

**BEFORE THE COMMISSIONERS
TARANAKI REGIONAL COUNCIL
NEW PLYMOUTH DISTRICT COUNCIL**

IN THE MATTER

notice of requirement and resource consent applications to construct a bypass at Mount Messenger, Application ID: DSN17/44711 and LUC18/47193

BETWEEN

**New Zealand TRANSPORT AGENCY
(NZTA)**

Applicant

AND

**TE KOROWAI TIAKI O TE HAUĀURU
IINCORPORATED (TE KOROWAI)**

Submitter

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM SIMPSON ON BEHALF OF THE SIMPSON WHANAU

DATED 14 July 2018

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is William Simpson.
2. I toto i nga Whenua o Ngati Maniapoto, Ngati Tama, Ngati Mutunga, Te Atiawa me Nga Rauru I te taha toku whaea.
3. My whānau live at 143 Broadway Waitara Taranaki
4. I am authorised to write this statement of evidence and to present this submission on behalf of my whānau.
5. This submission will focus on our whānau and their views while respecting the views of others such as Mr. William (Bill) Temaihengia White.
6. In our view Bill has articulated well the ancient beliefs how the tikanga of the whenua, awa, ngahere, rakau, te moana, whakairo, maunga were maintained by our people through whakatuaki, waiata, whakairo, purakau me waiata, to generation to generation.
7. These sentiments are echoed in the writings of famous European writers such as Elsdon Best,¹ J.B Condliffe,² Edward Tregear,³ and others.
8. It has been through these oral histories, written publications and books that keep us connected to our whakapapa, our purakau and our people.
9. In our view the cultural report presented to NZTA lacks the in-depth cultural and spiritual expression that is important and significant when talking of the Parininihi⁴. Examples of these stories are better expressed in the writings of “Te Putu”, “JB Condliffe” and many other publications and books of the past.
10. We recognise that Mr. Amos White is not presenting this as he is a principal witness in a High Court case to commence in the High Court Auckland on the 20th August 2018 and his time and energy is focused on that case.
11. We as a whānau give recognition to Te Korowai for providing a vehicle for our beneficiaries to use so their voices can be heard.

BACKGROUND

12. Our whānau have walked the roads, and street from Waitara to Mokau through

¹ The Māori 1924

² Te Rangi Hiroa always stayed in touch with Kapuakore (Cloudless), whom he fled to for comfort as a boy. She taught him the genealogies, legends and songs of her people. He loved her deeply and she always wept over him when he was to leave again.

³ The Māori Race 1904 talks about the Ngati Tama leader Taringa Kuri who lived to the ripe old age of 112.

⁴ In the words of Te Rangi Hiroa has expressed his deep feelings of the Parininihi “*this was my pathway into the fertile plains of Taranaki and along this the only path of old the hungry ‘tauas’ of the north had to tread their way but Katikatikaka to the north and Puke-aruhe to the south guarded the extremities of Parininihi the mana of N’Tama...*”

our religious upbringing.

13. We knocked on every door, spoken and listened to the old people who talked and shared their stories about the mountains, sea, rivers, creeks, streams, roads, forests and families of Ngāti Tama.
14. Our elders sat at the doors of the Marae of Puke-aruhe, Urenui, and Waitara.
15. Our whānau toto to the whenua o Ngāti Tama, Ngāti Mutunga, Ngāti Maniapoto, Te Atiawa me Nga Rauru.
16. As the author of this submission I attended the preliminary presentations by NZTA. It is my view that the option that Te Korowai has expressed would have been the preferred option.
17. This submission is to acknowledge our whānau and their thoughts about Ngāti Tama and to make a decision whether to give our support to NZTA or not.

Professional Background

18. Hinengaro Tapui Limited Advocacy and Support Services is my company and I have operated this service for our people for the past four years.
19. I am presently employed by Ngāti Tama ki te Upoko in Wellington as an in-house lawyer and I am one of the three negotiators working alongside Ngati Tama o Ngati Wai under the name of Ngāti Tama Mandate Limited with the Crown.
20. I was employed as the General Manager for Huakina Development Trust, one of the committees set up by Waikato Tainui to manage the environmental, educational, health and social affairs and more importantly to manage and to give support to the marae of Port Waikato and Tamaki Makaurau.
21. My knowledge and skills derive from my work with-in government organisations and agencies, as well as Iwi, hapu and marae interactions.
22. I was a member of the New Zealand Māori Council and Māori District Councils and;
23. I hold a Masterate in Management Systems, Degree in Law, Education and Diploma in Teaching and a Barrister and Solicitor.

