

KEI MUA I TE ROOPU WHAKAMANA I TE TIRITI O WAITANGI

WAI 49/682

I TE TAKE O

Te Ture Te Tiriti o Waitangi 1975

ME

TE TAKE O

A claim by Sir James Clendon Henare on behalf of the members of Ngati-Hine, Ngati-Manu, Te Kapotai and Ngapuhi-nui-tonu concerning Te Awa Tapu o Taumarere and its confluence Te Moana o Pikopiko-i-whiti (Wai 49)

ME

TE TAKE O

A claim by Rewiti Paraone, Kevin Prime and Erima Henare on behalf of Te Runanga o Ngati Hine for and on behalf of descendants of Torongare and Hauhaua (Wai 682)

**AFFIDAVIT OF PITA TIPENE IN SUPPORT OF AN APPLICATION BY NGATI HINE  
SEEKING AN URGENT HEARING INTO THE CROWN'S RECOGNITION OF THE  
TUHORONUKU DEED OF MANDATE**

Dated this <sup>19</sup> <sup>may</sup> 14<sup>th</sup> Day of April 2014

**RECEIVED**

Waitangi Tribunal

**12 May 2014**

Ministry of Justice  
WELLINGTON

**Director**  
Aidan Warren

**Solicitor Acting**  
Season-Mary Downs

One on London  
1 London Street  
PO Box 9348  
Hamilton 3240  
New Zealand

**DX** GP 20020

**T** 64-7-838 2079

**F** 64-7-839 4652

**W** www.mccawlewis.co.nz

**McCaw Lewis**  
LAWYERS

*Pat*

**MENA E PAI ANA KI TE ROOPU WHAKAMANA I TE TIRITI O WAITANGI:**

**Introduction**

I PITA WILLIAM TIPENE of Kawakawa swear as follows:

1. I am the Deputy Chairman of Te Runanga o Ngati Hine and I am authorised to provide this evidence. I am also the Chairman of the Ngati Hine Forestry Trust, the Chairman of Nga Hapu o Te Takutai Moana and the Co-Chair of Te Kotahitanga o Nga Hapu Ngapuhi.
2. This evidence is provided in support of the application by Ngati Hine for an urgent hearing into the Crown's decision to recognise the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate. I have read the application and affidavit evidence of Waihoroi Shortland and Erima Henare and I agree with them.
3. I wish to provide additional relevant information concerning Ngati Hine's exclusion from parts of the Te Runanga a Iwi o Ngapuhi ("TRAION") Board meeting where the Tuhoronuku mandate proposal was discussed. I will also give evidence on issues around the mandate hui held by Tuhoronuku, the vote on the mandate, the various facilitation and mediation processes created to bring parties together, the rejection of substantive recommendations from those processes and finally issues with the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate.

**Exclusion of Ngati Hine from TRAION board meetings**

4. I was the elected Ngati Hine representative on the TRAION Charitable Trust, a position I had held for six years from early 2006 through to the end of 2011. From late 2010, the Chair through the TRAION Board had begun to exclude me from parts of the board meetings on the basis that I had a conflict of interest. I did not consider that my involvement as Co-Chair of Te Kotahitanga o Nga Hapu Ngapuhi gave rise to any conflict of interest. Nor was my public voicing of the people's concerns in regard to the Tuhoronuku mandate process a conflict of interest. This was always alleged by the TRAION Board but never substantiated in relation to their stated policy.



5. Despite repeated requests from myself and other Ngati Hine representatives, the precise basis for this alleged conflict of interest has never been forthcoming.
6. The effect of my exclusion from those parts of the TRAION Board discussions regarding Tuhoronuku was one of severe prejudice for Ngati Hine. During this time Ngati Hine was not being provided with any of the Tuhoronuku reports and were side lined from decisions that were being made on Ngati Hine's behalf. Instead Ngati Hine was provided with a significantly reduced version of the TRAION Board report. This also meant that the people of Ngati Hine were not able to be informed or proactively contribute to the Tuhoronuku mandate process.
7. The Ngati Hine seat at the TRAION Board table was eventually suspended at the end of 2011. Ngati Hine had always elected its representative on the TRAION Board, using its own election processes, a process that the TRAION Board had not challenged previously. However, they chose to challenge the Ngati Hine process on this occasion which resulted in the suspension of Ngati Hine which continues to this day. All the while significant decisions which impacted on Ngati Hine were made by the TRAION board without the input from Ngati Hine. We have raised this matter as an issue for determination by the Maori Land Court in the Ngati Hine withdrawal proceeding against TRAION which I will return to later in my evidence.

