

Ngapuhi Treaty Settlement Issues Survey

Conducted by Horizon Research Limited for
Te Ropu o Tuhoronuku

2 August, 2011

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Principal findings

- **Negotiate 91%:** An overwhelming majority (91.3%) believe Ngapuhi should negotiate to settle Treaty of Waitangi grievances.
- **Tuhoronuku mandate 69%:** 69% support Te Ropu o Tuhoronuku having a mandate to negotiate with the Crown on behalf of all Ngapuhi
- **United settlement 68.7%:** 68.7% support a united Ngapuhi settlement. This includes 17% who support a united settlement, even if some hapu are not included at this time
- **Parallel process 50.3%:** 50.3% support a parallel settlement process – that is, Ngapuhi claimants appearing before the Waitangi Tribunal at the same time as negotiations occur with the Crown
- **Tribunal first 14.7%:** Only 14.7% want claims to be heard before the Waitangi Tribunal before commencing negotiations
- **Others' economic benefits recognised:** Ngapuhi believe that Treaty settlements made more than 10 years ago by other iwi, like Tainui and Ngai Tahu, have been beneficial to those iwis' people (40.3% beneficial to 11.7% not beneficial), and that iwi which have settled have achieved good economic progress for their people (44.2% good to 14.1% not good)
- **Top priorities for use of settlement:** As a result of a settlement, Ngapuhi set greatest priority on it being used to provide:
 - educational support (80.5% rating 1 to 4 on a 1-10 scale, with 1 being highest priority)
 - improve health (78.4%), and
 - Grow Ngapuhi businesses, provides jobs in Ngapuhi businesses and revitalise the te reo and Ngapuhi culture (all 76%)
- 15% made comments about the settlements achieved by other iwi. Most comments were about the model used post-settlement, and pointed to **the Ngai Tahu model as a preferred approach** over the Tainui model.

1.2 Awareness of Ngapuhi Treaty of Waitangi settlement process

- Awareness that Ngapuhi had begun its Treaty of Waitangi settlement journey was high (71.9%)
- 54.3% had heard that Te Ropu o Tuhoronuku had been set up to progress Ngapuhi's settlement (43.7% had not heard)

- 50% were aware Te Ropu o Tuhoronuku represented all Ngapuhi no matter where they lived in Aotearoa or the world (49.7% unaware)
- 55.4% were not aware Te Ropu o Tuhoronuku was about to seek a mandate to represent Ngapuhi in settlement negotiations with the Crown (44.6% aware). However, this lower level of awareness did not translate to a lack of support for giving Te Ropu o Tuhoronuku a mandate to negotiate with the Crown (69% support, 31% saying no).
- When asked how they would show their support or opposition to a mandate for Tuhoronuku, 35.3% said they would do so by attending hui; 50.8% by voting by postal ballot and 75.6% by online voting. All who said they would attend hui also said that they would use postal voting.

1.3 Informing Ngapuhi

- 29.5% felt they were well informed (9.1% very well informed, 21% informed) before the survey about Ngapuhi's Treaty settlement process, while 35% did not feel well informed (17% poorly, 18.1% very poorly). 31.5% felt neither well nor poorly informed.
- 45.6% had visited Tuhoronuku's web site before the survey (54.4% had not, and were invited to view it). Respondents were then asked their thoughts on the website.
- 71.6% regard it has informative (29.9% very informative, 41.7% informative), while 6% regard it as not informative enough (4.9%) or not informative at all (1.1%) and 22.3% were neutral

2. NGAPUHI THINKING

The survey also captured extensive comments from Ngapuhi on why they were responding on various issues. Some 32,000 words were entered and are available via the Horizon Research online results analysis system).

2.1 Other iwis' settlements benefits:

Several iwi have settled Treaty claims. Some, like Tainui and Ngai Tahu, settled their Treaty claims more than 10 years ago.

