why they had to bulldoze that house. It was only 21 years old. My grandfather was watching what was happening, standing there on the road with my little sister Josephine, another whangai who lived with my grandfather. He was crying and his suitcase was there beside him. Arthur went and spoke to the men with the bulldozer but they didn't listen and they drove a bulldozer into the back of the house right in front of my grandfather. They didn't even wait until he had left before knocking the house down. So Arthur picked up Josephine and my grandfather and took them away in the truck. All our turkeys and pigs and dogs and cats were let loose running around. We had about 30 turkeys then. They were all just left to run away. My grandfather was taken to the [Ngati Hine] marae to live, because there was nowhere else for him to go. He was moved from family to family, but he used to lock himself up in his room all the time. It was only a few months later that he died. (A14(2):2-3)

Dulcie Gardiner told the Tribunal about how worried her mother, a widow in her 60s, became when she was threatened with the prospect of having to leave her house near the proposed Tokaanu tailrace:

At about the same time, one of our whanaunga [relatives] Mr Tewe Eru, who was also an old man, refused to leave the house that Ministry of Works wanted to take from him. The house was bulldozed before his eyes, and all his belongings were left on the road. All of the local people knew this and it terrified my mother. She thought that she would be the next one, that her house would be bulldozed and she would be left with nowhere to go.

It was at this stage that my mother took to her bed. . . .

My mother was not an old woman. She was only 62, and a woman of vitality. She had asthma, but she was not an invalid. It was the Ministry of Works that killed her. I hated the Ministry of Works for what they did to my mother. They seemed to have no feeling at all for how their actions were affecting the lives of our people. (A19:3)

Ms Gardiner moved into her mother's house and still lives there, as it was later decided that it would not have to be taken. Her mother had also been upset by the taking of family lands for the tailrace. Both Ms Gardiner and Ms Bell were

adamant that the worry and stress over land takings and housing contributed to the early deaths of old people. Ms Bell felt that the events leading up to the death of her grandfather and the events surrounding it contributed to her own personal difficulties:

After the tangi, I went back to Auckland. My mother had 14 other children. I had been brought up by old people in the country. My grandfather was a Ratana minister, and I had been brought up in an old-fashioned Maori way. We hardly ever spoke English in the house. Suddenly I had to adapt to a big city family in Remuera. I had not known all these brothers and sisters, and it took me years to get used to them. I just could not handle it at first. I moved back to Turangi in 1967. I kept moving all the time. I couldn't settle anywhere. My mother died in 1968, but I couldn't get to the tangi because my family couldn't get in touch with me. I was always on the move. Finally I went back up to Auckland in 1970 and I made a go of it that time. I stayed there for over twenty years. I have only just come back to Turangi, and I have been here now for nearly a year.

The Ministry of Works caused my family a great deal of stress, without a care it seemed for my elderly grandparents who had nowhere else to go. The Ministry of Works' actions meant the breaking up of my adoptive family in Turangi, and I believe led directly to the deaths of my two grandparents. Old people should not have been treated like that, their lives suddenly blown apart, leading to endless unhappiness, stress, illness and then death.

I suppose my grandparents were not thought to be important because they did not own the house where we were living. But my mother had given over that house to those old people because it was my home and my sister Josephine's home. The Ministry of Works was not interested in how Maori customs operated, and looked only to the official papers which showed my mother as owner. My mother used to come back and bring the babies' [afterbirth] (pito) to bury on the land. Our family had a special connection with that place, but that was of no concern to the Ministry . . . Although my mother wasn't living in Turangi at the time, she was still very depressed about what went on . . .

Our whole family want to be back in Turangi, to be with members of the family who are buried here. When I tried to come back here to buy some land and build a house, the Housing Corporation told me I did not have enough money for a deposit, and I should go back to the city. I am now living with my sister and I don't want to go back to Auckland. I feel very aggrieved that I have to pay for land when my mother had land here for the children. I would dearly love to live in Turangi on family land. (A14(2):3-5)

12.3.5 Rota whanau experience

While some families had the town built around them, others were forced to give up their rural subsistence lifestyle and move into town. June Whaanga described her life at the Rota family home on Tokaanu B1L1, which was taken for the oxidation ponds:

When I was young I lived with my parents and about 17 children on the family [land] . . . We had a self-sufficient farm there, which took in a number of blocks between B1L1 and Maunganamu. Our extended family had interests in other blocks between our house and Maunganamu. That land also went when the hydro development came. We had pigs, about five cows, chickens, horses and a big orchard and vegetable garden. My father was an excellent gardener, and he used to supply the local greengrocer with vegetables. The family was more or less fed off the property and from the Tongariro River. We took trout from the river, morehana (carp), kokopu (native smelt), freshwater koura and watercress.

At this time, I was about 19 years old. Our Mum was very sick. She had had a stroke and was paralysed down one side. We had to move into town. My parents had to pay for a house to be built on land owned by my mother's family, the Rawhitis. We were not allowed to use the land near where our old house was, because the oxidation pond had been built on that land, and sewage was running over the land where the orchard and gardens used to be. But up until the time when all construction work on the oxidation pond was completed, we used to go back there, and we used the old house at Christmas time and so on. It was still our family home. We would all be there now if it had not been taken.

Even when we moved into the house in town we were still disrupted by the Ministry of Works. I remember one time the Euclids [bulldozers] coming right up the house about 3½ metres away, digging around us. I complained to the Ministry of Works but they took no notice. It was very distressing for us. My father's vege garden was dug up for Papua Street. The digging near our house only stopped because I knew one of the drivers who sympathised with our predicament. (A20(1):1-2)

Ms Whaanga noted that compensation was paid:

but we had no idea what the money related to. All it said on the voucher was 'compensation'. This compensation seems pretty low to me, and certainly was no compensation for the dramatic changes to our whole lifestyle. The areas where we used to get food were taken and polluted. There was no way we could re-establish that big orchard and garden in town.

Our family life changed altogether as a result of our land being taken for the power scheme. It was never the same in town, and our parents were not happy there. We were left out-of-pocket and confused by all the sudden changes that came upon us. I think we were treated badly by the Ministry of Works. They didn't have our welfare at heart. All they cared about was getting their power project done, and what happened to people just wasn't their problem. (A20(1):2-3)

In July 1966, Pehioi Rota, Ms Whaanga's father, was advised that sections valued at between £600 and £750 had been allocated to him and his family,

but that his own would not be released until the Ministry of Works was assured of his financial ability and intention to build a house within 12 months. He would have to arrange finance with the Department of Maori Affairs or the Department of Lands and Survey and could not simply deduct the section cost from any compensation payment received for having his own land taken, 'as these allocations cannot be treated as part of a compensation settlement'(B2(a):399).