#### **Issues with Tuhoronuku mandate hui**

8. In my capacity as Chairman of those organisations I listed in paragraph one, I have strongly advocated the will of the people I represent, often challenging the Tuhoronuku mandate process and its failure to meet the people's needs and aspirations.
9. I attended nearly all road-shows and mandate hui held by Tuhoronuku. I travelled with a small delegation of Ngati Hine to the Tuhoronuku mandate hui held throughout New Zealand and in Australia. The costs of attending those various hui in an attempt to inform our people in

Aotearoa and overseas, fell upon ourselves. Our group had very little funding of our own and no financial support whatsoever from the Crown.

10. The few information hui we did manage to hold in Auckland and in Australia, were warmly received and appreciated by the many people who attended.
11. In my opinion Tuhoronuku misrepresented the level of opposition by the people of Ngapuhi at these road show hui, saying that it was only a small disaffected group of people who opposed Tuhoronuku. As part of our delegation I could see that our people were confused by both the material presented to them and by the style of facilitation used in these hui. Our attendance was also met with opposition from members of Tuhoronuku including the facilitators of each hui. Our alternative proposals were shut down and we were told that if we wanted to present our various points, then we needed to hold our own hui. In fact I was physically intimidated and shouted down at some hui as Tuhoronuku tried to muffle the voice of people like me who had alternative concepts or who challenged their ideas.
12. I can confidently say that there were outright rejections and serious challenges to the Crown and Tuhoronuku mandate processes arising out of most, if not all of the Tuhoronuku mandate hui. The notes from the Crown observers at this hui must surely record this.
13. It is also an issue for us that the Crown did not require Tuhoronuku to hold indicative voting by a show of hands at the mandate hui. When we attempted to hold an indicative vote, Tuhoronuku disallowed it. We believe this is because Tuhoronuku would never have been successful in gaining support via these hui. Instead, Tuhoronuku chose to utilise a voting process that targeted the majority of Ngapuhi who live out of the region and who were not informed of the concerns of the hau kainga.

#### **Failure to hold a hui for Ngati Hine**

14. Tuhoronuku did not hold a mandate hui in the Bay of Islands sub-region or te rohe whenua o Ngati Hine. The hui was cancelled at the last minute



allegedly due to concerns that there would be protest from hapu in the Bay of Islands. As people living in the local area, we had heard of no such protests and were both astonished and angry when Tuhoronuku publicly stated that the venue had been changed at the last minute because of alleged local protests. Hapu in the Bay of Islands including Ngati Hine were then required to attend hui in other regions in order to table their objections to the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate. This proved problematic for us because the hui were so tightly controlled by Tuhoronuku that they only wanted to hear from people who were from those areas and who were in support of their mandate. Also, many did not know of the last minute changes of venue and were never able to attend a hui thereafter.

15. We also note that Tuhoronuku postponed the Bay of Islands information hui for the Independent Mandated Authority election process in March 2014 using the same rationale of protests by locals.

#### **Issues with mandate postal vote**

16. Ngati Hine has raised a number of issues with the Crown regarding the procedure for the postal vote. These have never been addressed by the Crown.
17. One of our key concerns was that many Ngati Hine would not be registered with TRAION and therefore would not have received voting packs in order to vote. TRAION has never been able to tell us how many voting packs were sent to Ngati Hine voters.
18. Those who wanted to vote but were not on the TRAION register were required to register to be able to vote. Many refused to register because they believed their information would be misused for other purposes by TRAION or Tuhoronuku.
19. Further, many of our people refused to deal with Tuhoronuku or vote at all as they felt they were being forced into a process they strongly opposed, such was their loathing for the Tuhoronuku process.
20. During the voting period, several of our people rang the Election NZ free phone number with the intention of registering to vote. However, they

reported that the phone was never answered. Other people reported that although they registered to vote, they had never received voting papers at all.

