ADDRESS BY
TIPENE O'REGAN
TO THE CANTERBURY BRANCH
OF
THE NEW ZEALAND PLANNING
INSTITUTE

CHRISTCHURCH, AUGUST 3, 1992

Copied to Rod
M 15/1.

(These were introductory remarks to the audience, prompted by a news report that morning).

Most South Islanders by now see me as pretty much part of the landscape, if not always a very attractive part of it. But as Ngai Tahu in the past few decades has emerged to assert our presence and our relationship to certain aspects of the landscape, there are a few people who have started playing the man and not the ball.

They question whether the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and Te Runanganui O Ngai Tahu have the authority to speak and act on behalf of Ngai Tahu in certain areas. I'm pretty clear-minded about that - the people have told them that they have the right to represent them. So if there's someone that barks on the side of the road "I have a Ngai Tahu whakapapa I don't like those who represent me", I am wholly unimpressed, no matter how much Ross Meurant, for instance, is impressed by it.

The reason I am here doing this job today is simply because my people have asked me to, and I have little prospect of release at least in the near future.

I guess most people know me as chairman of Ngai Tahu's administrative entity, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, and a member of the board who comes up for re-election every three years. If my electorate was dissatisfied with my performance, I would not be re-elected - I have just been re-elected so I face the Crown with equanimity on that subject even though there have been others including the Crown who have tried to challenge Ngai Tahu and other Maori representivity in recent times.

Furthermore, the position created for me and my colleagues on the Ngai Tahu team negotiating team and our two retained consultants follows the Ngai Tahu tradition of the iwi or tribe choosing those people who represent them and negotiate for them whom they regard to be the best qualified to do so. In Maori tradition if the tribe needed a warrior because the enemy was coming you put a warrior out in front. If you needed a peacemaker or a gardener you put them out in front. They generally came from the same pool of leadership or the same stable and people were always chosen on the basis of competency and that's a model we tend to follow internally within the tribe today.

Each November, Ngai Tahu from all over the South Island but particularly from our papatipu runanga and from the North Island gather for the hui a iwi - the annual meeting of the iwi or tribe. Each year that hui, since we embarked on this round of the Claim, has endorsed and supported the membership of the negotiating team. It has also backed the teams that were formed several years ago to continue our 143-year old claim Te Kereme, to the latest available judicial forum, the Waitangi Tribunal.

And those with even a little knowledge of Ngai Tahu would know the Ngai Tahu members leading that negotiating team would be continually seeking regular counsel

and guidance, and indeed direction from our elders, the kaumatua and kuia - the senior men and, I stress, women including our formidable frontline of aunties who know and hold in trust the traditions of all our tipuna or ancestors.

Speech notes (edited) for an address by Tipene O'Regan to the Canterbury branch of the New Zealand Planning Institute, Christchurch.
August 2 1992.

I am grateful for this opportunity to speak to you on some of the planning and conservation issues that have recently been in the news.

Since our Negotiations with the Crown began last September, a number of interest groups have concluded that certain aspects of the Negotiations appear to be contrary to what they regard as their own interests.

Many in the various environmental or conservation movements say they're concerned about the future of what they call the "conservation estate" - wharever that is, and say they have this concern because of the public interest.

There's been a fair old run of this in a range of national newspapers, periodicals and the radio on the question.

I want to say to you that the fears being expressed are groundless. In the event of a Settlement with the Crown, Ngai Tahu would not wish, as is asserted, to own outright prominent features in this Island such as Aoraki, or National Parks, in the sense of Western ownership. And anyone who has got the slightest sense of cash flow would understand why.

In the event that an interest in those asses of the Crown featured in any Settlement - and I say in the event - the current arrangements relating to public access, use or the dedication of those resources would not be affected.

What we are talking about in that sense is the dimension of mana. Insofar as that has a component of honour then in my view it should have some appeal to the people, even if the notion of the honour of the Crown is at times something people have difficulty understanding.

I believe in it and I know a lot of people are trying to, when they see how the Crown behaves.

I think if people paused even briefly to think about what is, and what might be going to happen, then they would see how wrong the allegations are that are being made about Ngai Tahu and the conservation estate.