Rota responded, indicating that he was 'deeply concerned' that, as one of the owners of land taken, he would be charged for the new sections (B2(a):400). Dick Lynch replied that Rota had 'misunderstood the position as we cannot make sections available without payment' (B2(a):401), and referred him to R E Tripe, the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board's solicitor, who had been asked to act on behalf of any owners who were not represented by any other solicitor or by the Maori Trustee. Lynch also wrote to Tripe at the same time, explaining that Rota could not be provided with sections at no cost, although the allocation of sections to him and to those of his family who needed them would be a priority. Lynch said that Rota could use part of his compensation entitlement for the taking of Waipapa 1E2C, 1E2B7, and 1E2B1 to purchase the sections if he wished, and that he (Lynch) would support an advance payment of up to £4000 (B2(a):402).

It is not clear why Lynch could not have told Rota directly that his compensation money could have been used to pay for sections in the Turangi township. A request was made in 1971 for assistance to preserve the old homestead, which the Ministry of Works declined on the ground that the building was 'past reasonable repair' (B2(a):403–404). The Rota family had to purchase a section and build a new house in town.

12.3.6 Church whanau experience

The Church family were also forced to give up their rural subsistence lifestyle and live in the new township. Reneti Church, the youngest of nine children, described how her family had to leave their house on Tokaanu B1K when this and the adjacent Tokaanu B1J and B1L1 blocks, part of her father's farm, were taken for the oxidation ponds (A15:B). William (Ned) Church held a leasehold of several blocks in a farm unit which was formerly part of the Tokaanu development scheme. Ms Church told the Tribunal:

I am not aware of negotiations having taken place between the Ministry of Works and my parents about those paddocks being needed for the oxidation ponds. I remember being told that one day the bulldozers came in and bulldozed the fence line while we were at home. This came as a complete surprise to my parents. Our stock, which was grazing on the paddocks where the oxidation ponds are now, just went straight out on to the road. We had to rush out and get them back.

Dad went out to talk to the Ministry of Works men, but I don't know what was said. No one stopped work.

.

Not very long after, we were moved out of our house because it was too close to the oxidation pond. This was quite upsetting for us because the family had never talked about having to move to town. All of a sudden one day we had to move.

.

They moved us into one of the 'substandard' houses on the land which had been owned by the Rawhiti family. I know that they tried to charge Mum and Dad rent for that little house which was stuck on ¹/₅th of an acre. They refused to pay. There were about twelve of us living there, and it was full of cockroaches. Cockroaches were a

feature of those substandard houses [which had been transported to Turangi from other projects].

My mum was really depressed to be there. My Dad was even worse. They hated being in such a small confined area. My parents were so angry about the whole situation. I understand that they were paid compensation for their land and house . . . but I am sure the money they received did little to make up for the life they had lost forever. They had been told they would be moved to a new house with no expense to themselves. Instead, they were in a crowded, small house which they couldn't stand. My father used to go down to the farm for the whole day, and came back late. My mother only lasted two years there until she died [in September 1968].

After that, I lived in the house in town with my father. The Ministry of Works were always coming around trying to get the rent. When they realised that Dad would never pay, they said that they would leave him there until he died, and then they would remove the house. Meanwhile, Puke [a sister] and I had moved to another house, where my father came to live after he got too sick to be on his own. When he moved out of his house, the authorities, I think the Ministry of Works, wasted no time in getting rid of that house. (A15:1-3)

In March 1965, Ramarihi Church applied for a Maori Affairs housing loan, but the assistant district officer, M McKellar, reported that there was some doubt whether the family could meet 'the difference between the loan limit and the cost of the proposed house' (B2(a):351). Ned Church was an undischarged bankrupt, but one of his sons had assigned part of his wages as a regular payment toward the deposit on a house. In June 1966, the house in Papua Street to which the family was to be moved was described as 'an ex Atiamuri 800 sq ft house that has been modified to include a space heater instead of an open fire'. At this stage, the house was connected to 'temporary services' because it would 'be some months before street, water and power services are complete'. It was also suggested that 'payment of rent could be allowed to accrue pending settlement of land compensation' (B2(a):352).

On 6 September 1966, Ramarihi Church signed a 'form of consent' to say that the £3 (\$6) per week rent would be 'a first charge against my share of the compensation due to me' for her interests in Tokaanu B1K (B2(a):353).

Mrs Church died on 20 September 1968, and the Public Trust Office agreed that the rent due to that date should be paid out of her estate. In July 1971, the Ministry of Works sought the payment of something over \$800 in rent arrears. Ned Church was approached in September, because he was now employed as a truck driver and was thought able to afford the rent, although he had not signed any agreements about the tenancy. He argued, however, that the family's house had been exchanged by the Ministry of Works and their present house should be rent-free. The Ministry noted that:

he did not seem to be unintelligent and the overriding impression gained was that this was simply a try on. What was definite, was his refusal to make any payment, current or of arrears. (B2(a):358)

By February 1972, Church was served with a notice to quit and agreed to pay \$10 per week (\$6 current and \$4 towards arrears) on the understanding that eviction proceedings would be withheld (B2(a):360–361). By August 1972, only \$30 had been paid and, when approached, he stated 'he would rather the whole affair was taken to court' (B2(a):362). At this stage, there were 12 people living in the house: Ned Church, one adult son, three adult daughters, one of whom was pregnant, and that daughter's husband and their five children, who ranged in age from one to nine years old. The Ministry of Works was again considering eviction proceedings, but delayed action for the time being.

By August 1974, the rent arrears had reached some \$1700 and the Ministry had served another notice to quit and had decided to proceed with the eviction. The secretary of the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board, John Asher, wrote to the project engineer, B Dekker (who had succeeded Gibson), saying that the Church family had only moved from their original home in Awamate Road because the location of the oxidation ponds, in the view of the Ministry of Works and the local

authority, had meant that ‘their continued occupancy of their home could well be hazardous to the health of their family’ (B2(a):366). He suggested that Ned Church would like to purchase the new house but he was unlikely to be eligible for a home loan. The house itself was substandard and was due for removal to meet the Taupo County Council’s requirement that all houses left in the Turangi township comply with their building bylaws. The trust board accepted no financial liability for the Church family but asked the board’s solicitor, Russell Feist, to take the matter up because, although the Ministry of Works was legally correct in claiming rent and issuing an eviction order:

morally, in the Board’s view, this family all of whom are beneficiaries of the Board, have a case to be put to Ministry of Works, Wellington, in that they were forced to leave their land and original family home to make way for a public utility (B2(a):369)

The Department of Maori Affairs had been asked to investigate the status of any unpaid compensation money for the Church family’s former house. It transpired that the house, described by the Ministry of Works as a ‘converted barn’, was located on a block of land (Tokaanu B1K) in multiple ownership and the house site had never been partitioned out. The house, therefore, went with the land, and any compensation paid for the house would be included in the payments made to all the beneficial owners of Tokaanu B1K.

