

Record of the Inaugural Hui
Kia Timata Nga Whakawhanaungatanga
“Let the building of relationships begin”
29 April – 01 May 2005
By Trish Rea, Scott Macindoe and Sonny Tau
3 May 2005

A hui to discuss concerns surrounding the mismanagement of New Zealand’s fisheries by the Ministry and Minister of Fisheries was held over the last weekend of April 2005. Non-commercial fishing interests held the inaugural hui at Whitiara Marae, Te Tii in Northland. This hui was significant as no other group of non-commercial fishing interests had ever attempted to meet with Maori to explore how we could combine to arrest the continued over fishing of our shared inshore fisheries.

Background

Late in 2004 Sonny Tau, the chairman of Te Runanga A Iwi O Ngapuhi, suggested recreational fishers had much to learn of things Maori and particularly Ngapuhi – he asked if we could set up a meeting whereby he and his colleagues could meet with some of us and present a Ngapuhi perspective.

After Christmas we followed up and it became obvious that a shift of venue to a marae in the north would allow us to learn first hand how tangata whenua go about meeting, sharing ideas and getting to know one another. To this end the hui was arranged with an appropriate theme, ***“kia timata nga whanaungatanga”*** or, ***“let the relationship building begin.”*** In addition to this theme, much discussion has occurred regards non-commercial fishing interests.

We accepted the invitation of Taiaimai ki te Marangai takiwa (a branch of Te Runanga A Iwi O Ngapuhi – TRAION) to a hui at their Whitiara Marae. This is at Te Tii on the Purerua Peninsula, north of Kerikeri. Thanks go to Judah Heihei and Ray Kapa for their enthusiasm and making the marae available. This marae is very beautiful and the scene of many successful hui for Ngapuhi.

Around 30 recreational fishing representatives assembled at the waharoa, gateway to the Te Tii marae on Friday evening. We were welcomed onto the marae with a formal powhiri, the purpose of which is to help visitors (manuhiri) feel entirely at home for the duration of the stay, to make everyone equal and encourage the best possible outcomes from the deliberations. The powhiri began with the Karanga or calling of manuhiri (visitors) onto the Marae Atea (area in front of the Wharenuui). We then entered the Marae and immediately went to the atamira (area where the dead lie in state) and payed our respects to the Tūpuna (ancestors), whose photographs hang on the rear wall.

After the hariru and hongiri (shaking of hands and rubbing of noses) it was time for the welcoming speeches. The tangata whenua (home people) spoke first and then handed the privilege to us, their visitors. The significance of this part of the hui is not to be underestimated as this set the wairua (spirit) for the entire hui. It is impossible to begin a hui with clear intentions to work together, without going through the entire

powhiri process. This might be something we can learn to introduce to our private and business functions.

The powhiri was followed by a wonderful kai – we were made to feel very much at home and most welcome.

Friday 29 April

Judah Heihei warmly welcomed all of us to the marae and explained the programme for the next few days. This was followed by a brief history of Ngati Rehia and local korero (talk).

Sonny Tau gave an overview of the history of Ngapuhi, its boundaries (both traditional and contemporary) and tikanga – practices. This presentation was an insight into the psyche of Maori, why they act like they do.

Frustration was expressed at the headline grabbing misconceptions that the media portray regarding Treaty of Waitangi settlements. It is important to know that in all the treaty settlements thus far, Maori have only received, in total treaty of Waitangi claims, \$715M which is dwarfed by the BNZ and Air NZ bailouts which didn't rate a mention in the media except to announce it to the country.

Ngapuhi accept that this hui was not about resolving Maori grievances but they wanted us to understand the background to their grievance so we can forge a relationship to work towards a common objective – more fish in the water.

Sonny Tau said that Ngapuhi were clear as to why they wanted to meet with other non-commercial fishing interests. They had recently discovered that there were three categories of fishers created in legislation - commercial fishers, recreational fishers and customary fishers. To fish customarily, Maori need a permit. "When we fish to feed our babies we are categorised as recreational fishers. Therefore 99.99% of the time Ngapuhi go fishing, we are fishing under the amateur fishing regulations."

