

1999 election guide to party policies

'Public
Access'

No. 12 November 1999

ISSN 1172-3203

Labour, Greens, United provide voter choice

Election Day November 27 provides a chance to salvage something of New Zealand's proud heritage of egalitarian access to and enjoyment of public open spaces, as well as citizen influence over its management. Democracy requires popular knowledge of the policies and practices of present and aspiring Governments. Presented here are the alternatives, and your choices at the ballot box.

PANZ looked at six key policy areas, being public roads, Treaty of Waitangi and constitution, DoC and public lands, the Queen's Chain, high country, and recreation in general.

We ranked parties' policies according to their 'access friendliness'. This was a weighted appraisal which was influenced by—

- how closely the policies coincide with PANZ's objectives (the protection/enhancement of access through public ownership and management of recreational resources);
- their specificity or ambiguity;
- contradictory policies, or actions;
- the absence of policies in important areas;
- PANZ's research.

All the parties listed were asked to supply policies and to answer a questionnaire. Two new parties – South Island and NZ Equal Rights answered but their replies are not included. OneNZ had no developed policy so could not answer. Mauri Pacific was also asked but did not reply.

PANZ is not aligned to any political party. We are not backward in being critical, or supportive, of any party's policies and actions, as past Governments will attest!

How the parties rank

Labour leads the bunch, scoring 19 out of a possible of 30 in 'access friendliness'. The **Greens** closely follow at 18.5, then **United** at 16. **Christian Heritage** and the **Alliance** are mid-field at 12.5 and 12 respectively. **National**, **ACT** and **NZ First** barely rate in 'access friendliness' at 7.5, 6.5, and 6.

The ratings are not uniform within the leading parties. **United** eclipses other parties on **Treaty matters**, and the **Greens** displace Labour as the leading advocate for the **high country**.

New Zealanders have been poorly served by lack of choice on Treaty matters. National and Labour remain indistinguishable on approaches to **Treaty settlements** affecting public lands. However ACT and United now provide credible alternatives. However ACT's other 'free market' policies would likely spell disaster for public lands.

Form Guide

Labour

Has a comprehensive programme which addresses many issues. Labour's score has dropped significantly since 1996 due to inconsistent high country policies and from a major shift towards Māori interests at the expense of the wider electorate.

Greens

Provide a credible platform of advocacy for outdoor recreation that wasn't apparent when part of the Alliance. Have evolved from a single-focus 'ecology' party. 'Politically correct' on Treaty matters, but want public consultation on settlements involving public lands and waters.

United

A new entrant to the recreation stakes. Have a well-developed Treaty policy founded on Liberal principles of reason, knowledge and justice, rather than political correctness. Has an acceptable outdoor recreation policy. Other policies variable.

Christian Heritage

Has grappled with Treaty issues. Sympathetic to outdoor aspirations, but has not developed detailed policy.

Alliance

Has just about written itself off as a credible advocate for public recreation. Lowest ranking on Treaty issues with a major shift towards a confused Māori 'sovereignty' - 'partnership' view. Constitutional proposals dangerous to democracy.

National

Appears to have no real interest in the welfare of the outdoors or its users. Will be judged by performance in Government—broken promises and privatisation actions despite denials.

ACT

Treaty policy a high profile challenge to the National-Labour approach. But other unpublicised policies really bad news for the public outdoors.

NZ First

Can't be bothered stating what they would do in Government. Stands to be tried by the electorate.

See over for access ratings...

How we rank the parties

	Roads	Treaty	DoC	Queen's Chain	High Country	Recreation	Totals
Labour	4	1	4	3.5	2.5	4	19.0
Greens	3	2	3.5	3	4	3	18.5
United	2	4	3	2.5	1	3.5	16.0
Christian Heritage	2.5	2.5	2	2	1	2.5	12.5
Alliance	2.5	0.5	1.5	3	2.5	2	12.0
National	0.5	1	2	1	2	1	7.5
ACT	0.5	3	0.5	1	0.5	1	6.5
NZ First	1	1	1	1	1	1	6.0

All policies, detailed commentary about them, and late-breaking news is posted on the PANZ website – www.publicaccessnewzealand.org

On the following pages we have rated each party in each key policy area using our graphic 'access figure'. Most of the relevant policies are reproduced for you to decide their merits. The emphasis (*italics*) is ours.