The Ministry of Works officials in Turangi were reluctant to proceed with the eviction and Dekker summed up the arguments against this course:

We don’t want the house which is substandard anyway.

With Mr Church are living various children and grandchildren, possibly some 12 altogether, some of them babies.

These children all belong to the Tuwharetoa tribe with whom we’ve successfully maintained good relationships over the years.

The original deal with the Church family does not do us credit although undoubtedly legally correct. The money we paid for their old house (\$1000) could not possibly buy them other accommodation. We should have just exchanged houses, even though in money values we could have lost on the deal. This same thing was in fact done when we

Impacts on Ngati Turangitukua

replaced badly substandard facilities along Lake Rotoaira by houses and jetty of far better construction. (B2(a):374)

It is important to reiterate that the \$1000 was not paid to the Church family, but to all the beneficial owners of the Tokaanu B1K block. The issue reached ministerial level. In November 1974, the Minister of Works, Hugh Watt, approved eviction proceedings, but after a visit to Turangi decided not to take further action until he had consulted with the member for Western Maori, Koro Wetere. The trust board continued to support the principle that, because the Church family had been forced to move out of their house, the Ministry of Works was obliged to find them a replacement home, free of rent. Ministry of Works officials pushed for eviction proceedings. In April 1975, another Minister of Works, Michael Connelly, after consulting with Wetere and the member for Eastern Maori, Brown Reweti, explained to the Commissioner of Works that the members' views were that Ngati Tuwharetoa had given much to the nation, including 'helping to facilitate the launching of their hydro electric scheme', and it was appropriate that the Ministry showed a similar level of goodwill to the Church family (B2(a):386). He went on to comment that it would not create a precedent because this was 'a special sort of case' and the family were now worse off because of the taking of their house. He asked whether there was any reason why, of all the project's houses, 'when they are being removed, that one of them, just a good average house' could not be given to the Church family (B2(a):387).

In 1978 Ministry of Works officials tried again to evict the Church family. The Minister of Maori Affairs, Duncan MacIntyre, told the Minister of Works that the 'fact that this situation has run on for so long aggravates the problem and frankly my Department would not like to be involved in any way with the eviction of Mr Church and his family as this is certain to be resisted by the Tuwharetoa people'

(B2(a):391). However, Ministry officials continued to pursue the eviction and began legal steps in 1979, only to be cautioned by Maori Affairs, which was trying to negotiate a housing loan in the name of Ned Church's daughter Puke. Ned Church remained in the house in Papua Street until October 1984, when he finally moved out to stay with Puke. The house was removed from the site and the Ministry wrote off the outstanding debt (B2(a):398).

12.3.7 Tribunal's comment

The foregoing account of the impact of the Ministry of Works and its bulldozers on the tangata whenua is disturbing and deeply depressing. It reveals, in many instances, an apparent absence of sympathy and respect for people who were attached to their ancestral land. There is little evidence of adequate consultation or, all too often, any effective consultation, especially with those who were obliged to vacate their homes. The promises made at the 20 September 1964 meeting that they would be kept informed of what was to happen were not honoured. One account after another of the uprooting of the claimants from their homes, sometimes with no or insufficient prior notice, suggests that progress had to be made at all costs and delays could not be tolerated. Arthur Grace's success in remaining in his home was a rare exception. The fact that bitterness and disillusionment persist to this day among the survivors and their descendants is not surprising.

12.4 THE TRANSITION FROM RURAL TO URBAN

12.4.1 Introduction

Many of the claimants, in their submissions to the Tribunal, lamented the loss of a traditional subsistence lifestyle and their forced adjustment to living in a new town. Some families lost not only their homes but also their livelihoods, their gardens and orchards, and their livestock, which had supported their large extended families. From an economic point of view, many of these households may not have been commercially productive, but when viewed against a social structure where kinship, whanaungatanga, and reciprocal obligations were often expressed in barter arrangements rather than cash, the economic arguments seem less relevant. Many of

the houses were ‘substandard’, as measured by the county building codes, but for many local families building regulations imposed from outside were irrelevant. Their primary concern was to preserve a lifestyle whereby local people remained in control of their lives, which were lived out on their ancestral lands.

The arrival of the Ministry of Works changed all that. Many families were relocated. Others had the town built around them. Local people lost control of their lands and lifestyles. The Ministry had promised that people would not be worse off. But many families felt that they were worse off, not just in financial terms, but also in terms of anxiety, stress, and a feeling of powerlessness. In this section, we examine in more detail the Maori housing policy of the Ministry of Works in the Turangi township against the background of Government policy generally, as it affected local people.

12.4.2 The Hunn report

The *Report on the Department of Maori Affairs* (‘the Hunn report’) established the basis for Crown policy toward Maori in the 1960s. The author, J K Hunn, became the Secretary for Maori Affairs. He commented that ‘Evolution is clearly integrating Maori and pakeha’.³ ‘Integration’ was a process in which Maori ‘have taken quite remarkable strides forward in the last two generations’ and this process was expected to accelerate in the next two generations.⁴ At a time when the Maori population was increasing rapidly and many Maori were moving to the cities in search of employment, it was the role of the Department of Maori Affairs to ensure that this ‘evolution’ was appropriately directed. Hunn believed that urbanisation was inevitable and essential for employment, and observed that, ‘Far from being deplored, the “urban drift” can be welcomed as the quickest and surest way of integrating the two species of New Zealander.’⁵

‘Integration’ was defined as a process and an objective: ‘To combine (not fuse) the Maori and pakeha elements to form one nation wherein Maori culture remains distinct.’⁶ The underlying assumption was that Maori, whose condition in 1800 was compared with that of ancient Britons at the time of the Roman invasion in 55BC, had to catch up and make the transition to ‘the 1960 pattern of living’, to a ‘modern’ way of life.

With the benefit of hindsight some three decades later, it is difficult to distinguish this policy of integration from the assimilationist assumptions derived from nineteenth-century colonial administrations. These combined Darwinian ideas of survival of the fittest with concepts of the superiority of modern industrial culture and the desirability of indigenous people ‘catching up’, so that they might then enjoy the benefits of civilised life in the 1960s.