21. At the mandating hui, the voting box was often overseen by members of Tuhoronuku. We were told that Tuhoronuku was responsible for couriering the box to Elections NZ. The box itself was of poor condition, being a photocopying box closed with brown packaging tape. This lack of security with the ballot box and a distrust of those responsible for its integrity, meant that many people doubted the sincerity of the voting process.
22. We also take issue with the fact that the Crown has never required Tuhoronuku to demonstrate support from a hapu or marae level. Instead, the Crown only required individuals to make an individual vote. This is entirely inconsistent with, and undermines our tikanga of making collective decisions in Ngati Hine.
23. In any case, the outcome of the postal vote was that 76% of those who voted were in favour of Tuhoronuku. We have conducted our own assessment of the vote using the estimated population of Ngapuhi frequently quoted by Tuhoronuku. Our assessment produced the following results:
  - (a) In total, 29,389 packs were sent out;
  - (b) We are unsure how many were returned due to wrong addresses;
  - (c) There were 6818 returned voting packs. This equates to a 23% rate of return;
  - (d) Of those that were sent packs, 77% of them did not choose to support Tuhoronuku;
  - (e) 5210 voted yes - 76.4% of the vote;
  - (f) 5210 is approximately only 4% of the Ngapuhi population based on 2006 census figure;

- (g) 1584 voted no. That is 23.2% of the overall vote;
- (h) 22 voted neither yes or no;
- (i) 2 ineligible;
- (j) 70% voted by post;
- (k) 28% voted online; and
- (l) Only 2% voted at the mandate hui.

- 24. This information indicates a very low participation rate by the people of Ngapuhi in the mandate process.
- 25. In terms of this system of voting we ask, how it is that the claims of Ngati Hine could be simply outvoted by people who are Ngapuhi? Or, to put it another way, how can people who are not Ngati Hine give Tuhoronuku the mandate to negotiate Ngati Hine claims.
- 26. We question how many of those members who voted in support of Tuhoronuku are Ngati Hine? This information has never been provided and therefore Tuhoronuku has no right to say it holds a mandate to represent Ngati Hine in negotiations.
- 27. Because of the outcome of the mandate vote, Ngati Hine is being bound to a mandate we have never endorsed.

**Ngapuhi facilitation, Tukoroirangi Morgan and Te Roopu Whaiti process**

- 28. In my role as Co-Chairman for Te Kotahitanga o Nga Hapu o Ngapuhi, Nga Hapu o Te Takutai Moana and Deputy Chairman of Te Runanga o Ngati Hine, I have also attended numerous meetings with the Minister and the Office of Treaty Settlements in a sincere attempt to broker a way forward. These have all been unsuccessful. At these meetings, we have tabled numerous briefing papers for the Ministers consideration and raised our concerns with the Tuhoronuku mandate process and settlement model.
- 29. I was present at the Ngapuhi facilitation lead by the Rt Hon. Jim Bolger, the mediation process run by Tukoroirangi Morgan and the Te Roopu

Whaiti working group. Annexed hereto and marked with the letter "A" and "B" respectively is the report of Tukuroirangi Morgan and Te Roopu Whaiti. All of these efforts were focused on addressing what were identified as three key issues:

- (a) the sequencing of Stage Two Waitangi Tribunal hearing and negotiations,
- (b) the role of hapu and how they are represented in the settlement process; and
- (c) the role of TRAION.

30. On the facilitation and working group processes, we note the following:

- (a) During Jim Bolger's facilitation process in 2011, Tuhoronuku pulled out of the process and pushed on with its mandating hui and postal ballot;
- (b) During the Te Roopu Whaiti (Technical Team) process, Tuhoronuku refused to take the completed report out to the people of Ngapuhi for consideration and feedback (as initially agreed in the Terms of Reference) and submitted its Deed of Mandate to the Crown. This action sowed the seed for further discontent and a lack of trust in the Tuhoronuku leadership;
- (c) During the Tukuroirangi Morgan facilitation process Tuhoronuku rejected and ridiculed Mr Morgan's independent report as commissioned by the Crown and continued pushing for its Deed of Mandate to be recognised.

31. We believe that the Crown supported these processes in order to give the perception that it was being fair and assisting parties to resolve the issues. However, in our view the Crown's support was token as Crown did not require Tuhoronuku to adopt the substantive recommendations from the reports of Tukuroirangi Morgan and Te Roopu Whaiti working group, which may have resolved some of the major issues in the Tuhoronuku settlement model.