Access ratings

1	Seriously flawed	
2	Poor	
3	Acceptable	
4	Very good	
5	Outstanding	

Key issues: what the parties say

Public roads

ACT

No response to questionnaire. No policies available, but media statements supportive of Government's road reforms.

"Only ACT is saying New Zealand needs more roads. Roads are not free; they must be paid for. ACT supports a system of motoring tolls, like they have in Melbourne...it is an issue not just for Aucklanders but the whole country."

Alliance

No response to questionnaire. Policy:

Under an Alliance government the road system will remain publicly owned and available for the use of all. The Alliance opposes moves towards the commercialisation of our roads and the formation of profit-driven road owning companies. The institutional structure for roading should not change, other than as necessary to implement the following policy measures:

Transport policy should be driven democratically through the national and regional Land Transport Strategies.

A regional fuel tax should pay for roughly half of expenditure on public transport and local road maintenance. Further local funding would be obtained through rates, parking charges, and *possibly tolls* on particular high use routes (segments of *state highways*), but only in limited circumstances...

Any review or consolidation of the law relating to roading should be designed for public, and not private, roading provision...

The PAYGO system, whereby roading projects are paid for with roading funds collected in that same year should be retained. Roading authorities will not be allowed to borrow money to pay for counter-productive road building schemes and burden future generations with more debt.

Christian Heritage

"With respect to land law, we believe that the rights of access and frontage must be preserved."

Greens

Response to questionnaire:

The Green Party believes strongly that roads are important public spaces, not 'corridors' or corporate assets. Roads are an integral part of both urban and rural communities, bringing local people together. Both formed and unformed roads provide important recreational access to New Zealand's myriad natural areas.

We strongly agree that public roads are for all means of public passage, not just for motor vehicles. Reclaiming roads as spaces for people, not cars, is a fundamental principle of Green transport policy.

Public control of roads must not only be retained, but that control must be exercised in the right direction. Roads must be managed with the objective of maintaining access for people, and building strong communities. There is little point in retaining public control if it is exercised at arms length by public companies, with making a profit as their key objective.

We do not support any actions which either restrict public access, jeopardise privacy or facilitate an environmentally damaging expansion of the roading network. Common law rights of passage *should* be maintained, electronic tolling should not be adopted as a *general* means of revenue gathering and tolls should not be used to build more motorways or urban links such as a second Auckland Harbour Bridge or tunnel. However there may be a role for some form of tolling as part of a congestion pricing system in major cities.

Unformed roads are an important and under-utilised means of access to natural areas, and should be maintained in public ownership. Obstruction of unformed roads is a significant problem. We would look at all the options available to ensure that practical access was maintained. We would also look to better integrate unformed roads into the DOC and local authority reserve systems, as public spaces and means of public access. The Green Party would promote public access as part of a wider strategy to encourage people to get out into the 'great outdoors.'

We are yet to explore all the issues concerning 'frontage.' Access is an important component of all property, but vehicle access may not be necessary. There are also, however, significant issues with landlocked Maori land. We would look for a solution which did not force property owners to have vehicle access if they did not want to, but would safeguard rights of public access.

Labour



Response to questionnaire:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes. They should be managed by bodies accountable to local communities.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. Yes.
7. Yes. Labour would consider arrangements to speed up the investment in alternative routes by allowing developers to build roads on a build, operate, toll and transfer basis. These arrangements would be on the basis that the roads would transfer back to public ownership on a contracted time scale. The condition of the roads at the time of the transfer would need to be specified. Prior to transfer, the original or alternative road in public ownership would need to be maintained to a satisfactory standard.
8. Yes.
9. Yes.
10. Yes. Labour will investigate ways of ensuring that, where land has been designated for future roading, rail or airport developments, a hold can be put on the land without unfair costs being imposed on landowners...[no response to UK Highways Act solution].
10. Yes. Undecided on Local Govt. Act and RMA changes.

National



Response to questionnaire:

1. National believes everyone who uses the roads, including motorists, cyclists and pedestrians, would continue to have the same access to roads that they do today.
2. Under National roads would not be privatised – roads currently under public ownership would continue under public ownership.
3. Under National communities would continue to have a say in road management.
4. The way we fund and pay for roads is often untargeted and unfair. For instance, in some areas 60 percent of people's rates go to maintaining roads regardless of how much they use them. The focus of the funding changes in the Better Transport Better Roads proposals is to make the way we pay for roads more efficient and fair - not to make people pay more. Technology would *probably* limit tolls and congestion pricing for some years to new motorways and bridges, or to heavily congested roads.
5. No loss of rights will be lost under National's roading proposals.
6. National recognises that the rules and regulations that govern motorways are different from other public roads.
7. Under National's roading proposals public road companies would be able to introduce tolls on *specific* roads and facilities and to introduce congestion prices to restrain traffic demand on heavily used routes.
8. Under National's roading proposals the present network of roads would be retained.
9. Under National's proposals unformed roads will be retained in Crown or local authority ownership.
10. National expects access to the roading network for all New Zealanders to be maintained.
11. National believes in maintaining access for all to public roads. Your comments have been noted.

