



ATTACHMENTS MINUTES

Ordinary Council Meeting

Monday, 12 April 2021

Table of Contents

3.2	Mr Rob Paterson – Maori Ward	
	Attachment 1 Presentation - Mr Paterson - Maori Ward.....	4
3.3	Mr Richard Prince - Maori Ward	
	Attachment 1 Presentation - Mr Prince - Maori Ward.....	16

Tauranga City Council Forum Monday 12 April 2021

Presentation Rob Paterson Tauranga

Maori Ward Amending Legislation.

Local Electoral (Maori Wards and Maori Constituencies) Amendment Act 2021

Passed 23 February 2021 with Royal Assent given 1 March 2021

Well respected former Labour Party Prime Minister the late David Lange in a Bruce Jesson Memorial speech/lecture back on 18th November 2000, warned that if NZ governments attempted to accommodate the increasingly audacious demands by the Maori tribal elite for independent sovereignty, they would end up threatening democracy itself.

David Lange stated *"Democratic government can accommodate Maori political aspirations in many ways. It can allocate resources in ways which reflect the particular interests of Maori people. It can delegate authority and allow the exercise of degrees of Maori autonomy. What it cannot do is acknowledge the existence of a separate sovereignty. As soon as it does that, it isn't a democracy.*

We can have a democratic form of government or we can have indigenous sovereignty. They can't coexist and we can't have them both."

When Maori wards were introduced (should not have been as they were race based) into the Local Electoral Act by Helen Clark in 2001, as it involved changing the voting system to include the Maori roll, the same constitutional safeguards were applied that already existed in sections 27 to 34 of the Act to protect electors if rogue councils decided to change the voting system **without public consultation**.

Helen Clark's Labour Government introduced petition rights for Maori wards as a democratic safeguard to protect voters from councils manipulating constitutional arrangements without mandates from their community.

This provision was actively endorsed and promoted by Ms Mahuta at that time.

As a result, the Maori ward petition rights, enabled electors to challenge a council's decision through a district-wide referendum – if they gained the support of 5 percent of voters via a petition and the referendum result would then be binding on the council.

The point is that in a democracy, it is deemed to be unconstitutional for governing bodies to change the voting system without consulting the public. That's why Helen Clark introduced the petition right safeguard – to protect Kiwis democratic rights. That's what Minister Mahuta and Maori sovereignty activists recently trashed for their own race-based agendas which is wrong, racist, and separatist with Northland and Bay of Plenty areas the primary targets.

In Tauranga, over 6,200 signatures were obtained to the recent Maori Ward Petition nearly 6 weeks before the cut-off date, promptly validated and then publicly advertised so that a binding referendum became mandatory with polls closing 9th May 2021.

Incidentally in Tauranga all Council Committees already have paid for unelected iwi representation and all major policies are fully canvassed with local iwi who are invariably consulted on major matters.

There currently exists with at least one maori liaison officer a joint maori committee group consultants, iwi representatives on all TCC committees and so forth. Perhaps the Commissioners should find out exactly how many people are involved and what the annual cost is then provide these details to the public as a matter of transparency. An interesting observation is that a maori ward seat could probably be gained with less than 1000 votes whereas a normal Council seat would require around 8000 votes. The cost of installing a maori ward would be at least an extra \$120,000pa plus associated OPEX.

The exalted position and privileges presently enjoyed by and given to maori interests is not available to other Tauranga citizens. Question if a maori ward materialises is it intended maori will forgo the other race based rights they currently enjoy.

Recently the 3 Northland Electorates collected over 16,000 maori ward petition signatures which were in the course of validation and public notification so binding referendums would have followed like night follows day and Ruapehu and New Plymouth Councils would have followed suit in fairly quick time.