But before looking at those conservation matters, it's probably a good idea if I give you a quick outline of what has upset Ngai Tahu for so long, and why we are now negotiating with the Crown.

Before 1840, Ngai Tahu owned Te Wai Pounamu, (the South Island) just as surely as if the title to the Island had been lodged in what's now the Land Transfer Office. Ngai Tahu owned the South Island in English common law, we owned it by recognition of it by the Crown and it was also recognised in international law.

That's why we went into the business of a Treaty, the Treaty of Waitangi, to be the legal vehicle for formally recognising and then organising the transfer of that native title - that indigenous title - to the Crown. That's what it was for. The Treaty of Waitangi was one of dozens signed in British colonies from the beginning of the 1700s that did this. There's actually one called the Treaty of Lagos that's looks as though it came off the same photocopier.

That common law native title I referred to covered Ngai Tahu property or title in - and here I quote from the English version of our Treaty - "lands and estates, forests, fisheries and other properties." Now that means a whole bundle of rights. They are to do with usage, the right to perform, the right to regulate, the right to allocate the use of, and so on.

In the case of fisheries there is still a very clear usage title as we found out in 1986 with the Te Weehi High Court decision that the Crown very deliberately refused to appeal. And the remnants of that problem are still with us and still to be negotiated.

Those "other properties" have since been defined by the Tribunal to include mahinga kai, or access to foodgrowing and foodgathering places, and ownership of pounamu or greenstone as well as burial places and other places special to Maori.

And there are places like that in the conservation estate. Just to the north of us here between the Heathcote and the Waimakariri there are buried some of our most important chiefs. In Fiordland National Park we have numerous burial places. I must say here that the Department of Conservation has been superb in its relationship with us over these places, but what we talking about with the Crown is not the doffing of our hats to these places, but the right of access to these mozanga in terms of the Treaty.

The Treaty also provided the way to transfer that property title from Ngai Tahu to the Crown if Ngai Tahu wished to sell any of those properties. The Crown would buy the title and then flog it off to the settlers, with, as we know a substantial capital gain to the Crown.

So far, the only part of the overall property title transferred from Ngai Tahu to the Crown has been land and some forests. Fish and other resources have never been the subject of negotiation. Fish(eries) have never been negotiated for, but the control of and in some cases the ownership of were asserted by the Settler Parliaments and have subsequently been assumed by the Crown.

Between 1844 and 1863 Ngai Tahu quite legally contracted with the Crown for the sale of the 35.5 million acres we owned in the South Island. Each of those contracts were formal agreements in English law. But in each of the land deals the Crown failed to honour its own legal agreements.

Broadly speaking, these agreements involved Ngai Tahu getting back one tenth of all the land sold to the Crown. That "Tenths Agreement" was the subject of the Tribunal's report and it found against us in certain areas and for us in others. Broadly speaking it concluded that a tenth of the land assets should have been reserved to Ngai Tahu. A part of our Negotiations with the Crown are trying to establish a value of the Ngai Tahu loss.

However, the Crown failed to honour these contracts and successive governments refused to put things right. We first started complaining to the Crown in 1849 one year after the Kemp purchase that covered this area.

By the time the last contract was signed, Ngai Tahu should have owned a total of nearly four million acres of land, along with access to important food-gathering and food-producing places such as lakes and estuaries, we should have owned all pounamu or greenstone, and have been provided with schools and hospitals.

I don't need to tell you that all we got was a very minor amount of acres and a very minor amount of pounds.

Ngai Tahu first said "hey, we've been robbed" in 1849, with a petition to Parliament even before the last of the contracts were signed. We went to court in 1868 but the Government quickly passed an Act stopping the Supreme Court from further deciding the case when it looked like we might win.

Then, when the Smith-Nairn commission brought down an interim report that looked as though it was in favour of Ngai Tahu, Bryce the Minister of Native Affairs cut off all funding to that Royal Commission of Inquiry and the whole thing came to a stop.

Since then numerous commissions, hearings, courts and Tribunals have established the justice of Ngai Tahu's claims. But we have not received justice.