As Ngapuhi also hold commercial quota it has been said that they will be challenged about their dual interests in commercial as well as recreational fishing. According to Sonny Tau, his iwi, Ngapuhi beneficiaries have stated categorically that they want fish on their tables rather than overseas or being used as crayfish bait for Australian fishers. Ngapuhi also view the mismanagement of our inshore shared fisheries as a direct threat to their commercial fishing returns.

Saturday 30 April

Hope and Potential – Judah Heihei and Scott Macindoe

A good point was raised that when Maori talk about pakeha in relation to Treaty of Waitangi issues they are referring to the Crown, not to pakeha in general. Some Maori have been portrayed in the media as being anti-pakeha, but for Ngapuhi they are clear, it is the Crown they have issues with.

Nothing without protest and no goodwill from the Crown – Maori have felt this for a very long time. We now find ourselves feeling the same way in regards to fisheries matters.

Ngapuhi's kingfish submission gave us hope when they made the statement, *"Ngapuhi individuals and whanau are passionate about recreational fishing both in Northland and wherever they might live throughout the country"*.

Ngai Tahu have submitted with similar statement as well.

Communication is the key to success. For too long Maori and recreational fishers have not consulted with each other, now is a good time to start working together. An example of a local aquaculture project failing due to objections from many recreational fishers was used to describe how the process was flawed. The potential exists to work together to find solutions that fit with Maori aspirations for economic development and for recreational fishers to enjoy the benefits.

Judah explained the local people had invested in a mataitai in their area to counteract the inability of MFish to stop illegal fishing. The mataitai was gazetted and an area agreed to by MFish, only to arrive at the conclusion that they had no real control over their fenced-off area. Progress has been slow but he was keen to hear what others had to say in regards to the suitability of a mataitai as a tool for fisheries management. Northland people are very keen to have tools for management of their local areas and harbours in particular. They are frustrated that these tools have never had a chance to be developed and that MFish changes direction on them, without adequate consultation.

Richard Civil, a Maori and fifth generation ex-commercial fisherman addressed the hui and talked about his experience of fishing around the Bay of Islands. The introduction of the QMS has seen around 95% of the quota that was held by local fishermen sold to the bigger fishing companies. In the early 1980s there were 96 permits held around the area. As far as the locals are aware only two local boats still work the area. Because most of the fish is exported the locals can only access fish through the local supermarkets, unless they catch it themselves.

Rick Pollock couldn't be at the hui as he had a charter on "*Pursuit*" but unloaded plenty of fish at Mangonui wharf. This was delivered to the marae for us to enjoy.

Barriers to Progress

Fisheries History – John Holdsworth

Before the introduction of the Quota Management System (QMS) the government was subsidising fishermen into bigger boats and the outcome was more fishing effort in a move designed to increase our exports by fishing further out to sea (but the boats were used to fish inshore). There was open access to our inshore fisheries that became the target of the ever increasingly efficient fishing fleet.

The advent of the QMS brought about the demise of many local fishermen who did not meet the criteria for getting an allocation of quota under the new regime. One of the criteria was the fisherman had to prove an income of around \$10,000. Many of Northland's local fishermen lost out due to these criteria. What was not taken into account was these local fishermen were "fishing for life", whether it was to supply the local shops with fish, bartering or feeding the whanau.

Three categories of fishers were also established at this time, commercial, recreational and customary Maori. The term recreational fisher was rejected by the hui as being derogatory and not reflective of what it actually is. Non-commercial is the preferred term and more appropriate now that we are working towards the same goal. It is also how the Fisheries Act 1996 describes us - *non-commercial fishing interests*.

In 1986 there was an upsurge in fishing rights awareness partly attributable to a court ruling in favour of a claim by an old Maori man that it was his customary right to gather shellfish from Motunau Beach (north of Christchurch).