Ms.Mahuta was clearly assailed by the peeved mayors and councillors who had voted for Maori wards (without proper public consultation or mandates) and Ms.Mahuta saw the writing on the wall and the dominos falling with the usual result of 70-80% of electors saying no to Maori wards. Her quandary; what to do, well for openers, change the rules, shift the goalposts and make it an unlevel field. But hang on even better why not just remove playing field completely. Hence the abolition pronouncement was made post haste but this 'regal command' had no validity unless sanctioned by Parliament being unlawful until amending legislation was passed by Parliament so the current law was still legally in place until 23 February 2021.

Ms.Mahuta argued that since 2001 times have changed but that is inane nonsense , and there was no public mandate with 70-80% of people usually being opposed to Maori wards and this race based approach.

Ms. Mahuta referred to an unverified pro maori ward 11,000 person on line nationwide public petition whereas certified petitions with over 22,000 physical voter signatures including full names and addresses demanding referendums were presented with these figures being confined to the said 4 electorates only.

The Local Electoral Act law was already heavily weighted against citizens as it involved considerable time, inconvenience and cost to organise and file petitions. Clearly *the total obligation should have been placed on errant Councils* to initiate and organise a poll in conjunction with the 3 yearly Local Govt. election cycles which would have saved considerable ratepayer cost while forcing councils to toe the line in the name of openness, transparency, accountability and honesty. However Ms.Mahuta the separatists and activists brigade didn't want a bar of this democracy stuff-quite the reverse and their response was draconian amending legislation taken under urgency.. . Race based seats are not necessary to manage roading, sewage, rubbish disposal waters, transport roading and infrastructure undertaken by Councils which are for everyone irrespective of ethnicity.

All new Zealanders need to wake up unite and speak out about these anomalies.

Rob Paterson 12 April 2021

GENERAL & MISCELLANEOUS 12/4/2021

1. You have only recently been appointed Commissioners, and unlike Elected Councilors you will I presume have little local background knowledge on these issues. TCC Council in 2020, voted 6-4 with one abstention for a maori ward- 3 of those who voted in favour of the ward had resigned prior to Commissioners taking over and can now play no part in any Council equation at all. They simply don't exist as Councilors any more
2. You apparently need to revisit issue by 21May 2021 -why not simply defer in the meantime and leave everything in limbo until a new Council elected either 2022 or more likely 2025. Any Maori Ward Councilor can currently play no part in TCC Council affairs anyway until a new Council is elected. Under the current situation they would have been removed from office too. TCC maori committee met on Monday 29 March 2021 and as I understand it had no Councillor representation so little wonder they embraced a motion to ratify the original council decision. Options look to be to ratify, revoke, a public referendum or sit tight which in my view is best choice.
3. Full consultancy with Tauranga citizens preferably by way of referendum or at least by the submission process is essential before any decision reached.
4. Referring to probable outcomes of the 2021 Maori Ward petitions: -80% veto was likely
5. The only thing racist about the 2001 LEA legislation was the fact maori wards were ever instituted and a Bill was presented in 2006 by Tony Ryall to repeal the whole maori ward referendum provisions -the petition provisions were simply democracy at work.

Note and also see the attached;

Full article on Maori Wards
Mayor Southgate, Hamilton City Council
Louis Houlbrooke, Taxpayers Union
Tom O'Connor Waikato Times
Tony Ryall Bill 2006

(80% Public don't want Maori Wards nor support the race based concept at all.
(Public Submissions against the Bill were significant

ROB PATERSON

COPY

Māori Wards must be decided by ratepayers, not councils alone

Tom O'Connor Saturday April 10 2021. WAIKATO TIMES

OPINION. While Hamilton City Council and the Taranaki Regional Council appear to be approaching the thorny issue of Māori Wards for local bodies from completely different positions, they are in fact both taking exactly the right course.

The Taranaki Regional Council recently resolved to establish a Māori ward in time for the 2022 local body elections. Before making that decision, the regional council had the time to ask ratepayers what they thought of the idea. There was a disappointingly low response but, of 383 submissions received, 55 per cent approved the concept. The regional council could then justifiably claim a public mandate for the proposal.