Officers of the Department of Maori Affairs, the Ministry of Works, and others operated within a framework of assumptions that Maori 'development' had to be directed; that urbanisation was the route to integration; that some Maori lived in a primitive, backward mode which was not desirable; and that such people needed to be persuaded 'to fall into line'. Maori culture was relegated to those elements such as language, arts and crafts, and marae institutions which might be worthy of preservation. This simplistic view of cultural relations had its critics even in the 1960s. Professor Bruce Biggs damned the report in 1961 as over-simplified and 'impatient of cultural differences'. He wrote:

Is integration as simple and polarised as the report suggests? Are the Maoris who are most advanced in terms of living standards the ones who have completely abandoned their Maori institutions and vice versa? Do the backward Maoris who live in isolated rural communities really provoke more of the frictions of co-existence than their city cousins who have absorbed more of the Pakeha way of life? And is urbanisation the quick frictionless road to integration? Why in the list of Maori cultural relics are only the most obvious, even hackneyed items mentioned, while no mention is made of for example: aroha; extended kinship obligations; attitudes to land, children, sex, rank; and other customs, values and attitudes of which long-time observers of the Maori are aware.⁷

In its consideration of social impacts, the environmental impact statement prepared in July 1973 for the Rangipo power scheme was restricted to issues related to ongoing employment and the survival of Turangi as a permanent township. The statement suggested that life in Turangi for many Maori was an important step in helping them prepare for city life.⁸ In the context of a Government policy of continuing to encourage Maori to migrate to cities to find jobs, this statement seems to imply that the Ministry of Works was assisting local Maori. It is beyond the scope of our inquiry to review Government policy generally on Maori

housing and urbanisation. However, it is now well established that the massive urban migration of Maori in the 1950s and 1960s was the cause of considerable social disruption, with negative cultural impacts in loss of identity with ancestral lands, language, and tribal tradition. On a number of occasions, the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board supported a policy of keeping young people in their home district and curbing the process of urbanisation. To some extent, the employment opportunities offered by the TPD did just that. But the restrictive housing policies of the Ministry of Works in the Turangi township worked to the detriment of many Ngati Turangitukua families.

12.4.3 Restrictive housing policies

The Ministry of Works' policy on housing Maori families in Turangi, including those who had been forced to move, was worked out in association with the Department of Maori Affairs at district office level. On 30 April 1965, the District Commissioner of Works informed the Commissioner of Works that there had been informal discussions with Maori Affairs officers in Wanganui, who had already received 14 applications for housing loans for the Turangi area. He noted that the Ministry had originally given assurances 'that dispossessed owners and their families would receive priority allocations of sections where required to establish their home in the township', and suggested that Maori Affairs be given an assurance 'that a section will be allocated to that Department for each applicant approved by them for housing finance' (B2(a):317).

On 18 May 1966, the Acting District Commissioner of Works wrote to Warren Gibson setting out, in the form of draft letters, the policy to be followed in the preferential allocation of sections to Maori in the Turangi township and noting that 'Unless there are special reasons I do not think we should attempt to reserve sections for unspecified applicants' (B2(a):318). In the draft letter headed 'Advice to Maori Affairs Department', the Ministry made it clear that it would only make sections available where the applicant had the intention and the money to build on it and that the allocations were in keeping with the assurances given at the 24 May 1964 meeting and 'quite independent of any compensation negotiations' (B2(a):319). A successful applicant who had been approved for mortgage finance through the Department of Maori Affairs, the State Advances Corporation, or another source had to purchase a section ranging in value from £600 to £750 (B2(a):320).

The assurances on housing made by Ministry of Works officers at the 24 May meeting were couched in very general terms: some houses would have to be moved, those who were displaced would be offered alternative accommodation, and compensation would be paid. At one point during the 20 September 1964 meeting, Gibson stated that the 'Ministry of Works proposes to buy all the land' and owners could 'make application to buy it back'. No price was mentioned and, in the context of so much else that was being said about the proposed TPD, the position was not made clear. In any case, Gibson went on to state that 'All this is subject to negotiation' (A7:83). When a policy of preferential allocation of sections was implemented, it was quite separate from any compensation agreements, and, in practice, applying for a housing loan in Turangi was no different from applying for financial assistance to build a house anywhere else.

For those who could afford it, it went against the grain to have family land taken by the Crown and then have to buy back a small section at a much higher price, which included the cost of development of roads and services which they did not necessarily need or want. There were some families who were displaced who could not meet the financial requirements for a Maori Affairs housing loan. At the 24 May 1964 meeting, Dick Lynch said, as we have quoted elsewhere (see para 12.3.1), that 'the intention was that the owner should be left as well off as he was previously' (A7:80). As we have seen, however, some families who could not afford to buy a new section and build a house were left much worse off than before.

Ministry of Works officials seem to have had an underlying concern to keep the number of sections allocated to local Maori to a minimum. On 18 March 1968, Gibson wrote to Lynch seeking clarification of eligibility for the preferential allocation of sections. The point at issue was the availability of sections for absentee Maori owners returning to Turangi, in line with assurances given and recorded in the minutes of the 24 May 1964 meeting. Gibson felt that any number of family members could claim a right to a section, and asked whether any minimum landowning interest had been set before someone qualified for the right to claim a section under the preferential scheme. Otherwise, he felt, the Ministry of Works

‘would be put in a very embarrassing position, as the number of sections which can be allocated this way is limited without expanding the town’s original area’ (B2(a):323).

On 25 March, Lynch responded that the ‘original intention was that a dispossessed owner would be granted priority where he or a member of his family could reasonably claim to have been deprived of land upon which they would have built’. It had been estimated that about 50 sections would be involved. However, he explained, the Department of Maori Affairs had begun arranging the supply of sections for any of their clients ready to build, and some Maori entitled to make a claim to the Ministry for a section could have been satisfied with an arrangement made with Maori Affairs (B2(a):325).

It is not clear why Gibson was so concerned about restricting the allocation of sections to local Maori. Given that Ngati Turangitukua applicants had to meet the same criteria as any other Maori applicant for a Maori Affairs housing loan, it is hard to see that any preferential treatment was being given to the people who had been dispossessed, the tangata whenua. We do not know how many of the Maori Affairs housing loans granted in the Turangi township in the 1960s were granted to Ngati Turangitukua families. Restricting the allocation of sections to those who could meet the requirements for a housing loan and build within a specific time period (six months was suggested) also precluded some families from purchasing a section and saving up for a deposit for a house over a longer period. The Ministry of Works’ attempts to prevent ‘trafficking in sections’ by only allocating sections where Maori Affairs housing finance had been arranged placed greater restrictions on local people in Turangi than if they had tried to buy a section on the open market in any other town.