32. Further meetings were held with the Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations and officials from the Office of Treaty Settlements to seek that further changes to the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate occur, however the Crown did not require Tuhoronuku to make those changes.
33. The changes that Tuhoronuku have made to their Amended Deed of Mandate following the Te Roopu Whaiti process, should have been debated by Ngapuhi in advance, rather than stated as final decisions in the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate advertised by the Crown on 6 July 2013.
34. It is our view, that the Crown and Tuhoronuku has refused to genuinely consider any of the recommended changes to the Deed of Mandate that arose out of these respective facilitation processes. This is because the Crown and Tuhoronuku have never been open to considering an alternative settlement model for Ngapuhi than the one proposed in the Deed of Mandate. Moreover, the Crown and Tuhoronuku has remained steadfast in its position and not made any real efforts to hear the key issues that were articulated by the people or make an effort to make meaningful change that may have allayed the misgivings of the people. Instead Tuhoronuku has tried to give the appearance that it has conceded on some points, however any changes have not been substantive and do not resolve the key issues with the Deed of Mandate.
35. Further advice on facilitation issues, which remain unresolved, should have been sought by the Office of Treaty Settlements from key hapu or iwi institutions and other government agencies.
36. In June – July 2013 I attended hui with Crown Officials in my role as Chairman of Nga Hapu o Te Takutai Moana to inform them that Nga Hapu o Te Takutai Moana, including Ngati Hine, were developing and Deed of Mandate Strategy and required the assistance of the Crown. Annexed hereto and marked with the letter “C” is the letter from the Minister dated 5 August 2013 where the Minister restated that he Crown’s strong preference is for a single Ngapuhi settlement and that the Crown would not consider another mandate or application for mandate funding while

the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate was advertised for public submission. In doing so, the Crown has simply continued to support Tuhoronuku with their Deed of Mandate while ignoring the voice of the people who were offering alternative views.

#### **Issues with the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate**

37. Ngati Hine was surprised that on 6 July 2013, the Crown publicly advertised and called for submissions on the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate. We believe that such a decision needed to be communicated through a wide and representative gathering.
38. The Crown took no interest in ascertaining whether the concerns that Ngati Hine has raised with the mandate had been sufficiently addressed by the minor amendments to the Deed of Mandate. The Crown's omission or flaw at this point, was in not requesting further discussion with Ngati Hine on the Deed of Mandate. In our view, the role of the Crown should have been to actively scrutinise every stage of the mandating process. The Crown should have required the correction of errors and the proper application of tikanga throughout the mandating process, rather than wait until the receipt of submissions to make its assessment.
39. Te Runanga o Ngati Hine made specific submissions on the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate. This is included in the documents supplied with the evidence of Waihoroi Shortland. Our specific submissions on the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate were as follows:
  - (a) The amendments to the Deed of Mandate are not substantive and do not resolve the key issues that were to be addressed in facilitation, which were:
    - (i) The sequencing of Stage Two Waitangi Tribunal hearings and any negotiations (we want the Stage One Report before Stage Two hearings and negotiations begin and we support Stage Two hearings, not a parallel process);

- (ii) The role of hapu and how they are represented in the settlement process; and
  - (iii) The role of Te Runanga-a-Iwi o Ngapuhi.
- (b) The Deed of Mandate does not incorporate key suggestions made in Mr Morgan's report which may have resolved these key issues;
- (c) The Deed of Mandate continues to include Ngati Hine hapu, marae and Waitangi Tribunal claims, in spite of repeated notification that we have never consented to be included in the mandate proposal and that we have expressly withdrawn our hapu, marae and claims from Tuhoronuku;
- (d) There is no hapu based settlement proposed in the Deed of Mandate. The Deed of Mandate does not guarantee that hapu (and regions) can negotiate their own specific historical, cultural and commercial redress;
- (e) Under the Deed of Mandate, a hapu cannot appoint their own mandated Hapu Kaikorero in accordance with their own tikanga;
- (f) Hapu (as a collective) have no mana or rangatiratanga in the election process of their own mandated Hapu Kaikorero;
- (g) Tuhoronuku's process gives individuals more mana than the hapu in that:
  - (i) Any individual from a hapu can nominate a person from their hapu to be the mandated Hapu Kaikorero;
  - (ii) Any individual of a hapu can be nominated to be the mandated Hapu Kaikorero for their hapu; and
  - (iii) Every individual from that hapu can vote for their preferred nominee, either at the hui, by paper ballot, by post or online.