When Hamilton City Council was faced with the same proposal last week, Mayor Paula Southgate said she also wanted a community discussion on Māori wards before asking her council to make the decision but did not have the time before the May 21 deadline.

She said the best way to consult with ratepayers would be when the council adopts its Pillars of Wellbeing strategy later this year. But that will be after the deadline for the 2022 local body elections. There will no doubt be adverse criticisms of both local bodies for those decisions but both have made the right decisions for the right reasons.

The Hamilton City Council does not have to wait for the adoption of their well-being strategy to consult ratepayers on a Māori ward and that decision is to be reconsidered. Making a decision on such a ward however should not be made without public consultation. While government has legislated to remove the previous right of five percent of ratepayers to demand a binding referendum on Māori wards, there remains an obligation for all local bodies to consult with their communities on such fundamental changes.

It is too easy to label those who disagree or agree with Māori wards as racist, but both sides to the debate have done that already. Many people on both sides of the question have strongly held opinions based on equality and the high principles of democracy and it is simply wrong to suggest they are all racist.

There appears also an assumption that non-Māori voters will not vote for Māori candidates so having dedicated Māori seats is the only way to have Māori on councils. The number of Māori in general seats in Parliament suggests there is more to the matter than simple racism. A lack of Māori candidates and a voter turn-out of little more than forty percent are more important considerations. There are many Māori members of district and regional councils and they have been elected by largely non-Māori ratepayers for no other reason than they were the right person for the role.

The Māori seats in Parliament have also been cited as a precedent but they were established in 1872 to ensure Māori could vote in general elections and stand for Parliament as only men with Crown issued title to land could vote in those times and they were almost exclusively Pakeha. New Zealand had a population of something less than 800,000 but only about 2500 could vote.

There have been no such impediments to Māori or other candidates in local body or general elections since 1893 and many Māori leaders now see the Parliamentary seats as a form, of separatism and a means of confining Māori political influence to an easily managed or ignored group.

There has already been a lot of discussion on the issue and unfortunately much of that debate has included a lot of woefully ill-informed rhetoric and acrimonious argument. That was evident when Hana-Rawhiti Maipi-Clarke, the grand-daughter of Taitimu Maipi who attacked a statue of Captain Hamilton with a hammer in 2018 calling him a murderer, told the Hamilton City Council that Māori, having been silenced for 168 years, wanted their voices to be heard. She then asked, "now where is my seat in this chamber?"

No one has been silenced by the Hamilton City Council or any local body and such statements are untrue and (un)helpful. There has never been any impediment, financial, legal or political for anyone standing for election to local bodies. And, as things are now, seats in the council chamber are totally dependent on the will of Hamilton city ratepayers when they vote every three years.

Council positions are a privilege, not a right, and therein lies the opportunity for anyone, Māori or non-Māori, to become a city councillor. There is ample time between now and the next round of local body elections to convince ratepayers they are the right person for the job. That will probably take a little more innovative persuasion than demanding a seat as a right or attacking statues of colonial figures and calling them murderers.

By Tom O'Connor

Ryall, Tony

Home » Parliamentary Business » Hansard (Debates) » Read Hansard Reports

COPY
Metada**Sitting date:** 22 Nov 2006

This page displays your selected transcript. You may view the recorded PTV video using the "Video" tab. Please note that the video tab displays all available video for the sitting day of the transcript. A filter will be available to find the specific debate / speech you wish to view.

Transcript

Video

Related Documents

Local Electoral (Repeal of Race-Based Representation) Amendment Bill — First Reading

[Volume:635;Page:6773]

Hon TONY RYALL (National—Bay of Plenty) : I move, *That the Local Electoral (Repeal of Race-Based Representation) Amendment Bill be now read a first time.* The bill that I have moved and am debating tonight is a bill designed to repeal those provisions of local government law that provide for separate Māori wards and constituencies in local authorities. At present the Local Electoral Act provides for an option of separate Māori wards and constituencies at district and regional council level, and the Bay of Plenty Regional Council (Maori Constituency Empowering) Act 2001 mandates such seats in that region. If this bill passes, it will repeal the provisions of the Local Government Act that allow there to be separatist race-based legislation, or race-based seats on councils—

Hon Dover Samuels: Have you got the support of the Māori Party to do that?