What is your opinion of what these iwi have achieved since making their settlements?

| | | | |
|----|---|--|-------|
| A. | The settlements have been beneficial to their people |  | 40.3% |
| B. | The settlements have not been beneficial to their people |  | 11.7% |
| C. | They have achieved good economic development for their people |  | 44.2% |
| D. | They have not achieved good economic development for their people |  | 14.1% |
| E. | Something else (please tell us what that is) |  | 15.2% |

Of the 44% who believed other iwi who had settled earlier had achieved economic benefits for members, most preferred the Ngai Tahu outcomes. Typical responses included:

- *Ngai Tahu seem to be doing ok...not sure about the others*
- *Ngai Tahu and their whai rawa scheme, an iwi that is focused on inter-generational wealth*
- *Ngai Tahu have achieved good economic development, but their people are not benefiting*
- *Ngai Tahu have used their settlements productively with their whanau. Unfortunately Tainui have too many personalities and egos in house and therefore like the casino and rugby league team that they purchased the people at the grass roots level did not benefit from the settlement.*
- *Ngai Tahu Iwi are a good example in terms as they continue to work towards their goals for the benefit of their Iwi. Also, they are well organised.*
- *Ngai Tahu only have made good progress*
- *Not all whanau and hapu have been informed of the treaty settlements not only in Aotearoa but also overseas.*
- *Not sure if the people have benefited, surely the company has.*
- *Our Ngapuhi whanau need help now*
- *Payments have been made to their members from profits*
- *Potential for future growth*
- *Reunited people, encouraged younger generation to achieve their greatest potential because they have so much more to look forward to - whenua, moana, iwi etc.*
- *Some like Ngai Tahu have done very wise things for their people, other not so much*
- *some settlements have been beneficial for some people*
- *The Governance of Tainui is rubbish compared to Ngai Tahu, I think the governance model adopted by Ngai Tahu works best*
- *The settlements have only been good for SOME of their people*

2.3 Negotiating to settle

Do you think that Ngapuhi should negotiate to settle their Treaty grievances?

| | | | |
|----|-----|---|-------|
| A. | Yes |  | 91.3% |
| B. | No |  | 8.7% |

Those who thought Ngapuhi should negotiate to settle their Treaty grievances said they thought this way mainly to find solutions quicker and fund a better future for the people. Nearly all respondents made comments on their support for negotiating a settlement.

- *Negotiation leads to solutions that work for both sides and to move forward you have to negotiate. If Ngapuhi want to move forward they need to learn how to negotiate effectively*
- *Because so much of it is historical and has to be proved. Many of us have left Northland as there is nothing there for our children but drugs and unemployment*
- *A good negotiator can settle these things a lot quicker and fairer for all parties concerned and the quicker these settlements are dealt with the better the whole off NZers will be as people are starting to resent the Treaty taking so long being settled. It makes sense so the money can be wisely invested to help people (for the iwi) in need.*
- *A) Negotiate to get the best and fairest deal regarding compensation for past wrongs
B) Settle so we can start funding our forward thinking for the benefit of our people!*
- *(Ngapuhi) will able to contribute to the economy from a position of strength*
- *all tribes should be settling their grievances*
- *A lot of korero is required so that all whakaaro are listened to with decisions collectively reached.*
- *Any grievance needs to be settled, otherwise the grievance festers and the people suffer*
- *It's time for them to claim their rights*
- *We should settle to represent what our tupuna both Maori and Pakeha would want, so we can become true New Zealanders.*
- *As with Tainui and Ngai Tahu, Ngapuhi deserve to be compensated and recognised for all that the tribe as a whole... lost and suffered during (the) colonisation period*
- *Because I feel negotiation is good*
- *Because i think it's the right thing to do*
- *I do not believe we should go through the Waitangi tribunal process, it could take up to twenty years for the tribunal to go through all the grievances and then the crown may not even take any notice of them. If Ngapuhi have the opportunity to negotiate now I think they should take it. The longer we wait the more opportunities are lost. how many more of our kaumatua and kuia are to pass away without any satisfaction.*
- *I feel that now's the time to settle things also there are years of grievances to be sorted*

Among the smaller number who thought Ngapuhi should not negotiate, thoughts were:

- *Because there could never be a final chapter in claims. It is an on-going because it was a brokering for peace on the pakeha's side, and has since been whittled at by politicians for their own means, The treaty was intended to help the Maori people without going to war, now they want it all settled so they can own the rest of what is left, and it's not just the pakeha that is doing it, some Māori are involved too.*