NZ First



No response to questionnaire. No formal policies available.

United



No response to questionnaire. Policy:

Will support temporary charging measures to effectively price the cost of congestion to the general public, including the possible self-funding of arterial and *alternative* routes, for commercial road transport to reduce congestion.

Will permit toll roads where a reasonable alternative route and transport system is available.

Will evaluate fully the social, environmental and economic effects of all road pricing policies.

The Treaty and Constitution

ACT



No response to questionnaire. Policy:

ACT says legitimate Treaty of Waitangi claims must be resolved. To enable us to move forward as a nation we must put the grievances of the past behind us. To do that it is essential that a timetable for the fair, full, and final settlement of all legitimate claims is established.

A clearly defined process for the settlement of Treaty claims and the application of the principle of one law for all

New Zealanders will enable our country to meet future challenges with confidence.

Fair, full and final settlement of all legitimate treaty claims. ACT proposes a law to set statutory time limits for lodging and settling Treaty claims:

- 31 December 2000: final date for lodging claims with the Waitangi Tribunal.
- 2005: the Waitangi Tribunal to have completed hearing and reporting on all claims.
- 2006: we achieve one law for all New Zealanders.
- 2010: deadline for the fair, full and final settlement of all legitimate Treaty claims between Maori and the Crown.
- Waitangi Tribunal to be resourced to allow all claims to be heard and reported on by 2005.

Appoint to the Waitangi Tribunal people known for their ability to rigorously apply the rules of evidence.

Amend the Treaty of Waitangi Act so as to redirect the Tribunal and the judges to the clear statements of the first and third Treaty articles.

Waitangi Tribunal to be abolished once it has completed its work on claims.

Repeal all laws that discriminate for or against any New Zealander on the basis of race, colour, ethnicity, or national origin.

Abolish the Maori seats to end state-sponsored racial discrimination.

Alliance

No response to questionnaire. Policy:

This policy primarily addresses the wider issues of partnership and of racial harmony.

It takes as its starting point the recognition of the key importance of the Treaty of Waitangi which defines the partners as on one hand being those *who wish to be acknowledged* as Māori under the auspices of the Treaty of Waitangi and on the other, *all others* including the various ethnic groups, *who are subject to New Zealand law and represented by the Crown (Government) partner*.

The Treaty of Waitangi is considered by many sections of government, business organisations and communities as being *the* founding document of Aotearoa/New Zealand. The Alliance shares this recognition of the Treaty as the foundation on which we can develop the relationship between Māori and Pakeha, necessary to unite all New Zealanders by providing justice and fairness for all. We believe, therefore, that *the Treaty must become a part of New Zealand's constitutional law*.

The Treaty of Waitangi *affirmed* the tino rangatiratanga (sovereign) rights of Māori as stated in the 1835 Declaration of Independence.

- accorded to the Crown, *kāwanatanga* (governing) rights and the rights of British people to be Aotearoa/New Zealand, citizens.
- accorded to Māori the same rights as British citizens.

The Alliance believes that it is vital for harmonious race relations in the new century that the well-founded historic grievances of Māori are addressed fairly and expeditiously... it is in the interest of all New Zealanders to have Māori grievances settled expeditiously. In recognition of this the Alliance has allocated extra funding to the Waitangi Tribunal and will contribute to a Treaty Justice Fund until all legitimate claims are settled.

Guaranteed Māori representation in Parliament will continue to be based on the number of seats generated by Māori represented on the Māori electoral rolls.

The Alliance believes that the relationship we have with Mana Motuhake is a genuine model for the expression of tino rangatira envisaged by the Treaty...*the genuine partnership* which is the *only* real basis upon which we can build the nation *envisaged at Waitangi*.