One example which illustrates how this ‘preferential allocation’ of sections to Maori did not always work out was the case of Duke Tamaira, who was represented by a Taumarunui law firm, McKenzie Ferguson and Donovan. Tamaira was the sole owner of Waipapa 1L1A, a house site of 1 rood 8 perches (1214m²) fronting on the old SH41, which was one of the blocks taken by proclamation on 1 April 1965.⁹ He wanted a section in the new Turangi township in exchange. On 6 July 1965, Lynch wrote to McKenzie Ferguson and Donovan stating that a section would be provided to Tamaira in lieu of cash compensation, providing he could ‘establish his intention of building a residence thereon for his own use’. If Tamaira preferred cash

compensation, however, he would not qualify for any preferential treatment in the allocation of a replacement section. 'Meantime,' wrote Lynch:

I am asking Project Engineer to earmark a section as close as possible to the original holding. It must be realised that the section cannot be held vacant indefinitely and for this reason your clients urgent decision – cash or replacement section – is required. (B10(a): doc 8)

A section was allocated to Tamaira, but his lawyer wisely advised him to wait until a valuation of his taken land was available before making a final decision. On 26 November, the lawyer wrote to Lynch stating that Tamaira had been advised to approach Ministry of Works officials in Turangi about choosing a section, which he had done. 'However,' he wrote, 'he says that the Ministry of Works people at Turangi have referred him back to us.' The lawyer sought clarification of the situation and, on 6 January 1966, Lynch replied that he was prepared to recommend that Tamaira receive a preferentially allocated section if he (Tamaira) obtained Maori Affairs assistance and intended to build, and that this would be in compensation for the taking of Waipapa 1L1A, despite, on the basis of valuations, this being to Tamaira's advantage. Lynch noted, however, 'that this proposal is without prejudice should Tamaira be unable to show that the section is essential for his own establishment' (B10(a): doc 8).

There was more correspondence indicating that Tamaira wanted to choose a section in the Turangi township. On 23 February 1966, the lawyer advised Lynch that the Maori welfare officer favoured Tamaira's application and 'will recommend that a loan to enable him to build be granted' (B10(a): doc 8). On 8 March, Lynch wrote to J E Cater seeking confirmation of Tamaira's eligibility. The

Impacts on Ngati Turangitukua

Maori Trust Office replied on 3 May that ‘in view of past performance it is unlikely that Duke Tamaira would be recommended as eligible for a Maori housing loan’, although any application he made would ‘have to be treated on its merits’(B10(a): doc 8).

On 11 May 1966, McKenzie Ferguson and Donovan wrote to Lynch urgently seeking the legal description of the allocated section in order to complete a housing loan application. The response sent on 13 May was that this would ‘not be available for some time’ but, in the meantime, the section was ‘identified as lot 105 plan HDH43113 – area 22p – Tautahanga Road Turangi’, which should be sufficient description for a housing loan application. Lynch also advised that he had checked Tamaira’s eligibility for a Maori Affairs housing loan. ‘From advice received,’ he wrote, ‘there is considerable doubt as to his reliability and I am not very optimistic about the outcome of your application’ (B10(a): doc 8). The lawyer responded on 10 May that his discussion with the assistant district officer of the Department of Maori Affairs indicated ‘that a proper application would be considered and we have reasonable expectations of being able to satisfy the Department that Tamaira should receive a loan’ (B10(a): doc 8). Lynch checked again with Maori Affairs and, on 12 July 1966, was advised that ‘no application for housing assistance has been received from Mr Duke Tamaira’ (B10(a): doc 8).

Lynch wrote to McKenzie Ferguson and Donovan on 27 July 1966 stating that ‘We seem to be going around in circles and I think a straight out cash settlement for the taking of Waipapa 1L1A – with no tags – is the only way we can reach finality.’ He proposed a settlement figure of £650, made up of a valuation of £600, plus interest since 1 April 1965 and legal fees (B10(a): doc 8).

The lawyer immediately wrote back indicating that an attempt had been made to sort out the situation through Maori Land Court proceedings, but this had not eventuated because one of Tamaira's brothers, who had promised assistance, had not been able to appear at the hearing. The lawyer agreed to recommend acceptance of the cash offer. On 9 August, John Bennion, on Gibson's behalf, informed the District Commissioner of Works that Tamaira wished to retain his section and build, rather than accept the compensation, but was having trouble with finance. He asked whether the district commissioner would:

please discuss the matter with Maori Affairs to see if there is any possibility of Mr Tamaira building a house with their assistance. While we do not want to see sections lying idle after development, I feel that in the case of Maori compensation and preferential sections a reasonable time must be allowed to organise finance and start building. I would suggest a period of 12 months from the date of availability for building is appropriate. In this case this would mean that we would be expecting construction on Mr Tamaira's house to start by June 1967. (B10(a): doc 8)

However, Bennion's intervention came too late. On 10 August 1966, Tamaira signed a memorandum of agreement in his solicitor's office accepting the sum of £650 'in full and final satisfaction of all claims for compensation', with a settlement date of 30 October 1966.

There was a further sting in this tale, however, when it was found that there was an outstanding survey lien of 10 shillings on Waipapa 1L1, the 'parent block' of 1L1A, which had to be met. Therefore, on 25 October 1966, a cheque for £649 10s was sent to McKenzie Ferguson and Donovan in payment of compensation for Tamaira's section, and the district commissioner undertook to pay the balance of 10 shillings to the chief surveyor in payment of the survey lien, a payment which should have been shared among all the owners of the parent block.

12.4.4 No provision for Ngati Turangitukua's future housing needs

One of the principal concerns of Ngati Turangitukua people whose lands were taken was the preservation of enough land on which local people could build their homes. As we have already outlined in chapter 10, the Maori owners of the residual lands west of the Turangi township were severely constrained by the Taupo County Council's planning policy, which zoned their lands rural, thus meaning there would be no reticulation of the water supply or sewerage. In a review of Turangi in 1975, the Taupo County Council's planner, Peter Crawford, explained that:

all future residential and urban land use in the Southern Taupo area will be concentrated in Turangi. This is a legal policy which means that no new urban areas will be created. Such a policy is necessary in order to preserve Lake Taupo and environs and Turangi is a strategic piece in the policy.¹⁰

Ngati Turangitukua families had foreseen the need for future housing sites and some, like Duke Tamaira, had already partitioned out residential sections. Arthur Grace stated to the Tribunal that, in his farm lease, there had been 'a provision which meant that any owners with shares in the farm block had a right to take up a building site in a designated block' (A21(1):15). This area was part of the Ohuanga North 5B2C2 and 5B3B blocks fronting on the old SH1. It was taken and valued as rural land but not used, and remains empty of houses as part of the Landcorp block between the old and the new SH1. These owners were deprived of house sites for the future. Indeed, many younger generation Ngati Turangitukua will not be able to live on family blocks. When Ngati Turangitukua want to return to

Turangi, they have to purchase houses in the town. Those who might have been entitled to house sites but were unable to meet the conditions for a Maori Affairs housing loan in the 1960s and build within six months lost any entitlement for themselves and their descendants. It is seldom expected in other instances that building a house follows immediately after the purchase of land. This sort of pressure put on Ngati Turangitukua by the Ministry of Works was unreasonable. The argument based on a perceived shortage of house sites is not well grounded, because there were areas taken in Turangi, in addition to the Landcorp block, which were not used for township purposes and were later offered for sale. There are vacant sections in Turangi even today.