After property rights for fisheries had been issued in the form of quota the northern people objected to their fishing rights being taken away. In 1987 a process was started that resulted in the Treaty of Waitangi Fisheries Commission agreeing with the Muriwhenua claim that Maori fishing rights had been extinguished, this was also confirmed by the courts and it found that Maori actually “*owned*” 100% of the fisheries. Negotiations took place between Maori and the Crown with industry very keen to participate.

There was a pre-settlement deal with the introduction of the Maori Fisheries Amendment Bill in 1998. The Treaty of Waitangi (Fisheries Claims) Settlement of 1992 established formal recognition of Maori fisheries claims. Until this settlement Maori had very strong claims to New Zealand’s fisheries.

The government was trying to work out what to do with recreational fishing and formulated a national policy¹ and what we now refer to as Moyle’s Promise². Subsequent Labour governments have not upheld this policy and explained this away by saying it was never passed by the Cabinet so therefore wasn’t official policy.

The 1983 Fisheries Act was replaced in 1996 and entrenched the QMS as our fisheries management tool forever. The lack of definition of recreational fishing rights was used as a reason for the 2000 *Soundings* document suggesting a proportional share (amongst other things) regime would be a good way to manage recreational fishing.

The response to the *Soundings* process was overwhelming. option4 mobilised and facilitated over 100,000 submissions in favour of the 4 principles - the public and eventually the Minister, Pete Hodgson, rejected the *Soundings* document. option4 recognised the danger of being fitted into the QMS in a proportional arrangement that would diminish the rights of non-commercial fishers.

Ngapuhi are welcome to share in the discussions we have regarding fisheries management and any material we have we will share with them. We are experienced in attending fisheries management meetings on behalf of non-commercial recreational fishers and are willing to share that experience with them. What we don’t want is any surprises, if Ngapuhi consider we are wrong then they need to tell us. Ideally we want

¹ National policy for marine recreational fisheries. Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries. June 1989

² Government’s position is clear, where a species of fish is not sufficiently abundant to support both commercial and non-commercial fishing, preference will be given to non-commercial fishing This position reflects Government’s resolve to ensure all New Zealanders can enjoy and benefit from our fisheries. Colin Moyle. Minister of Fisheries June 1989

to get to a stage where we have an agreed position before we proceed in any management arrangements. There is strength in unity.

Kahawai Legal Challenge

Why Ngapuhi should be concerned - Paul Barnes

After being denied the chance to discuss fisheries management with Maori through the official Ministry of Fisheries processes it was a huge leap forward and a privilege to speak with Ngapuhi on their marae.

Ominous signs for recreational fishing interests were apparent in the late 1980's and early 1990's. A meeting was organised with Peter Pearse in the early 1990's. It was revealed that the objective was to constrain recreational catch. Pearse's opinion was that the ideal way to do this was to license recreational fishers. Then the license price would be set to a high enough level that the only people that would participate would be those who were willing to pay. This would mean that those who couldn't afford to pay the license fee, the same people who are most dependent on fishing for food would be shut out of legally fishing. This was unacceptable. Pearse then wrote a report for the Ministry of Fisheries called Building on Progress.³

Around 1993 Wheeler was promoting much the same logic as Pearse, but more extensive work was done. Another report was produced and went further than just discussing licensing and constraining the recreational catch. The money generated through this process would be used to buy back quota from commercial fishers as the population grows.

The problem with this ideology is the declining biomass means there are smaller fish and less of them to catch and the recreational harvest declines with the falling biomass. Recreational fishers have fish taken away from them as the biomass declines, now they were proposing to have recreational fishers buy those same fish back. This proposal was completely unacceptable to recreational fishers.

The QMS was "sold" to non-commercial fishers as a mechanism to control commercial catch. Commercial fishers were causing the fishery to decline; they were threatening inshore stocks that were nearly all depleted. In 1986 the statement included in Moyle's Promise of 1989, regarding the preference that would be given to non-commercial fishers, was made. This was referring to all non-commercial fishing interests both Maori customary and recreational.