A new constitution (two policies)

To establish a constitution for Aotearoa/New Zealand based on the Treaty of Waitangi, the Treaty must be ratified through a legislative programme which recognises Crown and Māori rights and identifies processes for protecting them. We propose a joint Crown/Māori team to plan and implement a constitutional development programme. The constitutional programme should be fully implemented within ten years. Independent monitors selected by government and Māori will ensure the programme remains on track and achieves the agreed goals. There may be opportunities for other countries to share in this innovative process ('Treaty of Waitangi' Policy).

The Alliance is committed to the Treaty of Waitangi as *one of the most important constitutional founding documents*. That place in our constitution needs to be recognised...we will convene a Royal Commission to study and make recommendations on extending the Bill of Rights...its supremacy in a conflict of laws, the need for a more comprehensive written statement of our constitution than that contained in the current Constitution Act...*we expect* the outcome...to be subject to a referendum ('The Constitution' Policy).

Christian Heritage

Policy:

We ... want to settle all Treaty claims quickly and fairly. That is, in a way which does not create further injustices.

Christian Heritage recognises the Treaty of Waitangi as a *foundation document* of our nation. The Treaty provides a basis for mutual trust and honour between the Crown and Maori people.

Christian Heritage would:

- *uphold the Treaty and its conditions* in a spirit of justice and reconciliation;
- call for a review of the brief and make-up of the Waitangi Tribunal;
- increase funding of the Tribunal to enable claims to be investigated within a reasonable period of time;
- support the complete settlement of claims quickly and finally, while ensuring that further injustices are not created;
- seek to substitute references in modern legislation to the '*Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi*' with a simple requirement to abide by the '*Articles of the Treaty of Waitangi*';
- make the historical background to the Treaty a compulsory part of school curricula up to Form 2.

MEASURES TO PROTECT OUR CONSTITUTION

Amendment of the Bill of Rights to remove injustice resulting from its current interpretation.

Legislation to return the right of the Governor General to refuse assent to Bills not in the public good and to retain the right of appeal on legal matters to the Privy Council.

Oppose current moves to make New Zealand a republic.

"We do not wish to replace our existing common law constitution with a written 'republican' version."

Greens

Response to questionnaire:

The Green Party recognises that tangata whenua do have a special relationship with their rohe, and believe that there is a Treaty partnership between Maori and the Crown, representing all the people of New Zealand.

The Greens fully support the resolution of genuine historical grievances. Fair settlement of Treaty claims will provide enough resources for the iwi or hapu to sustain their economic, social and cultural development. This may include the return of land and resources currently owned by the Crown, but would not include privately owned land.

Public conservation land should not be used as a *general* means of settling Treaty claims. However there may be cases where the return of discrete sites of particular significance to the relevant iwi could be justified. We agree that a public consultation process should be established before the government negotiates any settlements involving public lands or waters.

The Department of Conservation must administer public lands on behalf of the public with the protection of ecological values as it's primary concern, in line with the Conservation Act.

The Greens support the use of nohanga or topuni as Treaty settlement mechanisms. There may be some restriction of wider public access to some sites, but this is acceptable in the context of unimpeded access to the vast majority of conservation land and the potential for Treaty claims to affect much larger areas under a different approach.

Full settlements should provide sufficient compensation to avoid any ongoing call on Crown resources, unless this is part of the settlement.

The Greens support the concept of *shared perpetual guardianship of public resources* under the Treaty of Waitangi. Issues of ownership do not arise unless there is an attempt to privatise those resources. Shared guardianship provides *greater insurance against privatisation* than a situation of 'Crown ownership' which has seen many public resources sold.

Constitution

The Green Party does not have a policy on the appropriateness of a written constitution for New Zealand.

Labour

No response to questionnaire. Policy:

Labour is committed to the Treaty settlement process and is committed to reaching a fair and just settlement on a case by case basis. Labour specifically rejects the fiscal envelope concept which would establish a specified sum to be available for the settlement of Treaty claims. Labour will continue to seek comprehensive settlements, we acknowledge, however, the legitimate voice of hapū and Labour will ensure their voice is not lost within the process.

Labour established the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975 and later extended its jurisdiction to ensure it could address grievances back to 1840. Currently the Tribunal has many more claims than it can possibly process within any reasonable time period at its present level of resourcing. Labour is determined the Tribunal will be able to meet its own work programme and priorities.

For claims to be settled effectively, negotiators on both sides need to have clear mandates and ensure members are informed on the progress of negotiations.