Hon TONY RYALL:—I would not think so—and also to remove the provisions of that Act in respect of the Bay of Plenty Regional Council. The outcome will be that there will be no racially based electoral representation in local government.

When the previous Government brought in legislation to provide for separate race-based wards in local government, the Labour Party hailed it as some sort of brave new world. Since that time not one local community has chosen to set up separate race-based seats—not one local council has chosen to have separate race-based seats. The provisions are unused, and they are already antiquated. They are not necessary, and they are divisive. Those communities that even considered having separate Māori representation soon found a complete lack of support in their communities for it, from all groups in the community, and they also found those seats divisive and completely unnecessary.

The National Party view, which we enunciated in our election policy at the last election, is that race-based representation is no longer needed in New Zealand, either at a parliamentary level or a local government level. We believe that it is divisive.

Hon Dover Samuels: That's not what you told the Māori Party.

Hon TONY RYALL: Well, I have, actually. Everyone knows what my view on this is.

https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/hansard-debates/rhr/document/48HansS_20061122_00001416/ryall-tony-local-electoral-repeal-of-race-based-re... 1/3

ryall, tony: Local Electoral (Repeal of Race-Based Representation) Amendment Bill — First Reading - New Zealand Parliament

Hon Dover Samuels: You said to them: "Let's get into bed together."

Hon TONY RYALL: I would ask that member whether he thinks he would have needed a separate Māori ward to get elected to the council he represented.

Hon Dover Samuels: No matter what I think—it's what you think.

Hon TONY RYALL: Well, it does matter what that Minister thinks, because he is the living embodiment of the fact that we do not need separate Māori seats to get Māori on to local authorities. That is a really important point, because that is one of the arguments that Mr Ririnui and the other liberals on the Labour side keep making about the need for separate race-based seats. They say that Māori cannot get elected to local government without dedicated seats. Well, I challenge members to tell Jacob Te Kurapa, who is on the Whakatāne District Council representing Murupara, that he would not be there without separate Māori seats—that he needs separate Māori seats. They should tell Bryan Riesterer, who is a Māori elected to a general seat on the Bay of Plenty Regional Council, that he cannot be there because there should in fact be dedicated Māori seats. They should tell Tai Eru, who was elected to the Bay of Plenty Regional Council in the general—

Hon Mita Ririnui: No, he wasn't.

Hon TONY RYALL: Yes, he was. He was elected to the regional council in the general Rotorua seat, and that member knows it. He was elected originally to the Rotorua electorate of the Bay of Plenty Regional Council. I must say that I omitted to say that this bill would be referred to the Local Government and Environment Committee, should it be passed. We think, from our side, that having separate Māori seats not only is divisive but also it limits the representation of Māori voters, for this reason. Surely the issues that concern Māori should be relevant to all the people who are elected on to local authorities, just as the concerns of other groups in the community should be relevant to them. But the accountability for Māori issues, if we have only Māori wards, is that members of councils think that only the Māori councillors need to be concerned about those issues.

Similarly, another reason we should not allow separate Māori wards is that it destroys the very important principle of equity of vote, which underpins our electoral system. Here in New Zealand we have an equity of vote—that is, the value of each vote in determining a member of Parliament is basically equal. That is why we have 55,000 in an electorate, plus or minus 10 percent, so that the vote of each of those constituents is basically equal. Each person has an equal say in getting someone elected.

But what happens when we have separate Māori wards? Let me tell members. In the Bay of Plenty Regional Council, which is the only part of New Zealand where there are separate wards—and they did not choose to have separate Māori seats in the Bay of Plenty; it was forced on them by the liberal Labour Government, which forced it on them at the last election—

Hon Mita Ririnui: No.