- *Negotiation will have major losses all across the board, look at the treaty between the whites and Maoris look what happened, we lost our culture, language etc., what we have left is what the whites allowed.*
- *Because of the legal grounds we have under the declaration of Independence signed previous to Te Tiriti O Waitangi*
- *There are other issues to settle before a negotiations can be entered into.*
- *My tupuna never ceded their Sovereignty*

2.4 The Tuhoronuku mandate

Would you support Tuhoronuku having a mandate to negotiate with the Crown?

| | | | |
|----|-----|---|-----|
| A. | Yes |  | 69% |
| B. | No |  | 31% |

Supporters:

Those saying they would support giving Tuhoronuku the mandate to negotiate a settlement said they did so they because they wanted a knowledgeable voice, felt they were good representatives, Tuhoronuku's representation was broad, Ngapuhi were widespread and individuals could not negotiate. Others wanted to ensure Tuhoronuku recognised all Ngapuhi.

- *A collaborative, collective approach is needed.*
- *A good selection of people from different areas.*
- *A good varied mix of Maori to represent Ngapuhi's interests makes me confident with their negotiations directly with the Crown.*
- *A voice independent of the Runanga is preferable.*
- *An educated, knowledgeable voice is more pertinent than many little cries based on supposed knowledge*
- *As long as they recognise ALL Ngapuhi then yes I would support the mandate*
- *As long as they talked to the iwi and the iwi knew and approved what was happening I don't mind*
- *We need to have one group that will voice our concerns; if many people spoke it could get quite mucky and take ages to sort.*
- *It seems that they have made efforts to act in the interests of all Ngapuhi no matter where they currently reside.*
- *It would take too long to negotiate with all separate factions of Ngapuhi nui tonu. As long as no one hapu/iwi is left out I am happy.*
- *It's not just one person making a decision. It can gather the wisdom and knowledge from many different people*
- *Tuhoronuku are representing the most prominent iwi (Ngapuhi) who are scattered throughout NZ, Australia and other places overseas. I think the representatives they have engaged to help with the mandate makes sense when negotiating with the Crown.*
- *If Tuhoronuku are prepared to bring their message to us, it makes sense that we can trust them to negotiate and map a future pathway on our behalf.*
- *It provides a viable option for matters to proceed.*
- *It seems fair representation covering all Ngapuhi iwi utilising rural urban and old new views.*
- *It would be a cheaper faster way.*
- *The crown will negotiate fairly if this is the case*
- *They an open, transparent organization grounded in the iwi who are known, and who have Ngapuhi interests at heart. They are also capable of doing this and doing it well.*

Opponents of a mandate:

Those who said they would not support a Tuhoronuku mandate, did not support a select group only being involved, wanted wider hapu involvement and regional and marae-based representation, raised issues of legal rights under the declaration of independence, suspected Government involvement. Many said they did not know enough about the Tuhoronuku representatives or their qualifications and their position would be conditional on that.

- *All Ngapuhi should have an opportunity to negotiate; it should not be a select group.*
- *All tribes are just looking for a quick pay day and having people on their boards that are not going to represent the majority of these iwi's.*
- *Because I don't know who they*
- *Every person in our iwi should have the chance to know about a group representing and have the chance to nominate and vote. This may have happened but was not open up to ALL iwi members,*
- *It should be represented by all hapu not only some also the hapu and all representatives should be Ngapuhi Marae based not regional based like Auckland west. Finally the Runanga should not have representation on the negotiating team they should be kept separate from the entire process.*
- *Because of our legal rights under British Law re the Declaration of Independence*
- *Because of the way that Tuhoronuku leadership have treated claimants - it's not that I disagree with the mechanism, I just think it could have been led in a much more cohesive (whanaungatanga) way*
- *Because they are a government entity set up under the Waitangi Tribunal*
- *They are usurping the prerogative of hapu; they are unqualified and are hardly representative of anyone.*
- *They cannot represent all hapu if all hapu do not agree with the terms.*
- *I want hapu to have fair representation on Tuhoronuku I want hapu to have the chance to negotiate.*
- *Each hapu have their own mana.*

3. USE OF TREATY SETTLEMENT PROCEEDS

A large majority of Ngapuhi want to see proceeds from a Treaty settlement used to improve education, health and investment in iwi owned businesses to create jobs. A revival of the reo and culture is also sought.