Bearing this in mind the Ministry were dealing in bad faith. The public gave their agreement to the QMS on the understanding that the promised preference would be applied, that if there weren't enough fish the people of this country would have a priority to fish for food over commercial's right to export fish. Or in the case of kahawai, take fish from our tables and export it for crayfish bait in Australia. This cannot be right or fair.

Doug Kidd introduced a new Fisheries Act in 1996 and he assured recreational fishing representatives that non-commercial interests would be protected in the new Act.

³ Building on Progress. Fisheries Policy Development in New Zealand by Peter H Pearse July 1991

The *Soundings* document produced in 2000 was the same ideology as discussed in 1991 and 1993. No mention of the promises made in 1986, the National Policy of 1989 or Moyle's Promise. The document basically promised non-commercial fishers the leftovers of the QMS. It promised tradeable quota that could be bought or sold.

A meeting of recreational fishing people was held in August 2000 and it was agreed that *Soundings* had to be stopped. Not only that, but an alternative needed to be offered so that people knew what recreational fishers wanted. A set of principles was required to guide people and assist their understanding of the basis of what option4 stood for.

option4 Principles

1. No licensing of recreational fishers.

This idea had already been rejected in 1991 and 1993. At a public meeting called to discuss the *Soundings* document an MFish representative was asked what the primary objective of the process was. The response - it was to cap the recreational catch and constrain recreational fishers to that capped level. And to avoid compensation issues for the Crown.

The *Soundings* process was not for the benefit of non-commercial fishers, it was a device designed to allow the Crown to escape from all the costs associated with the previous mismanagement of our fisheries.

They also wanted us to share the cost of managing our inshore fisheries. The Ministry considered the inshore fisheries needed this management, as there were too many competing interests. The commercial industry were the cause of the decline of our inshore fisheries, it should be their responsibility to rebuild them. If there was only non-commercial fishing effort applied in our inshore fisheries most of our stocks wouldn't need large-scale fisheries management, it was the commercial extraction that required the management.

The Ministry were asking us to subsidise the fishing industry again. They had already been paid compensation of around \$70 million for quota, then they received much of that quota back from the Quota Appeals Authority, now we were being asked to pay to manage ourselves and buy quota off them.

The Ministry were asked if were we (recreational fishers) eating too much fish? Or was it that they wanted us to buy our fish from the industry? No answer was forthcoming.

If we accepted a license regime it would be used against us. The money would be taken and applied to cover management costs that we had not been the cause of. The reason we need management of our fisheries is that the Ministry and industry are determined to maximise their quota and to extract the last possible fish from the water.

A license would be used against the poorer people of this country to keep them from legally accessing our fisheries. Those that did pay would be paying to buy back the fish that had been taken from us in the first instance.

This all adds up to the whakapapa on why we should never agree to licensing for recreational fishing.

2. Planning Right

The ability to devise plans to ensure future generations enjoy the same or better quality of rights while preventing fish conserved for recreational use being given to the commercial sector.

Non-commercial fishers have been led to believe that if they conserve fish it will do good things for the fishery. But if we look at kingfish that were introduced into the QMS in 2003, years ago non-commercial fishers could take 30 in a day. It was agreed that was excessive and was subsequently reduced to 10 per day then three per day.

The fishery was still considered to be in trouble so many people including the NZBGFC decided they would fish to a one-metre minimum size limit (MLS). MFish introduced a 65cm (MLS), which has subsequently increased to 75cm. Non-commercial catches were massively reduced by these impositions but it was an attempt to conserve the kingfish fishery.

While all this was going on we heard stories of commercial fishers taking two tonne of kingfish a night off certain reefs, even in the Bay of Islands.

When kingfish were being considered for introduction into the QMS option⁴ submitted that non-commercial fishers wanted what we catch now plus what we have conserved over many years to rebuild the stock. The Ministry response was that they considered commercial fishers also conserved kingfish so they would discount all the conservation efforts and just allocate on current catch levels.