Hon TONY RYALL: Do not say it was not forced on them, because the Parliament passed the law to say the council had to do it, even though the council at the time had a majority not to do it. Let us see what happens to equity of vote. In the Tauranga ward of Environment Bay of Plenty—that is, a general seat—the person who only just got in, was the chairman of the Labour Party in the area. He got 11,600 votes. So that is what one needed to get elected in the Tauranga ward.

John Carter: 11,000?

Hon TONY RYALL: Eleven thousand six hundred votes; but to get elected as the Māori representative in the equivalent sort of Western Bay of Plenty area, one needed only 721 votes. Because that is what Raewyn Bennett got. So to get a representative for Tauranga, one needs 11,600 votes; to get a representative for

ryall, tony: Local Electoral (Repeal of Race-Based Representation) Amendment Bill — First Reading - New Zealand Parliament

Mauao Māori, one needs 720 votes. In Rotorua one needed 7,600 votes to get elected in the general ward. In the Okurei Māori ward, one needed only 1,700—that was for Tai Eru, a good man. He needed only 1,700 votes. So the very important principle of equity of vote is undermined by these separate Māori seats.

The fact that there is not one local authority in this country that has chosen to have separate race-based legislation, indicates that the House should support this legislation, because the provisions that I seek to repeal are unwanted, unnecessary, and divisive. If members look at the only example in the country where we do have these electorates, I ask them whether they think Māori are better served, from having these separate seats. I do not think so. Actually, what do Māori think? Do they think these are something that encourages them to vote more? If we look, for example, at the Western Bay of Plenty Māori seat, Mauao, 23 percent of the voters turned out.

John Carter: How many?

Hon TONY RYALL: Twenty-three percent, compared with, for example, 40 percent in the Rotorua general seats. So even Māori were less interested in going out and voting in those Māori seats, even though Mr Ririnui decided that they were going to be such an electoral advantage for him in the 2005 election. And look what happened! Mr Ririnui campaigned on these seats. He said to his Māori people: "I've given you separate representation on the regional council." That was the centrepiece of his re-election campaign, and what did the people of Waiariki do?

John Carter: They didn't turn out.

Hon TONY RYALL: They did not vote for him. They expressed their view on his bill, by not re-electing him to that ward.

So the National Party supports abolishing race-based seats. We think they are divisive. We do not think they are necessary. We think they are unwanted. We think that local government should be there to serve all New Zealanders, regardless of their racial background. We think it is completely unnecessary for there to be separate or dedicated wards to secure representation of Māori people on those local authorities. Because in the Bay of Plenty we have shown that competent, good people, regardless of their ethnic background, can be elected to local authorities. Just ask Jacob Te Kurapa, ask Bryan Riesterer, and ask Tai Eru about his first election.

From: Louis Houlbrooke <team@taxpayers.org.nz>
Sent: Friday, 19 March 2021 8:44 AM
To: Rob Paterson
Subject: Local councils shouldn't be appeasing Nanaia Mahuta

COPY



The Māori wards debate now lies with local councils

The Māori wards legislation may have passed in Parliament, but that doesn't mean councils have to abandon local democracy.

Yesterday [RNZ reported](#) that five Whangarei District Councillors are challenging their council's decision to introduce Māori wards.

This needs to happen at councils across the country. The nine councils that chose to establish Māori wards for 2022 did so with the reasonable expectation that the decision would be subject to a binding referendum. Now that the Government has disabled the petitions to initiate referenda, those decisions should be revisited.

Councillors don't need to go so far as abandoning Māori wards – they can simply vote to initiate a referendum themselves, and commit to honouring its result. This compromise is more likely to achieve support across the council table than scrapping the whole proposal.

The legislation to disable Māori ward petitions was a Wellington-driven push to safeguard left-leaning majorities on local councils. Councillors shouldn't abandon local democracy to appease Nanaia Mahuta.