You can see we are basically talking about a massive breach of contract. Ngai Tahu owned something. We agreed to sell it. The price and other conditions were agreed on. Sales contracts were drawn up and signed. But the Crown never kept its side of the bargain. They put down the deposit, drove the car out of the yard and were never seen again.

The law says when one party doesn't keep its side of the bargain and refuses to put things right, then you can sue. Our lawyers tell us, and they are very good ones , that yes, we could sue the Crown, despite the statute of limitations. Those same lawyers tell us Ngai Tahu could expect the Courts to award damages totalling several

hundreds million dollars in respect of certain of those breaches, but the Ngai Tahu claim would not be adequately covered by a common law approach.

The Southland MP Bill English recently somewhat excitedly recently described this situation as the Ngai Tahu having the Crown by the short and curlies. There is such a thing called court risk, but our advisers tell us our position is quite strong.

However, we have decided, for the time being at least, not to pursue a Claim against the Crown based on common law and contract law questions.

Even though it is a route that is potentially extremely profitable, and perhaps even more profitable than the Negotiations - there is a risk factor in it and it would be deeply divisive of the communities that were affected by it.

So we have always preferred the Waitangi Tribunal route and that is why we supported the development of the Tribunal and the negotiation model. I had some difficulty with both Sir Robert Muldoon and the present prime minister some years ago because we refused to say we'd never take the common law route and that we would never involve ourselves in issues that would involve private land.

We have no wish to be involved in private land. We don't want to, but we have always refused to say that we will never take a common law route. Instead we are trusting, against all good reason, that the Crown will drive vigorously towards a Treaty-based negotiation approach.

We have always regarded the Treaty as the route to go and not that common law approach and I am deliberately being vague about the particular subjects involved in the common law argument because there are reporters here. But I do emphasise we want a negotiated outcome that goes no where near private interests that are currently guaranteed and protected by the Crown.

Typical of the benefits of the outcome of the negotiation route are those we can see in relation to fish. Maori have taken a substantial place there in only two and a half years and not one single person in the fishing industry has lost a cent.

That was despite the fishing people being given property rights in fishing quota, gifted by you and I take it with your informed consent. They were private property rights and they have all willingly sold or disposed of those assets at fair market prices.

Not a single person was affected negatively, yet still the outcry is heard. Of course, at the same time they're around the back trying to cut deals with operate us with us commercially. The fishing model is an interesting one and one that should be borne in mind.

We prefer the negotiation route before the Waitangi Tribunal because we believe it is an appropriate way for Ngai Tahu and pakeha to relate to each other. It gives us

contracts. That restoration has a spiritual, cultural and an economic/financial dimension.

The only assets that can be negotiated into a Settlement to restore our mana in those three dimensions are Crown-owned assets in the South Island.

I don't want you to get concerned about recent events in the North involving the Waitangi Tribunal that have made a lot of people apprehensive about our Negotiations with the Crown. There's been a lot of extrapolations from the north to the south by the Federated Mountain Clubs. I would like you to remember what we have always said about private land not being in the Negotiations. It's as simple as that.

We don't want private assets unless we buy them freely on an open market in a face-to-face deal with the vendor without any intervention from the Crown. But we won't be dealing with people who run (tourist) services and tell their customers about the wickedness of Ngai Tahu and we won't be dealing with those who attack us publicly and untruthfully.

There are now a significant number of sensible South Island business people who are rapidly making themselves known to Ngai Tahu. Our common self-interest will on the whole remove the doubts, hysteria and panic that tend to affect this curiously intense society of ours.

Another comment being heard from some in the conservation lobby especially, is that the Negotiations are secret. The fact is that naturally, the Negotiations are confidential. Any negotiations with someone are by tradition a confidential process and they have to be.

There are a wide range of topics being discussed within them, but that the Negotiations are taking place and what they are about in broad terms, is far from secret.

Right from the outset the Minister of Justice Doug Graham gave assurances that where third parties were affected they would be consulted, and they have been. We have consulted third parties. But there is no place at the negotiating table for any third party because this is a matter being resolved solely between the two Treaty partners, the Ngai Tahu and the Crown.