Another aspect of the housing issue was an expectation that, once the construction phase was over, land would come back to owners. Arthur Grace stated that Gibson:

told our people that only the land absolutely required for the project would be retained once the project was built. Everybody envisaged the people getting most of the land back after the construction and they saw themselves having the benefit of the town as well. (A21(1):5)

On the Rawhiti Rangataua lands, where many of the substandard houses brought in by truck from other projects were located, owners assumed that, when these houses were removed, the land would return to them. Jim Rawhiti Rangataua stated:

I recall that, at a meeting on Hirangi Marae which was held on 20 September 1964, attended by the whole hapu, [Project] Engineer Mr Gibson was talking to my older brother George Rawhiti who was the spokesman for our family. George said that he wanted to keep a block out of the development for his family . . . part of Waipapa 1F3B2B3B . . . Mr Gibson said *'Well, Mr Rawhiti, we'll put in a road for you. We'll put substandard homes on your land, and we'll withdraw the substandard homes when the job is finished'*. What was intended was that the area identified by my brother would be used to house people in substandard housing during the period when the development was being built, and the houses would be taken away afterwards. We knew the houses would have to be taken away because they were below the standards set by the Taupo

County. Once the project was finished and the houses were removed, that land was to come back to us. That was clearly understood by everyone concerned.

At the time the project was taking place, I was in business. My business phone was bulldozed down. My road was bulldozed all around my house. One time they had to pull me out with a truck so that I could get to work. There used to be manuka trees all around where I lived, but that was all bulldozed down.

Once the sections were cleared, they started bringing in the substandard houses. . . . At that time, we expected to get the land back. That Rawhiti block was the only one where they put substandard houses, and we thought that was because they knew they had to get rid of them when the time came for us to get the land back.

Sure enough, at the end of the project, they started taking the substandard houses away. But then they began selling the sections. Some of the sections sold at auction. We protested to the Ministry of Works and to the County. We found out that the Ministry of Works had handed the land over to the County, and we were given the impression that it was nothing to do with us anymore. We had to stand by while they sold the land, and there was nothing we could do about it. [Emphasis in original.] (A22: 1, pp 1–2)

There was clearly a major misunderstanding, because this block had been taken by proclamation in 1966.¹¹ This statement illustrates comments made by other claimants that they did not know what was going on, or which land was being taken. A further misconception that the land was handed over to the county council was also typical, and indicates a confusion between the taking over of local government by the Taupo County Council and the transferral of lands for disposal from the Ministry of Works to the Department of Lands and Survey. This family had wrongly assumed that their land would come back to them. The compensation subsequently negotiated by the Maori Trustee for the 16 acres taken in Waipapa 1F3B2B3B was \$6200, but this was reduced by \$2800 for the ‘betterment’ provided by the construction of an urban road, Papua Street, to Jim Rangataua’s house. Eileen Duff commented in her submission to the Tribunal that compensation ‘should not have been reduced by nearly half for putting in a road that Uncle Jim never asked for’ (A22(2):5).

Although we have focused on housing in this section, it is difficult to separate out this one issue from the many that impacted on Ngati Turangitukua

families. This example illustrates the powerlessness that many felt then and still do. It also illustrates the failure of communication between local people and the Ministry of Works, and the general feeling of loss of control and disorientation. The immediate and often most painful impact on Ngati Turangitukua was the dislocation of households, the loss of lifestyle and livelihood, and the loss of the guarantee of a place on ancestral lands for their children. The pain of this loss is long term, and is being passed on to the next generation.

12.5 THE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS

In 1964, when the decision was made to proceed with the construction of the TPD and a permanent town at Turangi, a great deal of preliminary work had been done by engineers. There had not been, as is now required of any developer, any assessment of the impacts of the development project on the local environment, physical and human, at Turangi. In 1972 Cabinet issued guidelines on environmental protection and enhancement procedures, which required that an environmental assessment be carried out for any development proposal and, if appropriate, an environmental impact report be compiled. The Commission for the Environment was established to oversee the 'audit' of such reports.

An environmental impact report was required to provide a general description of the existing environment prior to the implementation of a proposed project, including any ‘relevant aspects of the existing human environment’, such as ‘community patterns, man-made facilities, activities etc’.¹² The impact assessment report was also required to outline the expected effects and estimate their magnitude, intensity, and significance; establish whether they would be adverse and/or beneficial, unavoidable and/or irreversible; and identify and evaluate the safeguards proposed to alleviate or remedy the expected impact. The report also had to include some comment on individuals and agencies consulted ‘for their expert views, advice or opinion’, as well as references to any other written papers used.¹³

The process of environmental impact assessment and the audit of environmental impact reports became well established by the late 1970s. By the early 1980s, with the realisation of the magnitude of the social implications of the large energy development projects in Northland and Taranaki, there was an increasing emphasis on social impact assessment. In 1985 the Town and Country Planning Directorate of the Ministry of Works published a guide for developers and local authorities entitled *Social Impact Assessment in New Zealand*.

By the late 1980s, the process of social impact assessment was well established as part of the planning for any significant development project. Taylor, Bryan, and Goodrich set out six steps in the social assessment process which should be

carried out by developers in consultation with local and regional government and the local people likely to be affected. Their process also assumed that qualified social scientists and community workers would be employed along with engineers and other technical experts as planning proceeded.¹⁴

The first step in the process of social assessment was described as ‘scoping’, and the second stage involved a ‘social overview’. The third stage in the social assessment process was the ‘formulation of alternatives’.¹⁵ If there are several options, the preferred one must be chosen on the basis of the social, environmental, technical, and engineering information available, in consultation with all parties involved. The options could include a decision not to proceed. If the project were to proceed, the fourth stage would be a decision on a specific option, or options, and a more detailed analysis of the likely effects, including ‘mitigation and management of impacts’, before a final decision was made. This stage would involve a weighing up of all the pros and cons of a particular proposal, bearing in mind the different views held by different social groups, public agencies, and private sector interests.¹⁶ The fifth stage in the social assessment process was ‘monitoring, mitigation and management’ – that is, the collection of relevant information during project construction, the checking of any discrepancies between expected and actual effects, and the suggesting of any adjustments ‘to help reduce unanticipated and unwanted effects or to enhance benefits’.¹⁷ The final stage was ‘evaluation’, which could be a periodic assessment during the monitoring of the construction but, when the project ended, could include

a 'systematic retrospective review of the social effects of the change being assessed including the social assessment process that was employed'.¹⁸