Here are the councils that asked the Government to disenfranchise you

The following local councils lobbied the Government to disable referenda petitions on Māori wards:

COPY

- New Plymouth District Council
- Nelson City Council
- South Taranaki District Council
- Rotorua Lakes Council
- Ruapehu District Council
- Taupo District Council
- Whanganui District Council
- Northland Regional Council
- Opotiki District Council
- Waikato Regional Council
- Wellington City Council
- Wairoa District Council
- Gisborne District Council
- Bay of Plenty Regional Council
- Hawke's Bay Regional Council Maori Committee
- Kapiti Coast District Council

[You can find all these submissions here](#) Not a single local council submitted against the legislation.

Some of the statements made by council representatives are quite remarkable, with many suggesting the legislation doesn't go far enough.

Some councils claim to be concerned about the one-off cost of a referendum. The Taxpayers' Union is notoriously tough on council spending, but even we wouldn't justify restricting democracy on the basis of dollars and cents!

Read for yourself:

teamlegalz@gmail.com

From: teamlegalz@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, 12 February 2021 11:05 AM
To: letters@thesun.co.nz
Subject: FW: Truth about Maori wards

COPY

The Editor,

Sir/madam,

The Truth about Maori Wards

Helen Clark's **Labour Government** introduced petition rights for Maori wards as a democratic safeguard to protect voters from councils wanting to manipulate constitutional arrangements without a mandate from their community.

When LocalElectoralAct(2001) introduced Maori wards because it involved changing the voting system to include the Maori roll, the *same* constitutional safeguards were applied that already existed in Sections 27-34 of the Act to protect electors if councils decided to change the voting system between First Past the Post (FPP) and SingleTransferableVote (STV) without public consultation.

Maori ward petition rights, found in sections 19ZA to 19ZH of the LocalElectoralAct, mirror those in Sections 27-34, enabling electors to challenge council's decision through a district-wide referendum with 5 percent voters support in a petition. Currently result is binding on the council for next two elections.

HelenClark's 'direct democracy' veto *only* applies in situations where councils change voting systems without community consultation either by switching between FPP and STV voting, or introducing a Maori roll and Maori wards.

NZ democracy deems it unconstitutional for governing bodies to change voting systems without public consultation -that's why Clark introduced the petition right safeguard protecting KIWIS democratic rights and that's what Minister Mahuta, the separatists and maori sovereignty activists now want to take away from KIWIS. Their current race based retrospective actions are wrong racist and separatist claptrap that don't pass any 'sniff test'

Regards ROB PATERSON

9 Buxton Place
Tauranga 3112
Ph. 07 5753345

Maori Wards: Is it all over for democracy in New Zealand?

Dr Don Brash, Hobson's Pledge Trust.
Crushing Maori ward votes is dictatorship. *Press release: Feb 2, 2021*



"A Government that refuses to allow citizens to have a say over the imposition of racist voting structures in local government is one step closer to a dictatorship. Ms Mahuta demonstrates the Government's utter contempt for the views of ordinary New Zealanders in proposing to change the law so that ratepayers no longer have a right to have a say in the creation of race-based wards". Dr Brash said, "Most Kiwis want nothing to do with race-based political structures."

"The Treaty guaranteed all New Zealanders the same rights, and there was absolutely no suggestion that nearly two centuries later, councils would be creating new race-based political structures. The Minister claims to want the Maori voice to be heard. But the Maori voice must already be heard: all legislation relating to local government already requires that councils consult specifically with iwi, and the number of Maori councillors elected around the country has grown strongly in recent years, just as it has in Parliament." (Abridged)

Former Labour PM David Lange



In a speech in November 2000, former Prime Minister David Lange warned that if governments attempted to accommodate increasingly audacious demands by the Maori tribal elite for independent sovereignty, they would end up threatening democracy itself. He said:

"Democratic government can accommodate Maori political aspiration in many ways. It can allocate resources in ways which reflect the particular interests of Maori people. It can delegate authority and allow the exercise of degrees of Maori autonomy. What it cannot do is acknowledge the existence of a separate sovereignty. As soon as it does that, it isn't a democracy."