So non-commercial fishers had accepted cuts to achieve a rebuild, the biomass had continued to decline despite these efforts and MFish allocated non-commercial fishers an allowance at the lowest possible level. By discounting all previous conservation efforts they have made it worthless for non-commercial fishers to conserve fish. This is not the outcome we want for fisheries management in New Zealand.

Without a planning right we can't manage ourselves, we cannot conserve fish for future generations and we cannot plan for the future. We do not want to be conserving fish and then have those fish allocated as quota to prop up unsustainable commercial quotas in our fisheries. We have lost the ability to influence or improve the state of our fisheries. We have to get this ability back, without it we are lost, more so for our future generations.

3. Priority Right

A priority right over commercial fishers for free access to a reasonable daily bag limit to be written into legislation.

As a principle it sounds offensive and is frightening to commercial fishers but what we want is what we were promised – the preference referred to in Moyle's Promise.

The current situation is the fishing industry has priority in every fishery we share. We are supposed to run our fisheries at a level where we can get the Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY). All our important inshore shared fisheries are being run at a

level below this point. There are less fish in the water than what the legislation demands. The MSY target means around 20% of the original fish stock should be left in the water to breed and grow. In 1986 the SNA8 (west coast North Island) fishery had fallen to an estimated 3% of its original size. This fishery had been massively overfished with the pair trawlers being a large part of that. People have been waiting since 1998⁴ for that fishery to rebuild. The SNA8 fishery is currently around 10% of its original size; half the fish in the water that the Fisheries Act 1996 determines is the minimum. The Act says fisheries will be managed at or above MSY.

The SNA8 situation benefits the commercial sector because there is only half as many fish as there should be. It is twice as hard as it should be for Maori customary or recreational fishers to catch a snapper in SNA8.

The Fisheries Act 1996 says the Minister has to “allow for” our interests, at the moment he is not allowing for our interests in the SNA8 fishery. The commercial sector has been given priority in SNA8 and also in regards to our kahawai.

For kahawai, the recreational sector has been given a huge allowance but we have no chance of catching it. The Ministry continue to pretend that this is a good thing to do. They haven’t allowed for us to catch it, the allowance is meaningless.

It is impossible for us to double or treble our effort, we can only fish when we do. We can only catch what we catch. They are imposing a proportional system on us as suggested by Wheeler, Pearse and *Soundings* without consultation, by deceit and stealing our fish from us.

This is why we need a priority right. More fish in the water will be beneficial for all of us.

Benefits of more fish in the water:

1. Easier for non-commercial fishers to catch a fish.
2. Reduces costs for commercial fishers.
3. Eventually the fish will be bigger.

MSY is only one fishing management strategy and probably the most dangerous. A safer option is Maximum Economic Yield (MEY). Instead of running fisheries down to 20% of its original size we set the minimum stock size at a higher level so there are more fish available to be caught.

The current situation is by the time we realise there is a problem with a fishery it is well below the 20% level. The science follows the decline of the fishery by about five years, which means no management action is taken until years after the 20%

⁴ The decision letter from Luxton in 1998 regarding the SNA8 includes the following –
“ As part of my decision to set a 10 year rebuild timeframe, I have decided to set the TAC for SNA8 at 2060 tonnes, set an allowance for non-commercial recreational interests of 360 tonnes, set an allowance for customary Maori interests of 50 tonnes, retain the existing TACC at 1500 tonnes and to allow 150 tonnes for other removals at 10% of the TACC. In determining these allowances and the ten year rebuild timeframe, I note the forward projections indicate that at current removals the rebuild to Bmsy will be achieved in 2007-08 with a 61% probability. There are therefore some risks that the rebuild will not be achieved and it will be necessary to monitor the SNA8 stock to determine that the projected stock increase is occurring”.

minimum has been surpassed. The only way of achieving a priority right in important shared fisheries is to run the biomass above Bmsy.