NOTIFICATION:

1. Our whānau as beneficiaries have never been formally engaged in or participated in Ngāti Tama business here in Taranaki because of the feeling that we did not have anything to contribute.
2. We had read and heard many terrible stories about Ngāti Tama through the newspapers, television and people we knew. This gave rise to us talking as a whānau and me getting involved.
3. On or about the 02th June 2018 I attended a Hui at Pukearuhe and listened to the presentation made by NZTA and after that the lawyer (Mr. Tama Hovell).
4. I was not at all impressed a meeting was called to discuss the new road option over mount messenger and the effects it will have on Ngāti Tama lands. I noticed key beneficiaries were not there to have a say to express their views about the possible impact it will have on the environment and other matters. I do not believe that the people that attended that meeting including myself had the appropriate expertise, knowledge or skills to challenge NZTA's experts in their differing fields. This left me with the view that NZTA were circumventing a key process to consult widely to have their application approved.
5. This view was not helped with the fact that current Trustees were not cohesive in mind and thought leaving me to take the view that perhaps the current Trustees were deliberately excluding the beneficiaries from the consultation process.
6. I was left to agree with Mr. Bill White that the consequences of the application before you being presented by NZTA will be seen by the wider public and the Ngāti Tama beneficiaries as being fully completed in regards to the consultation processes and therefore the resource application can begin. This is far from the truth.
7. My assessment of the consultation process with Ngāti Tama to date appear inadequate and has not met the minimum requirement as I know it. It lacks transparency of processes and meetings with Ngāti Tama are attended with only a handful of the beneficiaries.
8. Beneficiaries are excluded from organised meetings due to poor communications or is it because of personality clashes? Regardless the mere fact that beneficiaries of Ngati Tama are not formally notified of consultation meetings leaves Ngati Tama at risk of giving NZTA false expectations. This in our view is unfair, unjust and unacceptable.
9. To be included and consulted with as an iwi is the cornerstone of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, in this case it appears the current Ngāti Tama Trustees have taken it upon themselves to exclude members. If this has any truth to it the outcome of this process adopted by the current Ngāti Tama Trustee will have a detrimental effect on the beneficiaries, the iwi as a whole and NZTA's application.
10. These concerns were raised by Tariana Turia when she addressed the select

EFFECTS OF THE APPLICATION

11. Our whānau are extremely concerned that if this application proceeds it will have a disastrous effect on the Iwi, and the environment, (ecologically, culturally) and in particular on the mana of Ngāti Tama for the following reasons;
12. The proposal and facts have never been presented to the Ngāti Tama beneficiaries as an Iwi, therefore like any information that NZTA or any Crown agencies have proposed to date it cannot be seen as being mandated by the Iwi. This essential and vital process has been disregarded and therefore the current Trustees and NZTA have no mandate to proceed.
13. The mere fact that these matters have never been presented and discussed with the beneficiaries is unacceptable.
14. The current Trustees themselves have held themselves up as being fully mandated to make formal decisions based solely on the view that they were elected as Trustees for Ngāti Tama. This is far from the truth, they are always accountable to the beneficiaries.
15. NZTA have never had meaningful discussions with the beneficiaries of Ngāti Tama to date, which in our view is an expectation of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Government.
16. The consequences of poor communications and the lack of consultation will be catastrophic and we will address these in brief in this submission as follows;

16.1 Ngāti Tama beneficiaries will have to live with a decision that does not represent their views.

- 16.1.1 The Trustees must take into account all the beneficiaries views, ideas and solutions, assess these and then make a reasonable and informed decision based on this information. This has not occurred to date.
- 16.1.2 The Trustees have an obligation to the beneficiaries to inform them of their decisions through face to face meetings. This has not occurred to date.
- 16.1.3 The Trustees need to walk in harmony with each other and their beneficiaries. This is not happening to date.

Beneficiaries have concerns their voices are being shut down and that the current Trustees are not engaging with them therefore allowing NZTA to believe that as an Iwi the Iwi are satisfied with their application. This is not true.

As beneficiaries there has not been enough talk to allow this view held by NZTA to be acceptable. We have experts in the environment matters that are not been heard, experts in tikanga that have been silenced and people of academic skills set aside. This cannot carry on.