We can have a democratic form of government or we can have indigenous sovereignty. They can't co-exist and we can't have them both." (Abridged)

Former Labour PM Helen Clark



Helen Clark's Labour Government introduced petition rights for Maori wards as a democratic safeguard to protect voters from councils wanting to manipulate constitutional arrangements without a mandate from their community.

When the Local Electoral Act 2001 introduced Maori wards, because it involved changing the voting system to include the Maori roll, the same constitutional safeguards were applied that already existed in Sections 27-34 of the Act to protect electors/citizens/ratepayers if councils decided to change the voting system between First Past the Post (FPP) and Single Transferable Vote (STV) without public consultation. The Maori ward petition rights mirror those in Sections 27-34, which enable electors to challenge a council's decision through a district-wide referendum with 5 per cent voter support in a petition. These results are binding on the council for next two elections.

Democracy in New Zealand deems it unconstitutional for governing bodies to change voting systems without public consultation. That's why Clark introduced the petition right safeguard protecting Kiwis' democratic rights, and that's what Local Government Minister Nanaia Mahuta, separatists and Maori sovereignty activists now want to take away from Kiwis.

The Minister of Local Government.



In a letter to constituents dated January 29, 2021, the Minister wrote:

"I believe it is important to have Maori at the forefront of the decision-making process. I am conscious that the presence of iwi, hapu, and whanau voices at the governance level brings a different perspective and world view..."

"As the Government, it is our responsibility to ensure every New Zealander has equal democratic rights."

Maori wards

The Mahuta abolition legislation, which is retrospective, was proposed on February 21, 2021. It was presented under urgency in Parliament on February 9, 2021. Just two days were allowed for public submissions which closed on February 11. The Maori Select Committee (shouldn't that have been the Local Government Select Committee?) reported back to Parliament on February 15. The bill was then rushed through Parliament and became law on February 25, 2021.

Local Electoral Amendment Bill 2021 (Maori Wards & Maori Constituencies) NZ Legislation website.

- NZCPR poll, February 2021: 96 per cent polled against the current legislation.
- Tauranga media poll, October 2020: 86 per cent of those polled opposed separate Maori Wards.

Helpful references:

Minister Nanaia Mahuta - Letter to councils dated February 1, 2021- Kiwi Frontline website.

Dr Don Brash - Prepared speech notes, January 29, 2021 Tauranga Meeting - Kiwi Frontline website.

Dr Muriel Newman - Article Abuse of Power, February 7, 2021 - NZCPR website

Rob Paterson - Opinion piece, Northland Age, February 23, 2021.

Graham Adams: Nanaia Mahuta and the Maori Wards, February 15, 2021.

Creative Commons CC - BY-NC 4.0. Attributed to Democracy Project website.

Overview

Referendum Petitions 2021 - Tauranga & various Northland electorates.

Northland Councils (three) - All signatures lodged with Northland Electoral Officer for validation to

be followed by council notifications and public notices for referendums. Northland Regional Council 8602, Whangarei City Council 5124, Kaipara District Council 1364. Total petition signatures obtained: 15,090.

Tauranga City Council (one) - Total petition signatures collected, over 6000 obtained by early January 2021 (over a month early). Validated target numbers confirmed mid-January, 2021. TCC notified and referendum advertised on February 12, 2021, with referendum voting closing on May 8, 2021.



Private Kiwi citizens have worked hard over several months to get 5 per cent of electors to sign the petitions for referendums. They have done this at considerable cost, time and inconvenience to themselves. And now their work will be trashed by retrospective, draconian race-based legislation. Thank you to the public who have supported volunteer efforts by readily signing the petitions.