We need to be running fisheries at a higher level, safer stock sizes and rebuilding fisheries. To achieve this there will be a cost. This could be in the form of a TACC reduction, or until the non-commercial sector unite and refuse to take any reduction in bag limits until the fishery is above MSY. If this scenario was allowed to occur in SNA8 our catches would double and people would have more incentive to look after the rebuilt fishery. Only then can we truly conserve fish, but this action would need to be in conjunction with a Planning Right.

4. Area Right

The ability to exclude commercial methods that deplete recreationally important areas.

The size of the management areas that MFish apply to our fisheries is unworkable. The Kaipara mullet and flatfish situation is an example of how it doesn't work for local people. The Fisheries Management Area (FMA) for grey mullet (GMU1) and flounder (FLA1) runs from north of Taranaki right around the north and down close to East Cape. The boats used to target these species are quite small and very mobile. If the fish are running in the Kaipara the fleet have been known to descend on the area, fish it really hard until there is not enough fish left to make it worthwhile staying. After the fleet moves on the locals are left with a depleted fishery. Flounder can regenerate very quickly, but just as the fishery is rebuilding the mobile fleet return and repeat the process.

Some locals started taking offence and were very overt in their protest that in some cases resorted to violence. The Minister decided that a management group would be the answer. The group formulated a very sensible plan that took into account the large nature of the harbour. They wanted to set a TACC to constrain what was taken commercially out of the harbour. Ministry declined to agree to the plan as they could envisage compensation issues and the area was too big.

So what the Ministry have basically indicated is that area rights that are too big will not be considered. Finfish management on a smaller scale wouldn't work; it has to be a large area. Unless area rights are very large or species specific and commercial quotas (TACC's) are set according to agreed limits then they won't work. To have a taiapure or mataitai where everyone including Maori and recreational interests, are working together on agreed outcomes would be a wonderful outcome.

The best part would be the government's reaction to being confronted with a unanimous proposal and being asked to sign it off. They are likely to run a mile.

An area right for sedentary species such as shellfish, on a small scale may work better. But it would be different for finfish.

We need tools to be able to manage on a local level. We need to be able to acknowledge and shut down areas where shellfish are depleted and keep them shut until they rebuild.

These principles are what option4 stand for. These have all been overridden in regards to kahawai and the reason why we are going to court. The kahawai decision has not been made in any non-commercial interests and many small-scale commercial fishers' interests.

Ngapuhi need something like these principles to guide them if you want your mokopuna to enjoy kaimoana.

Evidence of Priority

In any fisheries management advice paper there is plenty of discussion of the effects of any management changes on the commercial sector. When it comes to non-commercial interests there is very little discussion. The reason for this is compensation issues. The Crown can be sued by industry if MFish don't consider all the adverse effects on the commercial rights holders. We do not have any right of recourse. We can take them to court and challenge any decision but we don't have an opportunity to sue them for money.

We need the Kahawai Legal Challenge so the courts can determine what our interests are in fisheries. Then the Minister may get some guidance on what he has to "allow for" when making management decisions.

It is unreasonable for the Minister to set an allowance for non-commercial interests without allowing us the ability to go and catch that allowance.

The less divided we are in a non-commercial sense the more likely we are to succeed.

To have more fish in the water is the ultimate goal. To achieve this we have to catch less fish. If compensation is required to pay the commercial sector to achieve that goal then so be it.

The term "recreational" is designed to keep Maori and pakeha fishers apart. The term implies pakeha are out there playing with our food. The TOKM comment regarding pakeha and charter operators providing entertainment is not true.

We are in the same waka, Maori and pakeha. Most of the time Maori are fishing recreationally, according to the definition of the law.

A lively question and answer session followed Paul's presentation.

Kahawai Legal Challenge

Stuart Ryan - *Hesketh Henry Lawyers*

Prior to the advent of the Resource Management Act (RMA) coming into force in 1991 the Tauranga local council had a rule in its District Plan that could prohibit commercial fishing in the Tauranga harbour. This was available under the old Town and Country Planning Act, the rule known as the Maritime Planning Scheme. With the advent of the RMA local councils lost their ability to control local fishing rights. Under current fisheries legislation there is an absence of locals being able to have a say unless it's through using the customary legislation provisions.