⁵ Read Bill Whites submission

16.2 Ngāti Tama mana will be compromised and placed at risk of humiliation and shame.

16.2.1 Ngāti Tama have seen in the past the humiliation of bad investment and decisions by past Trustees and management. There must be a lesson learnt by these mistakes and errors. NZTA must surely realise that a meeting with the beneficiaries is essential, failing to engage with the beneficiaries will affect them and the outcome. To rely solely on "*TRONT is the mandated group*" must be seen as foolhardy. They needed to ask what the beneficiaries felt about the options and their proposal. NZTA needed to see and hear for themselves that at least 50 % of the beneficiaries of Ngāti Tama give support to their proposal. To date this number is suspect to say the least.

Ngāti Tama should never be placed in a dark place again. At this juncture with NZTA's application Ngāti Tama will be heading in that direction. The mana of Ngāti Tama is at stake.

16.3 The Trustees need to walk in harmony with each other and their beneficiaries.

16.3.1 The current Ngāti Tama Trustees are currently embroiled in a High Court case over their roles, duties and obligations to Ngāti Tama, this in itself should have raised a red flag to NZTA that perhaps they should have waited until this matter was resolved rather than to push on with the application knowing that some of the Trustees and beneficiaries will oppose the application.

16.3.2 The fact that the current Ngāti Tama Trustees have alienated themselves away from the beneficiaries is another indicator that NZTA should have realised and backed away until they had credible information to discuss around their proposal.

The process used to date by both NZTA and the current Ngāti Tama Trust raises serious concerns around credibility and integrity of the application.

CONCLUSION

1. After close scrutiny of the facts as a whānau we have no option but to oppose the application regarding NZTA to use of Ngāti Tama Land for the current route for the following reasons;

- 1.1 There has been no formal consultation with the beneficiaries of Ngāti

Tama to date about the options.

- 1.2 There has been no formal consultation with the beneficiaries of Ngāti Tama over the adverse impact that will occur on the environment, ecologically and culturally.
 - 1.3 The beneficiaries of Ngāti Tama have never been provided the opportunity to have their say in the NZTA application.
 - 1.4 The beneficiaries have been denied the opportunity to challenge any of the NZTA application or to assist in the improvement of the application.
 - 1.5 The current Trustees are no longer able to agree as a whole and are dysfunctional and therefore have no authority to continue until after the court case in August 2018 is determined.
1. We believe that Te Korowai was established by disgruntled Trustees as a vehicle for Ngāti Tama Iwi beneficiary members to participate with (NZTA).
 2. As a result it would be prudent at this time that Te Korowai Trust be appointed to act as interim Trustees on behalf of all the Ngati Tama beneficiaries. Failing that, that an appointed team of Ngati Tama professional be appointed until the next Ngāti Tama elections which is March 2019.
 3. This submission is to give recognition and support to NZTA's application.

Summary

As a whānau we have always had faith in those that are elected to represent the views of our people and therefore there was no need to get involved directly or otherwise unless called upon. It is with regret that we are now involved however what we are seeking is a way forward for NZTA to complete the road through the Parininihi without any further delay.

To achieve this we must all be on the same page and talking with each other, at this time this is not the case.

We ask that we delay the application and allow Ngāti Tama to clean up their act. We have at our disposal extremely talented experts in every field that would only compliment the people that NZTA have on their books. Ngāti Tama wants to engage productively and produce a legacy for all New Zealanders not just a road.

“

The following paper is a summary of points for consideration

Treaty Settlement

We believe that Ngāti Tama obtained a treaty settlement of \$14.5 million dollars together with some of the land that was stolen by the Crown. That the settlement funds of \$14.5 million was misappropriated and or squandered under the management of Mr. Greg White who was acting in a management capacity of those funds at the time. We strongly believe that this was a significant loss of monies and has caused the mana of Ngāti Tama to be examined.

Ngāti Tama beneficiaries do not want a repeat of this and therefore NZTA must appreciate that caution must be shown.

Cultural Assessment.

We as a whānau cannot see how we are able to adopt the current Ngāti Tama cultural values assessment report in regards to the NZTA proposed bypass through Parininihi at this time, as it is not culturally comprehensive, and fails to address the impact it will have on the ngahere, wai, maunga, awa, moana, ecologically and culturally.⁶ These sentiments are echoed by Te Rangī Hiroa⁷

It was said that Ngāti Tama were given back a small portion of the land that was confiscated through raupatu, and then were burdened with covenants and restrictions.⁸ These covenants and restrictions were designed to protect the unique pristine environment we know as Parininihi as it is the home of our ancestral beings; endangered species of vertebrates and invertebrate's the unseen fragile Taonga of the Parininihi that weeps for our protection. There is very little to mention of how importance these remnants are to Ngāti Tama.