Labour will:

- resource a Treaty of Waitangi education programme to improve the understanding of all New Zealanders;
- ensure that the Waitangi Tribunal is adequately resourced;
- ensure that the Waitangi Tribunal has the flexibility to determine its work programme and priorities;
- give proper and speedy consideration to the recommendations of the Waitangi Tribunal;
- review the Treaty of Waitangi Act to ensure its provisions continue to effectively *facilitate* settlements.

National

Response to questionnaire:

1. National believes that the Crown represents and has a duty to act in the best interests of all New Zealanders.
2. Maori means a person of the Maori race of New Zealand, and includes any descendent of such a person. National does not believe Maori ancestry creates superior legal and civil entitlements that might arise from non-Maori origins.
3. National does not believe the Treaty of Waitangi Act be amended so that the Crown's actions, and Maori entitlement for redress, must be assessed *against the context of the full history of the early 19th Century*, including the effects of tribal warfare prior to the effective establishment of Crown sovereignty.

Maori claims do not relate to the early 19th Century. The Waitangi Tribunal only investigates claims about grievances that had been caused by any action of the Crown back to 1840, when the Treaty of Waitangi was signed.

4. The National Party does believe there *is* a Treaty partnership between Maori and the Crown. This does not mean that the Maori population are entitled to the ownership, control, or management of 50% of public resources and political power.
5. National shares with many New Zealanders a firm commitment to the protection of New Zealand's conservation estate, and believes that this protection need not conflict with the settlement of Treaty claims affecting conservation land.

National follows key points set out by the Office of Treaty Settlements that ensure the conservation estate *is not readily available* for the settlement of Treaty claims and should only be considered in special circumstances. These key points are:

The conservation estate is held by the Crown on behalf of all New Zealanders. However, the Crown may have to consider competing interests in fulfilling its obligations to the public under Article 1 of the Treaty.

The existing legal protection provided to the natural and historic values of the conservation estate will not be diminished, except where there are beneficial conservation effects.

A change in the management of the estate will not be approved if it results in a loss of protection to the natural and historic values.

Existing public access and recreation rights will not be reduced (except to protect the natural and historic values).

The existing property rights of third parties (lessees, administering bodies etc) granted under conservation legislation will continue.

The potential interests of existing concessionaires in future uses, and the needs of sectoral interest (e.g., the tourism industry), will be considered.

6. The Department of Conservation is intended to administer public lands on behalf of all New Zealanders, Maori and non-Maori.

7. In negotiating with Maori to settle Treaty claims, *National believes it represents the Crown and the public of New Zealand*. National is aware that there is widespread interest in the development of settlements for claims that may involve returning conservation land.

National acknowledges the value of consulting with the public and special interest groups about settlements which concern the conservation estate. At present, the implementation of a Treaty settlement involving conservation land *may* require a public consultation process under statute or during the passing of special legislation. National will consider other consultation processes on a case-by-case basis.

8. Nohoanga (camping licenses) give some Maori (i.e. members of Ngai Tahu in their settlement with the Crown) the right to occupy *temporarily* a campsite near a river or lake, traditionally used by Ngai Tahu members for food gathering for up to 210 days a year between August and April. The Ngai Tahu settlement included provision of 72 nohoanga. Each site is approximately 1 hectare in size.

National believes nohoanga are justified as Treaty settlement mechanisms. They protect the wider public interest in the management and recreational use of such areas because:

- The reserves are set back from the marginal strip;
- The reserves do not impede public access to or along a waterway;
- The reserves only give permission for *temporary* occupation to Maori.

The wider public stand to gain from Treaty settlements that involve Maori co-management of the conservation estate. The public for the first time has access to and public use of 35,000 hectares of former pastoral leases which are entering the conservation estate and legal wander at will rights over the associated farmed flatlands as a result of the Ngai Tahu settlement provisions relating to the sale to Ngai Tahu of three high country sheep stations.

9. National does not believe it is desirable to repeal provisions in any Treaty settlements that allow for nohoanga.

10. National does not believe that this is desirable.

11. The Government does not often negotiate the transfer of ownership or control of public lands and waters to Maori without independent verification of claims by the Waitangi Tribunal. Sometimes the tribunal will recommend instead of the claim being heard by the Waitangi Tribunal, the claimants should settle the problem directly with the government. Members of the government will hold meetings and negotiate with the claimants to try and solve the problem.