I can assure you the Crown negotiators are fully capable of protecting the interests of third parties, particularly if those third parties have political pull. We all have a duty to conduct the negotiations firmly, honourably and with goodwill.

This talk of secrecy is shown for the nonsense that it is when you consider what will happen if the Negotiations are satisfactorily completed. The proposed Settlement would have to be shown to Ngai Tahu at a special hui a iwi or meeting of the tribe,

some kind of charter for our relationship and we believe that to be important, rather than have the continual ad hoc-ery that represents New Zealand's governments today.

So, the Tribunal largely validated the Ngai Tahu Claim although it did reject some aspects of it that we were prepared to accept at the time and that's how the negotiations started.

We are now hearing a new package of objection to Ngai Tahu receiving justice from our Treaty partner.

The objectors say we are all one nation and all one people. Therefore Ngai Tahu should not end up owning assets as a result of any Settlement because that would be an ownership based on race. If it's Maori property it's race - if it's pakeha property it's somehow different, and there is an effort being made by some to drive New Zealand towards this concept of ownership by race.

Anything that settles assets in Ngai Tahu is an expression of Ngai Tahu property rights that reside in that group. No problem of course if that group is a pakeha company or a pakeha trust, or a pakeha city council. But somehow if it's a Ngai Tahu property right based on Ngai Tahu kinship then there's a problem. But if it's the kinship of the (Sir Robert) Jones's, the (John) Spencers, the (John) Fernyhoughs or the families that are Christ's College then somehow that's different.

The newly formed Jade Miners & Manufacturers Association in Hokitika, for instance, uses this objection in attempts to stop ownership of all pounamu or greenstone mineral rights in the South Island being returned to Ngai Tahu.

The association says that the vesting of any resource on the basis of race is an idea that most New Zealanders would find totally unacceptable. Ngai Tahu would also find it unacceptable. Vesting something in Ngai Tahu collectively or corporately is not vesting it on the basis of race. In the case of pounamu, it is a return of the rights in the group that were unlawfully taken.

If something Ngai Tahu owned was taken off us and given to someone purely on the basis they were Australian, Chinese, Japanese, or even Irish, then we would very upset.

We want ownership because we have always owned the rights to pounamu. In 1840 there was a Treaty that confirmed the pre-existing rights in these assets. We never sold them, they were unlawfully taken and now we want them back. The Crown argued all sorts of tricks before conceding the point and coming to the conclusion they should be returned.

With the negotiations, essentially the position is that Ngai Tahu wants its mana to be restored to where it would have been in 1992 if the Crown had honoured all those

before it could be signed. We would certainly sign nothing on behalf of the tribe that did not have that endorsement. If I had my way it would be signed by each of our eighteen papatipu runanga.

Similarly there's no way that Doug Graham's going to be allowed to sign anything. It'll have to be seen by the Cabinet and where necessary where statutory amendments are necessary, by Parliament.

Let's now look at what kind of Crown assets might be involved in resolving this breach of contract and restoring Ngai Tahu's mana. We have developed an idea of shared title with our Treaty partner, of having it clearly recognised that we belong to and that there is a deliberate connection with such places as Aoraki-Mount Cook and other mountain peaks that were named by Ngai Tahu a thousand years ago.

This would not affect access for climbing people going skiing or wanting to jump off and it's a very important concept to get across, so you don't get hung up on ownership meaning exclusion.

The Crown is still considering those proposals and there are a lot of honourable people on the Crown side who are working on a model that's acceptable. In the light of that, the comments of Hugh Barr in particular of Federated Mountain Clubs have been a pretty sad event.

There is no foundation for any suggestions that mountain climbers and other visitors to these areas would have their rights of access changed.

The then director-general of the Department of Conservation told the Tribunal (during the hearings) he could see no particular difficulty with the concept of shared title - and the exact formula is still a concept - provided that the estate remained under what he termed a comparable standard of protection. That is what we have always advocated.

I think if you look at Ngai Tahu's concern for the protection of National Parks and other premium conserved estate areas, it's best illustrated by our support for the successful creation of a south-west New Zealand World Heritage area.