The deaths of Maungatautari and Taiporutu of Ngāti Maniapoto and Ngāti Haua in 1810 characterizes the significance of Parininihi and Te Kawau and the special role that Ngāti Tama saw as the protectors to the gateway into Taranaki and how much it meant to them and others.⁹

The construction of the current Mount Messenger road will breach the tenure of Ngāti Tama and compromise the security of Parininihi resulting in Ngāti Tama and its people being disadvantaged culturally and economically.

⁶ Ngāti Tama beneficiary et al have been prevented by the current Trustees from having a cultural say as to the impact the road(s) will have on the ecology, environment and the mana of Ngāti Tama. The views of the beneficiaries are a requirement in law that has been quashed so that progress on the preferred option can begin in haste.

⁷ "...I looked upon the few aged women and men who came hurrying up at the sound of the ancient call which bids us meet together and lament our deaths that by the shedding of tears and mucus the thrusts of Aitua may be revenged. Then I thought of the ancient fame and might of the tribe which every hill and stream of the country through which I had ridden had vividly raised in my mind...Parininihi will stand on through the ages but though the sons of men may increase and multiply they will not be of the blood of the sea gods who came first and loved the tall white cliffs and who through sunshine and storm clung its rigged crags to the last" pp61, 62 Te Rangī Hiroa, The Life of Sir Peter Buck.

⁸ Billy Whites submission 2018

⁹ Tainui 1949 by Leslie.G.Kelly also known as Te Putu wrote of the death of Maungatautari by Ngāti Tama and Taiporutu of Ngāti Haua.pp295,296

The story of Nga Tai Pari Rua in 1815 – 1820 displays how important the security, welfare and the land meant to all those that took part in this skirmish.¹⁰ The following whakatuaki likens us to the moving shellfish that is yet to settle.

*“Haere ana koe, ko nga pipi o te aria, ka noho matou ko nga pipi o te whakatakere”
“We are swept away like the shellfish in deep waters between two shoals. We remain undisturbed like shellfish at the bottom of the channel.”*

Cultural Values Assessment

There is significant costs involved in a comprehensive cultural values assessment (CVA) being prepared for consideration, and we like Te Korowai expect the CVA to be funded by the applicant so an in-depth and comprehensive CVA report is properly researched and completed.

This report will give the Crown the information required to make an informed decision that will protect the mana of Ngati Tama, the Crown and the whenua itself.

An agreed timeline needs to be negotiated between all parties and a committee set up to manage the process.

Consultation with Iwi

As stated earlier in this paper the current Trust is seen to be dysfunctional which has not assisted in them making sensible decisions on behalf of the Ngāti Tama. We have been advised that the current Trustees are not acting in accordance to the Ngāti Tama Trust deed and in fact as Trustees they have not met as a full Trust Board for some time. If what has been advised is true than it would not be prudent for NZTA’s application to be heard.

Unless the wider Ngāti Tama Iwi (beneficiaries) are involved in the formal consultation processes and their views heard then it would be churlish to say at the very least to rely on the current Trustees word as a given that they have a solid mandate by the beneficiaries as to the following points:

- the sale of any Ngāti Tama Land to NZTA;
- whether use of the land is acceptable to Ngati Tama;
- any cultural redress that may be required to take place,
- the ecological and environmental impact and proposed options and
- any commercial benefits that may be provided in this project

Engaging with Ngāti Tama at this time would be commercially and economically unsafe and unsound.

Mandated Authority of Te Runanga O Ngāti Tama (TRONT)

It is now widely accepted that consultation with a wider Iwi and hapu is a component of consultation with Maori. ¹¹That clearly has not happened here.

¹⁰ Tainui 1949 by Leslie.G.Kelly pp 297,298 & 299

¹¹ Justice Mick Brown, Legal Researcher Rob Joseph and editor Mr. Tom Bennion - Consultation with iwi under the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Proposed Government Bill

There is a tentative deal on the table for Ngāti Tama to consider and among those are;

- A \$5 million cash injection to go towards a cultural competence programme that Ngāti Tama will be able to establish,
- The exchange of land (Gilbert Road),
- Funding in perpetuity for pest control,
- The sale of lands that will be used by NZTA for the proposed mount messenger road.