The construction of the TPD proceeded without any social or environmental impact assessment. The engineering design work, based on investigations over a period of nearly 10 years in the late 1950s and early 1960s, was prepared before approval of the first three stages was given by Cabinet on 21 September 1964. The preparation of plans for the Turangi township was carried out in a much shorter time-frame, beginning late in 1963, and the bulldozers were on site on 1 October 1964. The tight deadlines set by the Ministry of Works and the pace of construction work meant that many decisions were made quickly and without adequate consultation with the local people. The Ministry of Works officials had some preliminary talks with the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board in early 1964, and there was a meeting of Ngati Tuwharetoa called on 24 May 1964. Maori owners who attended this meeting were expected to comprehend a large and complex hydroelectric power scheme, as well as the prospect of a new and permanent town on their lands, *and* to reach agreement on this proposed development at one meeting in one day. It was unrealistic to assume that the full implications would be immediately appreciated. People needed time to think it all through and consider how it might affect them and their families. They needed time to decide on what position to take and on any other responses which might seem appropriate. They were not given that sort of time. The 'agreement' to proceed that came at the end of their meeting was little more than an agreement in principle – an acknowledgement of the potential

benefits to the region and its people which a large development project might bring in terms of employment and amenities. No opportunity was given to consider the possible costs to the local community.

If such a large development project were to be considered now, three decades later, there would have to be a much longer period given to all parties to consider the implications of the proposal. There would be a process of social assessment, along with technical and other assessments which would have to meet the stringent requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and other legislation. The project would be subject to a process of public notification, objection, and appeal. The Resource Management Act, at section 8, includes a requirement to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. In the 1960s, the Crown, as developer, was not bound by any legislative restrictions. Once the approval of a project was granted by Cabinet, the Ministry of Works could, and did, proceed with construction, with little or no accountability. During the 1970s, public attitudes to large Crown development projects changed. By the mid-1980s, the Ministry of Works was employing social scientists and, in 1985, it issued guidelines for assessing the social impact of major development projects.

The assumption in the 1985 guidelines was that all involved or affected in some way by the proposed development project would be given the opportunity to express their views. As we have already outlined in earlier chapters,

there was little consultation with local Maori between May and September 1964, in spite of the appointment of a liaison committee of Maori owners. The 20 September 1964 meeting of Maori owners was merely an opportunity for Ministry of Works officials to tell the local people that the project was proceeding. All the plans and Cabinet submissions were already prepared, and the Ministry only awaited Cabinet approval, which was granted the next day. After that, construction moved apace. Local people felt powerless as bulldozers moved in on 1 October 1964 and the Turangi township was constructed around them.

There was some consultation between the Ministry of Works and the Taupo County Council, which was anxious to see a permanent town developed at Turangi. On 29 September 1964, the council resolved to notify publicly proposed changes to the district scheme. The Ministry of Works did not wait for any objections to be heard before proceeding, because the scheme changes arose out of a ministerial requirement lodged with the county council. Construction was well underway when special legislation, the Turangi Township Act, became law on 4 December 1964. A senior Ministry of Works engineer, John Gardenier, provided a retrospective view of the extent of the Ministry's consultation in 1964:

Turangi has been the first hydro town in New Zealand which was designed and built as a permanent extension of an existing small settlement. This required the involvement not only of the Crown (Ministry of Works) but also of local government (Taupo County Council in this case) and to achieve this the Project Engineer of the Tongariro Power Development proposed some months before the scheme was officially approved, the formation of a liaison committee. This was in June 1964 . . .

It took some time to implement the proposal, which required special legislation. Yet it all went with surprising speed. On 7 August 1964 a meeting of interested parties was convened in Taupo . . . and the Turangi Township Act was passed on 4 December 1964.

Meanwhile much of the technical planning of the town had been completed by a provisionally appointed liaison committee . . . Six lengthy meetings were held between 31 July and 1 December 1964. One meeting lasted from 9 am till 6.30 pm. This was the meeting of 4 August where the detailed standards of the District Scheme of the new town were discussed.

The first meeting of the Liaison Committee with a representation as required by the Act did not take place until 5 April 1965.¹⁹

The ‘provisionally appointed liaison committee’ comprised both elected members and officers of the Taupo County Council (five men), as well as three men from the Ministry of Works, including the project engineer. There was no Maori representation on this provisional committee, nor did the Turangi Township Act 1964 provide specifically for local Maori representation. There were Maori members on the Taupo County Council by virtue of their election to represent the Tongariro riding. Jack Asher chaired the liaison committee from April to October 1965. This position was then taken by Lang Grace as chairman to March 1972, and as a riding member until November 1973. John Asher served as a riding member from October 1971 to October 1972. Both Jack Asher and his son John served as secretary to the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board. However, their position on the liaison committee was ex officio, as elected riding member of the Taupo County Council. Bessie Jorgenson was appointed as a ‘local member’ by the Taupo County Council and served from April 1965 to March 1968 as one of only two women appointed to the liaison committee over the period 1965 to 1974. An elected district community council replaced the liaison committee in 1974.²⁰

Impacts on Ngati Turangitukua

Ngati Turangitukua were the ‘host community’ for the construction of the Turangi township. They were and are the tangata whenua. The claimants told us in their submissions that the Ministry of Works did not respect their mana and rangatiratanga. Their way of life was changed almost overnight. Some families were evicted from their homes. The whole community was rapidly urbanised. They had to adjust to the arrival of a large number of newcomers – people with different lifestyles – who came to live among them, and traditional social structures, leadership styles, and patterns of social control were stretched to breaking point. There were tensions between the newcomers and the host community, and there was social disruption within the host community itself. The elders of Ngati Tuwharetoa, both individually and collectively through the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board, strove to protect Maori interests. But everyone knew that the real power in the community had shifted to the Ministry of Works, which was backed by the Public Works Act 1928. Throughout the submissions, there was a strong sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’, and local people felt powerless. The situation became adversarial. People felt they had to ‘fight’ or they would be ‘trampled on’. At times, especially on the issue of land takings, it seemed that both the Ministry of Works and the Taupo County Council were ranged against Maori landowners. Other Government departments, such as the Wildlife Service of the Department of Internal Affairs and the Department of Lands and Survey, were also trying to obtain land.