We joined the Royal Forest & Bird Society particularly in that thrust and the Crown took the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and the Forest & Bird Society on the title page of the application to the United Nations. It recognised the importance of what the society had done and it also recognised the importance of Ngai Tahu in that process.

Having backed it, we got a fair bit of flak from our own people but we did it and it was overwhelmingly endorsed - by a majority I must admit. We are not out to see it removed from that condition as a world heritage area. It's a matter of pride to us, for that area is the cradle of our mythology, one of the deepest well-springs of Ngai Tahu heritage and identity with this landscape. It's also a connective tissue with other

Polynesians, running through the Marquesas and Tahiti to that south-west corner of the island.

We have some very strong views about what should happen in the area of conservation, and land and resource management. We have long wanted to get into the business of restoring some of the catchments and repairing some of the damage on the cover.

Whether we are able to do so largely depends on the Crown's willingness to give us some of those damaged areas and whether there will be a sufficient cash component for us over a long time to get it back into a reasonably clean and healthy condition.

Why should we bother doing this? Because a major concern of ours is that our mahinga kai (rights of access to traditional foodgathering and food-growing areas) is largely an estuarine and coastal zone. The bottom of Waihora (Lake Ellesmere) for instance is progressively moving up towards the surface and the only thing that's keeping it alive is the wind across its surface. It's been one of the greatest resources in New Zealand of fish, in eels and flounder, and is virtually destroyed because of the land management models that have been used in the catchments that flow into it.

Our concern at the end of the day is with those coastal and estuarine zones. But we know what a millstone much of that degraded high country territory is. We are going to be able to consider, depending on how much cash comes out of a Settlement, to make some contribution.

We aren't going to be able to restore this island but we want to have a big enough stake and sufficient footing to make sure we can have a clear voice in restoring the cloak of this island that is our mother.

We want to do that because our interest is in the restoration of one of our greatest treasures, our mahinga kai - our capacity to take food. Our runanga are coming to us and saying get in there and do something about it and that's what drives us back to our Negotiations with the Crown, to try and establish this stake for our people.

That leaves other land still regarded by many as part of the conservation estate and which, as an available Crown asset could well come into Ngai Tahu's full ownership.

Much of this land sits in the conservation estate because no-one can think of any particular use for it. On the West Coast, for instance there's thousands of hectares of gorse-covered, possum-infested, and heavily eroded land.

But propose some kind of more appropriate use for the land - and that might include restoration to its natural state so tourists can be shown it, then there'll be someone somewhere who will tell you, with a perfectly straight face, that the land has a high conservation values and should not be disturbed.

However, since it's costing DoC and other government departments or SOEs a lot of money to have this kind of land in the estate, we have detected a certain amount of enthusiasm on the part of the Crown negotiators whenever it comes up for possible inclusion in any Settlement.

Some Crown land available for inclusion in any Settlement is in the high country and subject to long-term leases - so long-term and on such favourable terms to the lessees that I notice many of them have to be reminded from time to time by the Crown that Her Majesty is still the landlord.

There are some who suggest there are many high country sheep stations that would not be in business if they had to pay the Crown what would be regarded in any other business as a fair rental.

These pastoral leases have been described as being the last bastions of taxpayer subsidy to farmers and as such must have long been on Treasury's hit list. Trouble is, no-one in the last Government, and no-one in this one either seems to have been brave enough to broach the subject with the farmers involved.

It seems many of the pastoral lessees have seen the writing on the wall about these rentals, whether it's going to be the Crown or anyone else who ends up owning them in the event of a Settlement.

At least two runholders have already sold their leases to the Crown in anticipation of a Settlement, with the stations near Lake Wakatipu now being managed by the Crown until the outcome of the Negotiations is known. I understand that others are now thinking about approaching the Crown and also offering their pastoral leases for sale.

In any event, I want to assure the holders of pastoral leases that in the event of Ngai Tahu acquiring either the lease, the underlying title or both, that their farm management expertise would be seen by us as something we would need to continue with.

And talking of management, in the past few weeks there's also been quite a bit of comment from some in the conservation movement about how Ngai Tahu would manage the conservation estate. It's clear that for some reason they are quite apprehensive about what they consider Ngai Tahu's management philosophy to be.