Our whānau at this time along with Te Korowai reject the proposed deal by the NZTA and the current Trustees.

We strongly believe that Te Korowai Trust is committed to provide for the future generations of Ngāti Tama and it is only fair that they be given the opportunity to speak to that matter themselves.

Our whānau believe that all beneficiaries of Ngāti Tama must be provided the opportunity to be heard as well. To date it appears that, that privilege and right has been overlooked.

It is only right that any decision that Ngāti Tama makes in regards to NZTA's application and the use of substantial assets and land left to Ngāti Tama must be used and protected in such a way as to ensure future generations will view the final decision as being culturally sound, and acceptable.

We agree with Te Korowai' Trust view that New Zealand's history is full with unfair inequitable outcomes negotiated by generations of the ill-informed people.

New Zealand's history is resplendent with unfair bargains in relation to land transactions with Māori when looked at subsequently. For example, the payment for Whanganui¹² consisted of "*muskets and gunpowder, tomahawks, clothing, red blankets, tobacco, jew's-harps, fish-hooks, beads and a variety of other trade goods*". Auckland similarly. The Crown paid £341 for the original land handed over for the settlement (3000 acres)¹³.

¹² <https://teara.govt.nz/en/whanganui-region/page-5>

¹³ <http://teahou.natlib.govt.nz/journals/teahou/issue/Mao27TeA/c11.html>

Pekapeka block in Waitara saw the theft of land from Maori and Council then leasing stolen lands back to the original owners¹⁴. One land owner stated:

Heoi taku kupu tuturu: Kaore he hoko tahae, 'e hoko whakariterite, kaore 'e hoko muru tahae, 'e hoko whakapatipati e iri ki rung a ki tekiona 118 - 75 eka 0 poraka 1, Opunake - ka herea mai au mo roto i nga tau maha, tomo atu ki roto ki te kotahi miriona tau (E: 150)¹⁵.

The hurt felt by our people before us will forever be etched into their hearts and onto their graves. We do not want history to repeat itself.

Our whānau believes a wider consultation process with the Ngāti Tama beneficiaries is required to gain an insight and their views of land tenure as well as the possibility of sale and purchase of Ngāti Tama lands to NZTA.

The following points are there to add clarity and discussion.

Name of New Road:

That the Parininihi Road be named after an Ngāti Tama eponymous ancestor after consultation with the beneficiaries to ensure the continuity of Ngati Tama.

Our whānau are supportive of this directive.

Return of old Mt Messenger Road to Ngati Tama:

The old road named as Mount Messenger, be returned to Ngāti Tama as the rightful Kaitiaki.

Our whānau are supportive of this directive.

Signage at waypoints and resting stations:

The way-points and rest stations on the NZTA Parininihi Road have interactive signage that tells the story and history of the Ngāti Tama; the confiscation and tragedies that were inflicted upon Ngāti Tama. Showing the chiefs and people that fell in defense of their whenua and its people.

Our whānau are supportive of this directive.

¹⁴ West Coast Native Reserves Act 1892 and similar Acts

¹⁵ *This is my considered opinion: What a thieving deal, a manipulative deal! What a plundering thieving deal, a deceitful deal over Section 118 (75 acres of Block 1, Opunake) which binds me throughout the years ahead, right up until a million years from now!*

Lease – perpetual v/s sale of land:

We do not want to see any more of Parininihi (Lands) pass out of Ngāti Tama hands, neither for money nor for exchange or at all.

Unlike Te Korowai Trust we would like to walk cautiously prior to allowing the use of any lands owned by Ngāti Tama to be used in a similar manner that the Anglican Church¹⁶ allows the use of the land around St Helliars, Mission Bay and Meadowbank in Auckland – A perpetually renewable lease¹⁷. A full cost and benefit exercise may be helpful in this decision.

We will require any money to change hands for reimbursement of the costs involved in setting any transactions into place, and the subsequent payment of the ongoing costs.

However in regards to any perpetual lease the benefits must be based on the net value basis rather than gross.

Our whānau although reluctant are supportive of this directive subject to a proper and in-depth cost and benefit analysis been completed.