The Kahawai Legal Challenge is based on a judicial review of the Minister's decisions regarding kahawai. It will be seeking to look into:

1. Section 21 of the Fisheries Act 1996. A relatively simple argument.
2. The TAC and the process to determine how many fish are left in the sea. A more complex issue.
3. The allocation of kahawai based on catch history, affording a priority to commercial catch history.

The proceedings are currently in draft stage and hope to be finalised over the next month.

A decision still needs to be made regarding a review of the case before it is lodged in the High Court. We want to lodge the proceedings with the High Court as soon as possible. The Minister is obliged to make a fresh decision in advance of the new fishing year on 1 October 2005.

The parties to the proceedings are the Minister of Fisheries and the Chief Executive of MFish. Two fishing companies have also expressed an interest, Sanford Ltd and one other. It is likely there will be commercial fishers participating in the proceedings.

Neither recreational nor Maori customary non-commercial fishing interests are defined in the Fisheries Act 1996. One of the objectives of the court case will be to get a determination on what those interests are. The Minister has set a tonnage in an effort to "allow for" our interests. Non-commercial interests do not have any ability to control catching a tonnage.

The best outcome would be a determination that results in more fish in the sea.

Kai for tomorrow

Emma Gibbs - Ngapuhi

The Maori concept of fisheries is how do we look after this for tomorrow's kai. It's about making the pie (fish biomass) bigger. Fisheries management is based on figures that are guesswork. The hui needs to empower Maori not just consult and move on.

We need to consider replenishing the stocks, not just arguing about who has the last fish.

Labs need to be set up to grow spat that can be released into the wild to enhance wild stocks.

Water quality issues need to be addressed in conjunction with fisheries management.

Emma encouraged the hui to work together and asked us to submit in response to the Resource Management Act review.

The term "recreational" fishing is insulting, getting kai for the table is not fun (although it can be), it's feeding the mokos. MFish should change that word to another.

Waiata Session

Sidney Tau – Lecturer, Ngapuhi

Sidney has chosen a contemporary waiata to teach us. Waiata connects everyone together and the tupuna (ancestors) with the people. The Maori worldview includes the spiritual world and the physical world.

Sidney demonstrated two different instruments used for waiata and for calling people together or alerting people to war.

Waiata is used to pass sacred and ancient knowledge from one person to another, one generation to another. There are appropriate waiata for different occasions. Karakia can be incantations or waiata. Waiata sung after a speech should be related to what has just been discussed and it is important that the person starting the waiata knows it from start to finish. If you don't know your waiata, don't sing it - it is inappropriate for people to act like a fish, mouth moving but no words.

Sidney taught us the following waiata, a contemporary waiata that can be sung on any occasion.

Te Aroha

The love

Homai e te atua

Give to us o Lord

Te Aroha

The love

Te taonga o te tangata

The treasure of a man is

Te tumanako, whakaponono

The trust, the faith

Me te Aroha e

And the love

Te Aroha te Taonga nui rawa

Love is the greatest gift of all

The Role of Maori

Naida Glavish – a remarkable session taking us all deep into the realms, phenomena and realities of being Maori.

Maori individuals are part of a collective, part of a whanau. Whanau are communities, not just the family unit. Hapu is the extended whanau and iwi is the tribe. All of these are connected by the whakapapa, the genealogy. The tupuna is the ancestry connecting all of these elements together. Ngapuhi's great ancestor is Rahiri.

There are 80 registered tribes in the country. Every tribe measure their tribal boundaries by mountains.

Ngati Whatua has 17 hapu within their tribe and 34 marae within those hapu. Ngapuhi have 125 marae.