In his 1975 study of Turangi, P Crawford noted that ‘prior to the Hydro-electric scheme and for at least 100 years or more Tokaanu and the adjoining district had a well structured and organised Maori community’, but, in the 1960s, ‘the fabric of that community was weakened’. He observed that the Ministry of Works had

been a 'transitory interloper' and had left the local Maori community with the need 'to restructure itself to restore its traditional patterns'.²¹

In the late 1970s², local people were faced with the wind-down phase of the construction of the TPD. After the Rangipo Power Station was commissioned in 1983, the Ministry of Works began selling houses and industrial plant. Lands no longer needed were transferred to the Department of Lands and Survey, and many sections in the town were disposed of. Once again, there was no participation by Ngati Turangitukua in this process. Some expected that these lands, which had not been used or were no longer required by the Ministry of Works, would be returned to them. When some offers to sell land back were made under the provisions of the Public Works Act 1981, local people were dismayed that the current market values of lands taken from them in the late 1960s were beyond what they could afford. This issue of disposal of lands has compounded the sense of grievance.

Many Ngati Turangitukua people acknowledged that, while they had derived some benefit from employment on construction work and from the facilities provided by the new town, when they balanced up the costs and benefits, they felt that they had given up more than they had received. They had lost land, lifestyle, and livelihood. Now that employment prospects in Turangi are more limited, many feel that the promised benefits of the Turangi township and the TPD were more illusory than real. Many accept that the TPD was in the national interest. Some question whether the Turangi township, as designed by the Ministry of Works in the 1960s, was in the national interest. If the Turangi village had been allowed to develop at its own pace, social change would have been slower and at a pace people could have coped with.

Impacts on Ngati Turangitukua

No social assessment, monitoring, or evaluation of the impact of the construction of the Turangi township and the TPD on Ngati Turangitukua was carried out. If a large development project like the TPD were to proceed today, not only would there be a great deal of social and environmental impact assessment prior to the decision to proceed, but there would also be people appointed to community liaison positions who would provide assistance to people affected. In Turangi in the 1960s, the only source of assistance was through solicitors appointed by the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board or individual owners or through the Department of Maori Affairs and the Maori Trust Office. The Wanganui office and, in particular, the district officer, J E Cater, were loaded with an enormous additional administrative burden in the negotiations over the Turangi township and the TPD. None of these people lived in Turangi.

Some indication of the work of the Maori Trust Office in Wanganui in negotiating compensation claims was provided in a letter sent in 1975 by the deputy registrar of the Maori Land Court, Brian Herlihy, following an interview with two owners:

The point I attempted to make when referring to the Ministry of Works and Development was that the Ministry is using public funds and has a responsibility to the taxpayers to ensure that these funds are spent wisely.

The Maori Trustee, however, has no such responsibility to the taxpayers and as agent of the Maori owners his sole responsibility was to ensure that he got the best deal possible for the Maori owners.

When I stated that the Department, and more particularly the Maori Trustee, had done its utmost to ensure the Maori owners got a fair deal, I was not speaking from hearsay but from personal experience. Before returning to work in the Maori Land Court I was directly involved with the work of the Maori Trustee in negotiating compensation with the Ministry of Works and have therefore a personal knowledge of the efforts made to obtain the highest compensation possible.

To help him in his work the Maori Trustee used his own legal staff and also engaged outside expert Legal Counsel and expert Valuers. The work carried out by the Maori Trustee's staff, which on a number of occasions involved night and weekend work, was at no cost to the Maori owners, and the advice of outside experts was at little or no cost

to the owners as the Maori Trustee claimed those expenses against the Ministry of Works. (B10(c): doc 29)

Cater worked closely with the trust board and several solicitors. However, with the magnitude of the task that confronted Maori Affairs staff, in addition to their normal duties, it is not surprising that not all Maori owners were kept fully informed or fully understood the process of negotiation for compensation for lands taken by proclamation by the Crown, or otherwise affected by the Turangi township or the TPD.

Some Ministry of Works engineers, John Bennion in particular, did provide a community liaison role, in addition to their numerous other responsibilities. Bennion commented in his address to the Lions Club symposium on the township's future in 1973 that:

The town itself was inevitably a compromise between the desire to produce a planning and architectural showpiece, and the need to provide, quickly and economically, accommodation and industrial facilities to serve the Power Development.²²

Rural farm land around the old Turangi village was transformed dramatically into the urban landscape of the Turangi township. This engineering accomplishment had a high social cost in the disruption, stress, and continuing sense of grievance among the host community, Ngati Turangitukua.

The construction of the township and the TPD also severely strained the relationship between the Crown and Ngati Tuwharetoa generally. The following comments were part of a statement made by the Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board to the Prime Minister in January 1972, and are still relevant today:

The Tuwharetoa people are currently co-operating with the Lake Taupo Basin Co-ordinating Committee for the establishment of Lakeshore Reserves. We have written assurances from Government that such reserves would only be acquired by Government as a result of negotiation and agreement and that they will not be taken by Government compulsorily. These negotiations are continuing in good faith on the part

of the Tuwharetoa people and resting on the assurances given. The fact that other assurances given with regard to the Tongariro Power Development Scheme have not been kept puts in jeopardy these negotiations and any other negotiations which there might be between the Tuwharetoa people and the Government. The Tuwharetoa people wish to continue negotiations in good faith and in the knowledge that assurances given will be kept. (A10:93–97)

References

-
1. Ministry of Works: Power Division and New Zealand Electricity: Development Division, *Rangipo Power Scheme, Environmental Impact Statement*, cyclostyled report, 1973; Commission for the Environment, *Rangipo Power Scheme: Audit of Environmental Impact Report*, cyclostyled report, 1973
 2. *New Zealand Gazette*, 1966, pp 1333–1334
 3. J K Hunn, *Report on the Department of Maori Affairs*, Wellington, Government Printer, 1961, p 15
 4. *Ibid*, p 14
 5. *Ibid*
 6. *Ibid*, p 15
 7. B Biggs, 'Maori Affairs and the Hunn Report', *Journal of The Polynesian Society*, vol 70, 1961, pp 361–364
 8. Ministry of Works and New Zealand Electricity, p 15
 9. *New Zealand Gazette*, 1965, p 436
 10. P Crawford, *Turangi – 1975*, Taupo Regional Development Committee, Regional Study Series No 2, 1976, p 35
 11. *New Zealand Gazette*, 1966, p 1487
 12. Commission for the Environment, *Environmental Protection and Enhancement Procedures*, 3rd ed, Wellington, Government Printer, 1980, p 13
 13. *Ibid*, p 14
 14. C N Taylor, C H Bryan, and C G Goodrich, *Social Assessment: Theory, Process and Techniques*, Lincoln University, Studies in Resource Management No 7, 1990
 15. *Ibid*, p 87
 16. *Ibid*, pp 87–88

Turangi Township Report 1995

17. Ibid, p 88
18. Ibid, p 84
19. J Gardenier, *Turangi Liaison Committee 1965–1974*, Turangi, Ministry of Works and Development, 1975, pp 1–2
20. Gardenier, passim
21. Crawford, p 39
22. E V Mercer (ed), *Turangi 'The Town of The Future'*, Turangi, Turangi Lions Club, 1973, p 9