

Before the Waitangi Tribunal

Wai 2490  
Wai 2434

**Under** s6 of the Treaty of Waitangi  
Act 1975

**And**

**Concerning** the Ngapuhi Mandate Inquiry

---

**Statement of Evidence in Reply of Herbert Vincent Rihari**  
**(particularly in support of the Ngāti Torehina ki Matakā Wai 2434 Claim**  
Dated: *25* day of *November* 2014

---

<b>RECEIVED</b> Waitangi Tribunal
<b>25 Nov 2014</b>
Ministry of Justice WELLINGTON

**CORBAN REVELL**  
*Lawyers*  
133A Central Park Drive, Waitakere City  
DX DP92558  
PO Box 21-180  
Phone: (09) 837-0550  
Fax: (09) 838-7187  
**Counsel: JP Kahukiwa**

## Statement of Evidence in Reply of Herbert Vincent Rihari

I HERBERT VINCENT RIHARI of Auckland state as follows:

### *Introduction*

1. I have filed affidavits in support of the claim by Ngāti Torehina ki Matakā Wai 2434 in this urgent inquiry on 1 May 2014 (A10), 26 June 2014 (A30a) and 7 November 2014 (A54) respectively.
2. Now that the Crown and Tuhoronuku have filed their evidence I wish to make a further statement in reply.

### *Response to Brief of Evidence of Raniera (Sonny) Tau dated 17 November 2014*

3. In my Brief of Evidence dated 7 November 2014 I stated:<sup>1</sup>

*3. I would like to make some comments about Tuhoronuku and the affect that it is having on us:*

---

*3.1 Coalitions- We are not averse to coalitions. But we want to be able to choose our own coalition. We feel safer in the coalitions that we choose particularly those coalitions that we are used to working with and made up of neighbouring hapu. This is because we already have relationships in place. Tuhoronuku lacks that proximity.*

4. In his Brief of Evidence dated 17 November 2014 Raniera (Sonny) Tau responded to my evidence above as follows:<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Brief of Evidence of Herbert Vincent Rihari, dated 7 November 2014, paragraph 3 (A54)

<sup>2</sup> Brief of Evidence of Sonny Tau, dated 17 November 2014, paragraph 8 (k) (i) (ii) (A98)

*(k) Claimants are not opposed to a unified, coalition approach to settlement, but that they want to choose their own coalition:*

*(i) This position is at odds with many Claimants' fundamental opposition to the idea of hapū only being one part of a larger whole, because such a position (to them) necessarily means hapū rangatiratanga is diminished. This position shows that Claimants are not opposed to the actual structure of the Tūhoronuku IMA and how it works, nor to the idea of hapū coming together in a bigger group to pursue settlement. It raises concerns as to the actual reason for opposition to the Tūhoronuku IMA.*

*(ii) If Claimants want a transparent, accountable vehicle with capacity to take forward Ngāpuhi's aspirations, the Tūhoronuku IMA is that vehicle.*

5. In my view membership of a coalition by its very nature should be voluntary, and protective of the differences that a coalition party brings, while establishing a union that aspires to the same goal. By my understanding coalition by force is not a coalition/union/alliance or partnership – it is a takeover.
6. Mr Tau misunderstands my key point, so I wish to restate this and make it plain; it is not the concept of a coalition that we oppose, rather we maintain that our Hapu and all Hapu have a right to choose to enter into a coalition.
7. The inclusion of our claims within the Tuhoronuku IMA has not come about through a voluntary alliance it has occurred through the seizure

of our claims; it is this act that is a violation of our Hapu Rangatiratanga.

Dated at Auckland this 25 day of November

2014

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'H. Rihari', written over a horizontal line.

Na matou, Ngāti Torehina ki Matakā

Herbert Vincent Rihari