A scale of 1 to 10 was used for respondents to indicate the priority they gave to various initiatives, 1 being the highest priority, 10 the lowest.

The least popular option was using proceeds to provide better social services with 39.8% ranking it 1 to 4, 21% neutral (5) and 50.6% low (between 6 and 10).

| Initiative | Top ranking 1-4/10 | Ranking 5 /10 | Low ranking 6-10 |
|--|---------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Educational support | 80.5 | 3.7 | 15.8 |
| Improve Ngapuhi health | 78.4 | 5.3 | 16.3 |
| Revitalise the reo and Ngapuhi culture | 76.7 | 5.3 | 18 |
| Jobs created by Ngapuhi businesses | 76.5 | 5.6 | 17.9 |
| Grow Ngapuhi businesses | 76.3 | 7.3 | 16.4 |
| Rebuild marae | 69.9 | 8 | 22.1 |
| Return of taonga | 63.4 | 11.4 | 25.2 |
| Make Ngapuhi great | 58.4 | 11.1 | 30.3 |

| | | | |
|---|------|------|------|
| again | | | |
| Ngapuhi to have major influence in the life of Aotearoa | 53.3 | 14.1 | 32.6 |
| Provide better social services | 39.8 | 3.7 | 50.6 |

4. CONCLUSIONS

- **A significant majority support a negotiated settlement**
- **There is majority support for a parallel process** (i.e. direct settlement negotiations with the Crown for an early settlement, while at the same time individual Ngapuhi Treaty claims are heard through the Waitangi Tribunal).
- **A significant majority support a united Ngapuhi settlement.**
- **A significant majority support Tuhoronuku having a mandate** to negotiate with the Crown on behalf of all Ngapuhi
- Respondents want to see education, job and business growth, improved health and revitalisation of the reo and Ngapuhi culture as key priorities following settlement.
- **Only 29.7% feel well informed about the settlement process;** this figure is much higher in Northland. Many of those not yet supporting a Tuhoronuku mandate want to know more about the negotiators and to ensure consultation is widespread.

5. METHODOLOGY

Sample

Horizon Research has established the Horizon Research Maori Panel by inviting Maori nationwide to register. Invitations were issued by e-mail to ensure the panel matches the Maori population at the 2006 census.

Panel members select one of 75 a primary iwi affiliations.
At the time of the survey the panel had 613 Ngapuhi members.

Members of the Horizon Research Maori Panel who had identified their iwi as Ngapuhi were invited to take part in this survey, together with additional Ngapuhi from lists sourced by Te Ropu o Tuhoronuku. 302Ngapuhi completed the survey, a response rate of 49.2%. This compares with typical response rates of about 30% for online surveys in general.

The maximum margin of error at a 95% confidence level is 5.6% overall but is effectively 5.4% on the key question of support for Tuhoronuku having a mandate to negotiate with the Crown.
**This sample size is similar to those for TVNZ's Marae DigiPoll*

Dates

The survey was conducted between July 2 and 22, 2011.

Geographic distribution of respondents

The pre-weighting geographic distribution of respondents by local authority area was:

| | |
|---------------------------|--------|
| Northland | 28.5% |
| Auckland | 38.1% |
| Waikato/Thames/Coromandel | 5.2% |
| Bay of Plenty | 2.7% |
| Gisborne/Hawkes Bay | 3.8% |
| Manawatu | 2.7% |
| Wellington | 7.9% |
| Other North island | 1.0% |
| South Island | 10.0% |
| Total | 100.0% |

Analysis

Results shown in this snapshot top-line summary are unweighted.

Respondent comments

All verbatim comments from respondents are captured and available from the Horizon Research system.

Contact

For more information about this survey or additional analysis, please contact Grant McInman, Manager, Horizon Research Limited. Telephone: 021 076 2040. E-mail: gmcinman@horizonresearch.co.nz