Of course, in relation to Aoraki and National Parks, these people forget that DoC would continue to manage those conservation areas.

But I think a little Ngai Tahu history would give you the answer as to how we might be managing any other land that could be in a Settlement.

When Ngai Tahu initially arrived in the South Island about 1000 years ago, they obviously had an impact on the ecosystem. The people needed to eat, they needed shelter and they needed to cultivate the food they brought with them.

It's a simple fact of life that many of these activities - if we look at them objectively - would have had a negative impact on the ecosystem.

An ecologist would probably say that man has had nothing but a negative impact on the ecosystem since coming down from the trees and starting to walk upright.

But by about the 1500s, Ngai Tahu had evolved a pretty good relationship with the ecosystem of Te Wai Pounamu. They had to. What today we call sustainable management, Ngai Tahu knew as survival. The Ngai Tahu knew and used and sustainably managed just about every nook and cranny of the South Island.

We know that because if you dot the location of every known archeological site in the South Island on to a blank piece of paper, it forms a very precise map of the coastline, lakes and interior features of the island. There's nearly 4000 such sites and no doubt more waiting to be discovered.

There has always been a cost to the environment in having human life in it. Throw in what Nature is capable of doing - a volcanic eruption like Taupo or Pinatubo for instance - and you can see that the environment can have a pretty precarious existence.

It is the philosophy of sustainable management and sensible use of natural resources that is fundamental to the Ngai Tahu's view of life and of the ecosystem. Broadly speaking this philosophy sees human life as an integral part of a larger dimension in which all living things have their place.

For instance we regard water as a living thing. So it's quite puzzling to Ngai Tahu to see pakeha putting a high value on water quality in the high country, yet not caring about the quality of that very same water at the mouth of the Waimakariri.

Another curious activity of the pakeha is setting aside and preserving huge areas of land such as in Fiordland as a pristine wilderness and occasionally visiting it to breathe the fresh air and to hear the birds sing.

All this contrasts with where those visitors actually live. There the air tends to be dirty, the water's only fit to drink if treated to taste like a swimming pool and sewage is poured straight into the sea. Or in this city's case you could say briefly shaken and stirred and then poured into the sea. Foul the nest, but never mind, there's always Fiordland at Christmas time - for those who can afford it.

Well, Ngai Tahu's view is that the nest and the forest are all one and should be managed as one. Water is precious wherever it is, so are the birds, and the fish and the forest.

They're precious because there must always be enough - always more than enough - to sustain life in both its spiritual and physical sense. Ngai Tahu sees Fiordland for instance, as a spiritual and cultural treasure, but one that has to be managed to keep it that way and a benchmark for management of the environment for where we all live.

Outside of National Parks and other premium land in the conservation estate, there are huge areas of Crown land in the South Island in desperate need of rehabilitation.

At the moment, no one has the money for this restoration work. I know that DoC looks on with despair as hillsides in vital catchment areas fall into rivers. In the event of these areas forming part of a Settlement much of this land would be actively managed back to its natural state by Ngai Tahu.

There are for instance substantial areas suitable for restoration as wetland habitat and as other wildlife habitats. I'm wondering when the Forest & Bird Society for instance will wake up to this and realise how much we can together achieve for the environment.

To illustrate the short-sightedness of the opposition to a fair and equitable Settlement from the environmental sector, could I move briefly into the financial dimension of any Settlement.

Our Trust Board executives are now being overwhelmed by people wanting to do business with us. Representatives of just about every major accounting, legal, valuation and real estate firm in the country, along with the major banks, superannuation fund managers and merchant banks are clamouring for appointments around at our office building in Armagh Street.

Yet as little as a year ago, the business and commercial world was ignoring Ngai Tahu. This was despite our considerable financial strength even without a Settlement being on the cards.

But shrewd people had come to us when they saw what had been unfolding during the Waitangi Tribunal hearings. Many of them are now with us as directors of our companies and as our advisers.

So, a year ago, the greater business world was oblivious to the benefits to the South Island of a Settlement. Now they aren't. In the tourism industry especially, some of the major players have made the right strategic decision to say kia ora, how can we do business together.