Maori view themselves as having a physical being, a spiritual being and a psychological being. Everyone stems from a creator, people choose to refer to that creator in different terms, and for Maori it is Io. The reason the Maori welcome includes Haere mai, haere mai, haere mai is acknowledgement of all three beings.

Kaitiaki is not just guardianship, for a pipi bed, it also encompasses the interest of the pipi bed.

Mauri is the essence, the life force of something, whether it is the sea, a rock or anything we come across.

Degradation – the new threat to our sea

Dr Floor Anthoni – Director, Seafriends

Greed, apathy and ignorance are threats to the health of our ocean.

Floor has been diving for 40 years and has noticed the degradation. In 1987 he started to take a particular interest in what was happening in the marine environment and do something about it. His question is why are we losing so much so fast?

The website www.seafriends.org.nz has much of Floor's information about degradation and marine protection.

Floor has major concerns about the siltation of our coastline, examples of degradation were shown of Parengarenga Harbour, Whangaroa, Poor Knights, Goat Island, Great Barrier Island, Cape Brett and Mayor Island.

Degradation is more of a threat to the sea than fishing. It is very important to leave fish in the sea to reproduce and also provide food for other species. Stopping fishing only addresses the top layer of the marine food chain and does nothing to mitigate the ill effects from degradation. Marine reserves are the wrong medicine.

Everyone can do his or her bit to improve the health of the sea, even if it is being aware of what we do on the land.

Kahawai is a sick stock and should be treated as such. MFish are regarding it as a healthy stock but it should not be commercialised. Only commercial by-catch should be allowed for but large-scale exploitation is not good for kahawai.

Hui Evaluation

All participants enjoyed the opportunity to offer what they had gained from the hui.

We need more of this – all over New Zealand. There has to be a way we can all paddle the same waka. The public servants have been tyrants. The officials need to be taken to task. Thank you for the humour and passion – I feel empowered. We need to retain both of our two voices. Let the relationship building begin. Regular meetings are needed

The kids have been fantastic. We need to get focused on how we market the messages – the layman struggles to understand. Need sound bites – one sentence. More fish in the water for more food on the table. Need Ngapuhi to offer lead to other iwi. Government will struggle with people from such diverse backgrounds working so closely together. This is bigger than fisheries. Makes me proud to be a kiwi. We understand our focus much better now – challenge is to bring two focuses together. Never thought I would see myself in the same room as option4 agreeing with the principles. I am here for a selfish reason – for my kids to enjoy what I have enjoyed. Good to see some pakeha aggressive in learning something from us. Objective of protecting the environment is important. We all know MFish are mismanaging the fisheries – they have their minds closed. There is no goodwill from the Crown – nothing without protest. It's all made up of political mumbo jumbo – very little common sense. The system rewards the plunderers. Need local control – mataitai sounds magic to me – experience and common sense that we desperately need. This has been about much more than fishing. More fish in the water – keen as. I am excited to rediscover the Maori world view. Don't like to see talk fests that fizzle out and give birth to a mouse. Keen to get involved and help design a local management plan. I have a sense of responsibility. I had not realised there was so much pain out there about our fisheries being felt by pakeha. Government keep moving the goal posts. I can take these tools home and we can start talking. A lot of the management troubles we bring upon ourselves – need more people attending ministry meetings – your mere presence makes a difference – sometimes changes their decisions. A real eye opener for me from deep south. Side by side in the same boat going in the same direction. Looks like lots more work – looking forward to getting stuck in. Need lots of two pronged attacks and flanking attacks.

Sunday 1st May

Another beaut breakfast and then the farewell. For many this was a highlight. The concluding speeches, the heartfelt appreciation and sense of accomplishment was oh so tangible. Speech and waiata, speech and waiata – none wanted it to end – we gave “Te Aroha” our all – pretty good we were too. Many a tear was shed.

Thank you Ngapuhi – this weekend was one we will never forget.

This hui was an overwhelming success and is a good starting point for non-commercial fishers to work out the process how to achieve our common goal -

"kia maha nga ika ki te moana"
More fish in the sea