Lease review and ratchet provisions:

Te Korowai claims that the lease rate reviewed every 3 calendar years provided that failure to review at the calendar year does not bar future claims against the lease, and backdating of the same to the calendar year. The lease should be ratcheted so that it is indexed upwards by whichever is the greater of the rate of increase in the consumer price index, or the rate of economic benefit increase to New Plymouth and New Zealand.

Our whānau are supportive of this directive.

Lease value at start to be determined based upon economic value:

Te Korowai claims that the first rate of annual payment for any lease should be a market value reflection of the economic benefit of the use of the Ngati Tama lands to the Crown and the communities of Taranaki and New Zealand.

Our whānau are supportive of this directive.

Reimbursement of Costs:

In dealing with the Crown over the NZTA proposal, Ngati Tama expects its full costs to Ngati Tama be remunerated by the Crown.

Our whānau are supportive of this directive.

Economic value benefit to be determined at outset:

Te Korowai view that requires an economic costs benefit and analysis of the increased value of the improved road to be determined and from that value the first annual rate of

¹⁶ <https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/publications-and-resources/school-resources/orakei/the-founding-of-auckland/>

¹⁷ https://www.parliament.nz/resource/en-NZ/51SCLGE_E...

remuneration to Ngati Tama to be set, with payments to be in advance, the first payment on signing. This we believe is prudent for all parties to consider.

Stockpile of Timbers for Ngati Tama future use:

Te Korowai claims that all timbers found in the NZTA road constructions are to be removed, and stored so that they are protected from deterioration for Ngati Tama use.

Our whānau are supportive of this directive.

Partnerships

The New Zealand Māori Council identified ten (10) implicit principles deriving from Te Tiriti o Waitangi;

- 1 The duty to actively protect to the fullest extent as possible,
- 2 The jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal to investigate omissions,
- 3 A relationship analogous to fiduciary duty,
- 4 A duty to consult,
- 5 The honour of the Crown,
- 6 The duty to make good past breaches,
- 7 The duty to return land for land,
- 8 That the Māori way of life would be protected,
- 9 That the parties would be of equal status,
- 10 Where the Māori interest in their taonga is adversely affected, that priority would be given to Māori values.

These values were stated in the 1986 High Court case of Tom Te Weehi where he was able to “*exercise a customary Māori fishing right*” as promised in Te Tiriti o Waitangi. These sentiments were also argued by the late Koro Wetere when he said in parliament that “*there is no argument that the Māori people want a greater say in their own destiny*” the Government response was then published in the document (Partnership Response, policy statement 1988) whereby the government reaffirmed the principal objectives set out in “*He Tirohanga Rangapu*” (May-June 1988) There are to;

- Honour the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi,
- Eliminate the gaps which exist between the educational, personal, social, economic, and cultural well-being of Māori people,
- Provide opportunities for Māori people to develop economic activities as a sound base for realizing their aspirations, and in order to promote self – sufficiency and eliminate attitudes of dependency,
- Deal; fairly and justly and expeditiously with breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi,`
- Provide for the Māori language and culture to receive an equitable allocation of resources and a fair opportunity to develop,
- Promote decision making in the machinery of government, and
- Encourage Māori participation in the political process.

In the leading High Court case *New Zealand Māori Council v Attorney General (State Owned) Enterprises Act 1986* the Crown only adopted five (5) of these principles. The appeal court judges however placed emphasis on Te Tiriti o Waitangi as a partnership that required “*the utmost good faith*”¹⁸

¹⁸ Re Royal Commissions Documents , July 1987

It is our view that the Treaty of Waitangi is a living breathing document and a partnership must be based on honour, good faith between all parties. The question must be raised *“where exactly can you pin point the honour, and good faith”*, if NZTA will not recognise that they are not negotiating with the rightful and mandated group. That the beneficiaries themselves are at a remiss as to whom they are to look up to for this guidance.

Let's heed the words of our forebears *“It appears that NZTA without realizing it are the principal impediment towards the current Ngati Tama demise, and development, which appears to be composed and orchestrated for the purpose of division, uncertainty, controversy and conflict amongst our people. It has pitted our own against our own, ironically in a system that has never been developed by ourselves”*.¹⁹

Ngāti Tama is seeking a long term partnership with NZTA that will last forever in a day. To achieve this we see the importance of consulting with the beneficiaries in a series of meeting so that we are able to move forward together.

Regards and on behalf

William Simpson 17 July 2018

¹⁹ J.Koia July 2001 Te Tiriti o Waitangi Maori fishing /property rights