The point I'm trying to make is that when you look at it objectively it makes good sense to get alongside Ngai Tahu.

Given that Ngai Tahu have so much in common with conservationists and environmentalists, isn't it also good environmental sense for Federated Mountain Clubs, Forest & Bird and others in the environmental movement to also say kia ora.

Of course one thing that Forest & Bird see as a possible hurdle to saying kia ora is Ngai Tahu's reported culinary interests in birdlife.

Ngai Tahu have never thought to criticise all those Forest & Bird members who tuck into roast turkey at Christmas-time. At this very moment there's thousands of turkeys - obviously a native bird of some land - being fattened for the Christmas table.

When Europeans first arrived in the South Island, there were no turkeys for Christmas, but there were plenty of wood pigeon. A day or two before Christmas at Akaroa for instance you went into the nearby bush and shot a couple of wood pigeon for Christmas dinner. And three or four hundred more just for the heck of it. They were left where they fell.

Of course if you don't practice sustainable management of kereru you inevitably get the situation you see today. Very few kereru. None in some places.

Yes, it is one of Ngai Tahu's very long-term aspirations to once again go into the bush just as the first Europeans did on Banks Peninsula and elsewhere and perhaps take a kereru or two.

But just the two, and really, it isn't something that anyone in this room need be concerned about. It will be three or four generations before that bird species and its habitat has been sustainably managed up to numbers where the existing rahui or ban on taking kereru could be lifted.

In the meantime, I guess Ngai Tahu will continue to gather the miro berries that kereru eat and stuff them into a number eight Tegel chicken from the supermarket to give us the flavour. A flavour, I hasten to add I only know about from listening to some of Ngai Tahu's northern neighbours talk about it.

So let me then summarise for you some of the things I've been saying today.

In the event of a Settlement, Ngai Tahu would have a form of shared title with the Crown to prominent features like Aoraki and other similar areas that are important to Ngai Tahu. Current levels of public access to these areas would not change in any way.

In relation to such areas as National Parks and other premium conservation areas, we are also proposing a form of shared title and again, nobody's rights of access to these

areas would change. For all of these areas, management would stay right where it is, with the Department of Conservation.

Current levels of public access to other areas that might come into Ngai Tahu's full ownership would also not be affected.

I think a lot of the apprehension that's felt about the prospect of Ngai Tahu being able to assert themselves once again as a social, cultural and economic force, stems from wondering whether Ngai Tahu feel anger or resentment over past injustices.

No, anger and resentment do not possess Ngai Tahu. Instead, what we have is a simple faith in our system of justice and a belief in the sense of fair play of the average New Zealander.

In the face of quite a few indications to the contrary, we have kept that faith and held that belief for nearly 150 years.

Ngai Tahu hope that this year that faith in justice and our belief in New Zealanders' sense of fair play will be vindicated with a fair and equitable Settlement with our Treaty partner.

ooOOoo

Sir Tipene To Escort Prime Minister At APEC
Press Release New Zealand Government 8/09/99 16:31:00

The Prime Minister confirmed today that Ngai Tahu kaumatua Sir Tipene O'Regan has agreed to be her kaikorero (speaker) and escort for the formal powhiri for APEC Leaders on Sunday.

Sir Tipene has a distinguished background in trade and economic development. He is a recognised expert in Maori culture and of kaumatua status in his iwi.

"I am honoured that Sir Tipene representing Ngai Tahu will be at my side during the ceremonies. Ngai Tahu welcomed our guests to the first APEC Ministers' meeting this year and it is fitting that the iwi will be at the last meeting.

[Image]"As the Member of Parliament for Rakaia, I am pleased to have[Image] home support from the South Island in undertaking this important task," Mrs Shipley said.

Sir Tipene will escort the leaders through the powhiri process and will respond to the welcome speeches from Auckland's Ngati Whatua tribe on behalf of the Prime Minister and the group of APEC leaders.

ENDS

Classifications
Wires: Politics
Business: Trade Agreements
Politics: Government Press Releases , Prime Minister
Social Issues: Maori
World: Foreign Affairs