- (h) The Deed of Mandate does not allow a hapu to withdraw from the process;
- (i) Instead, the Deed of Mandate proposes a single Ngapuhi mandate and single Ngapuhi settlement through TRAION /Tuhoronuku. Given the political organisation in Ngapuhi, it is unreasonable to expect that a single settlement through TRAION /Tuhoronuku can be achieved that would hope to be enduring and bring peace;
- (j) The Deed of Mandate portrays that Tuhoronuku represents a Large Natural Grouping. Tuhoronuku is a sub-committee of a Charitable Trust based in Kaikohe. Tuhoronuku's composition and representative structure cannot be perceived as natural. The Charitable Trust does not represent all of Ngapuhi;
- (k) Under the Deed of Mandate, the roles, powers and responsibilities of the Independent Mandated Authority are unclear;
- (l) We oppose the composition of the Independent Mandated Authority under the Deed of Mandate and ask what justification is there for the current composition? These are issues that must be rationalised and articulated so that Ngapuhi whanui can see that there are real and transparent reasons for the current composition of Tuhoronuku. In particular:
  - (i) We do not see why TRAION requires a seat on the Independent Mandated Authority. Who does TRAION represent that the hapu representatives, kuia and kaumatua and the urban representatives not represent?
  - (ii) How is it that urban representatives get to vote twice; once to elect hapu representatives and again to elect urban representatives? Yet those living within te rohe o Ngapuhi only get to vote once and that is to elect hapu representatives?

- (iii) Why is it that under the Deed of Mandate is it much easier to elect representatives than it is to remove them?
- (iv) We reject that, under the Deed of Mandate, the Chairperson of Tuhoronuku will have a second or casting vote. If there is an inequality of votes, the motion should be lost as it did not get the necessary support;
- (v) The provision for Alternate and Proxy representation under the Deed of Mandate should not be allowed. How is it that Trustees can pick whoever they want to act in their place? Why are alternates or proxies not dealt with in the Trustee election process? Why is it that other Trustees can consent to a Trustees nomination of an alternate? It should be the group that the Trustee is representing that consents to an alternate; a modern day example of an unfair process is the issue that the CFRT Board is facing regarding Proxy's and look at the effect that is having.
- (vi) The Deed of Mandate provides that, if a dispute about the validity of an election or appointment process conducted under Schedule One cannot be resolved under clause 11.1, the Trustees shall determine the issue. Their decision shall be final and binding. It is entirely inappropriate for the other members of Tuhoronuku to determine this matter, as they have a vested interest in the outcome. Disputes over appointment processes should be decided by the groups responsible for appointing that representative, or someone independent, or an arbitrator.

40. The Crown did not meet with us to discuss our submission on the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate. Instead, on 14 February 2014, the Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations called Te Kotahitanga o Nga Hapu Ngapuhi to a meeting in Auckland. At this meeting, to our surprise

the Minister announced that the Crown had chosen to recognise the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate with five conditions. The Minister offered us a chance to provide feedback on the Crown's letter confirming recognition. When we questioned if the Crown would instigate a process to incorporate our feedback into the Deed of Mandate, the Minister refused. He then advised that the Crown's recognition of the mandate would be publicised at 6pm that evening. From this point forward, we knew that our last four year's efforts of trying to ensure a fair and transparent settlement process for Ngati Hine and wider Ngapuhi, was in vain.

#### **No alternative remedy exists for Ngati Hine**

41. Our tribal development has been stifled over the past four years. We have committed substantial time and resources into countless meetings with the Crown and Tuhoronuku and this involvement has come at a great expense for individuals personally and our collective wellbeing. Internally we have been required to hold hui after hui to regularly inform our people of developments with the mandate process. The Tuhoronuku settlement kaupapa has dominated our discussion at hui.
42. The Tuhoronuku mandate process has been all consuming and we have had no choice but to direct our resources to protect our rangatiratanga, our tribal identify and our right to settle our own Te Tiriti o Waitangi claims. It has been an entirely frustrating process. We always hoped that the Crown would hear our voice and revisit its agenda but it never has.
43. In addition to the historic settlement issues, we are engaged in a Maori Land Court process to resolve outstanding issues for the Maori Fisheries Settlement. Ngati Hine has a unique right under the Maori Fisheries Act 2004 to withdraw from TRAION. Upon withdrawal from TRAION Ngati Hine will be recognised as a Mandated Iwi Organisation for the purposes of managing and receiving Ngati Hine's portion of the fisheries settlement that currently sits with TRAION. Ngati Hine commenced withdrawal proceedings in the Maori Land Court in August 2011. We sought a hearing on priorities issues concerning the Tuhoronuku mandate process

as we believed the mandate sought by Tuhoronuku sought to bind us back into TRAION when we seeking to withdraw from the entity. The Court set down a priority hearing as we had sought interim orders, amongst others, that:

- (a) An order that was necessary to prevent prejudice to the interests of Ngati Hine, arising out of, or in connection with, the attempt by TRAION and its subcommittee Tuhoronuku to obtain a mandate to represent Ngapuhi (including Ngati Hine) in negotiations with the Crown, for the comprehensive settlement of all Ngapuhi (including Ngati Hine) historical claims concerning Crown breaches of Te Tiriti o Waitangi/The Treaty of Waitangi; and
- (b) An order that TRAION and its subcommittee Tuhoronuku remove any and all references to Ngati Hine and Ngati Hine marae, hapu and historical claims from its mandate proposal.

- 44. The Court ultimately held that it did not have the jurisdiction to decide on matters concerning the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate, as the issues were not matters in terms of the Maori Fisheries Act and were political in nature. Annexed hereto and marked with the letter "D" and "E" are the decisions of the Maori Land Court and Maori Appellate Court from these proceedings.
- 45. Ngati Hine and TRAION are now involved in tikanga based discussions in an attempt to complete Ngati Hine's withdrawal from TRAION out of Court. Parties are required to update the Court regarding the progress made, on 14 May 2014.
- 46. Te Runanga o Ngati Hine has been granted special aid from the Maori Land Court as we have no financial resources to meet the ongoing legal costs of this litigation.
- 47. We had originally viewed the Maori Land Court litigation as an alternative to an application for an urgent hearing by the Waitangi Tribunal as we believed that with the assistance of the Maori Land Court we would be able to remove Ngati Hine hapu, marae and Waitangi Tribunal claims from

the Tuhoronuku mandate process. However, the Maori Land Court has now helpfully clarified that it is unable to assist us. We therefore have no alternative option but to seek the assistance of this Tribunal. Only this Tribunal has the exclusive jurisdiction to intervene and this Tribunal is the only forum that can offer Ngati Hine some relief.

#### **Concluding remarks**

48. It is clear that the errors in the Tuhoronuku mandate process are beyond rectification. Aside from the fact that Tuhoronuku does not have a mandate to represent Ngati Hine, it is also clear that the failure of the Crown to require Tuhoronuku to make substantive changes to the Deed of Mandate, as suggested in the reports by Tukuroirangi Morgan and Te Roopu Whaiti, means that the Tuhoronuku Deed of Mandate is flawed and Tuhoronuku will not achieve a robust and enduring settlement for Ngapuhi.
49. The mandate process, pursued by Tuhoronuku and supported by the Crown, has had a huge impact on the internal relationships within Ngapuhi. The relationships within Ngapuhi are extremely fragile and tensions are high.
50. If the Crown chooses to continue settlement negotiations with Tuhoronuku, it will be promoting entrenched division between the claimants, hapu and Tuhoronuku and Te Runanga a Iwi o Ngapuhi.
51. There is a real danger of our settlement process becoming consumed by political rather than Treaty compliant priorities. It is apparent that the Crown is fixated on reaching an AIP with Tuhoronuku within 2014. Ngati Hine is therefore in a situation where we are being "squeezed" by a tight timeline, all for political expediency.
52. Ngati Hine and Ngapuhi require the intervention of this Tribunal. We need to revisit the approach to settling Te Tiriti o Waitangi claims in Ngapuhi. Ngapuhi kowhau rau needs the space to ensure that tribal relationships are rebuilt, a pono and tika process is followed and all the



Crown's minimum guidelines for Treaty settlements are rigidly complied with from the outset.

Sworn by Pita Tipene )  
at Kawakawa this 10<sup>th</sup> day ~~May~~ )  
of April 2014 before me )  
may

P. Brister JP

~~Solicitor of the High Court of New Zealand~~  
Justice of the Peace