History of Maori Wards (since 2001): Across New Zealand so far, the average referendum vote against Maori wards has been 73 per cent and in some cases as high as 82 per cent. Clearly an overwhelming failure to endorse Maori wards.

Only three councils have Maori wards:

- Bay of Plenty Regional Council in 2001 installed three Maori Wards by virtue of unique legislation.
- Waikato Regional Council imposed Maori wards without any referendum in 2011.
- Wairoa District Council approved Maori wards at triennial elections in 2016.

In no case has a petition referendum held under the Local Electoral Act 2001 endorsed or approved Maori wards.

The National & ACT parties have vigorously opposed the proposed Mahuta legislation. Kiwis should be proud of that fact as essentially, the vast majority have voted down these proposed race-based wards. It is of course their democratic right to do so.

Kiwis can objectively make up their own minds whether or not what has occurred here is race-based, undemocratic and unconstitutional.

Quote: "When certain groups of people get accustomed to preferential treatment, equal treatment then seems like racial discrimination" (Thomas Sowell).

Presentation

Maori Wards

Good Morning Commissioners I am Richard Prince and I live in Welcome Bay

We are here today because of Minister Mahuta's trampling of democracy, by removing the right to petition for a poll and nullifying any that had achieved the 5% level to demand a referendum.

This was the case in Tauranga. All that work by concerned citizens at considerable cost, time and inconvenience - trashed by retrospective, draconian and race based legislation.

Why Ms. Mahuta has done this, is because she knows full well that letting the community have its' say would doom Maori wards. So - change the law and deny the community their democratic rights! I helped collect signatures and was surprised at the number of Maori who signed the petition. When asked why they signed, the two main reasons cited were:

Councils lack of consultation and

Council's lack of transparency.

Commissioners should take note.

In the past referenda has been around 70% to 80% against race based wards. Maori have the same right to stand for Council as anyone else, Buddy here, stood in the last election.

Maori do not need patronizing or undemocratic leg-ups. Notable successful Maori in local body politics are:

Ray Ahipene-Mercer, who in the Wellington electorate didn't get elected the first time he stood. He was elected and served 3 terms before retiring. And in his last election was the highest polling candidate.

In the Wairarapa we've had Mayor Ron Marks, and Georgina Beyer, who is not just Maori but trans-sexual, which didn't affect her Mayoral success, and our own – the late Colin Bidois, who was for 9 years a Manukau City Councillor.

Will this be an end to ethnic based legislation? I have no doubt that Ms. Mahuta has another 'dose of salts' lined up. In a letter to constituents dated 29 January 2021, she wrote "I believe it is important to have Maori at the forefront of decision making process" NB she didn't write "to be a part of" but "at the forefront".

To quote Thomas Sowell the noted black American economist and social commentator, "When certain groups of people get accustomed to preferential treatment, equal treatment then seems like racial discrimination."

The Tauranga City Council already has a number of consultative bodies with Maori. There are:

Te Rangapu Mana Whenua O Tauranga Moana Partnership

The Tangata Whenua and Council Committee

The Kaumatua Forum

Iwi and Hapu involvement in the Resource Management processes.

I expect Maori to have input into council decision-making and I expect the council to consider those views but what I do not accept is for Maori to have an unqualified right of veto. To elevate the Maori world view above all other's world views is unacceptable.

The Treaty cannot imply a superior form of citizenship. Any argument for different treatment under Article 2 or 3, based purely on an ethnic basis, is fundamentally repugnant.

We need to be a country where we celebrate our differences, where our diversity enriches us, where ethnicity matters but does not bestow privilege and where all citizens are united equally under the law.

If we continue down the path of separatism and don't unite as New Zealanders, we will fail as a country.

The community has overwhelmingly spoken. They do not want Councils divided by ethnicity and they expect councils to honour the democratic principle.

Commissioners here is your opportunity to show that you stand for democracy. Vote against Maori Wards.

Richard Prince.