12. National does not believe the Waitangi Tribunal should be disbanded and replaced by the High Court. National feels the Tribunal has an important role in the Treaty claims process. The Tribunal ensures that claims fulfil the requirements laid out in section 6 of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975, listens to all the facts, and then makes recommendations (which are usually non binding) to Government.

13. National believes the sea, seabed, foreshores and rivers should be retained in Crown ownership for *all* New Zealanders to enjoy.

14. National has no plans at this stage to legislate to overrule any Court determinations to the contrary.

15. [no response]

16. National believes all New Zealand citizens have equal rights and privileges.

17. The terms “tangata whenua” and “indigenous” do not imply greater entitlements for Maori than other citizens. “Indigenous” means originating in a country. Therefore you could say Maori are indigenous to New Zealand. “Tangata whenua” is a Maori with several meanings, including resident, native, inhabitant, and citizen.

18. National, like many other people in New Zealand, would like to see Treaty of Waitangi claims settled as quickly as possible. However, people cannot be forced to negotiate or accept Treaty settlement and National has no intention of doing this. Therefore, National does not believe in setting a time limit for the lodgment and processing of Treaty of Waitangi claims. Most Treaty claims are however known, and have already been lodged with the Waitangi Tribunal. National believes that imposing a deadline on Treaty claims would disadvantage Maori claimants because, unlike the Crown, they did not have the resources to research, prepare and mandate claims.

Several non-historical Treaty claims, such as the claim to broadcasting frequencies, have been overruled in Court.

19. National does not believe that reference to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi should be repealed from legislation.

20. A Written Constitution for New Zealand?

The National Party feels the issue of a written constitution for New Zealand goes wider than politics, and would require input from all New Zealanders. At this stage National does not consider it necessary to have a written constitution for New Zealand replacing existing constitutional conventions and laws. However, if the wider public demanded such a constitution, National would support public feeling on the issue.

National supports the freedom for people to hold their own views in a society tolerant of differences.

NZ First

No response to questionnaire. No policies. One media statement:

“Labour’s Maori policy is an attempt to appropriate the legally recognised rights of hapu and iwi under Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi...Maori do not need more grossly overpaid Wellington bureaucrats telling us what to do...New Zealand First will ensure that Maori will be given the tools under the Treaty to do the job themselves.”

United

Policy:

United New Zealand is committed to addressing Treaty of Waitangi issues in a positive and constructive way that benefits all New Zealanders. United accepts that Maori recognise they have major historical grievances which must be remedied before they can move into a development mode.

It is not in the best interests of Aotearoa, New Zealand to lock a significant section of the population into a grievance mentality so United supports the policy of attempting to remedy *provable historical grievances* for all New Zealanders.

Principles–

Recognition that the Treaty is a document for all New Zealanders.

Commitment to fair and reasonable settlement of legitimate treaty grievances.

Settlements are reached within a liberal democratic society and the norms and values of that society cannot be violated.

PANZ's questions to political parties

Public Roads

Does your party consider?

1. That public roads are for all means of public passage and not just for motor vehicles?
2. That public ownership of public roads should be retained?
3. That public control of public roads should be retained?
4. That funding of roads should not move towards direct user-pays, i.e. tolling?
5. That common law rights should be maintained over public roads?
6. That motorways are different legal entities from public roads and therefore do not have common law rights of passage?
7. That tolls should be confined to major new motorways, bridges or tunnels until construction costs are paid off, provided alternative public roads remain available?
8. That unformed roads (being half the road network) are a large part of the Queen's Chain, and are critically important for public access to rivers, lakes, the coast, and public lands in general?
9. That unformed roads be retained in Crown or local authority ownership subject to existing road 'stopping' procedures?
10. That unlawful obstruction of unformed roads is a major problem?

If so, would you enact a legislative equivalent to that in the UK Highways Act creating a duty for district councils to assert and protect public rights of passage?

11. That the right of 'frontage' of public and private lands to roads should be retained? If so, will you oppose moves to repeal s321 Local Government Act, under the Resource Management Amendment Bill 1999, and repeal an already enacted amendment to Clause 6, 10th Schedule LGA which removed a requirement to maintain "adequate access"?

(Explanation: 'frontage' is the primary reason for public roads. Loss of existing legal requirements to maintain frontage/access will remove the main protection from road 'stopping' or permanent closure).

The Treaty and Maori claims to public resources

Does your party consider?

1. That "the Crown" represents all of the people of New Zealand?
2. That being Maori depends on descent, or ethnicity? If "descent", does an individual's part-Maori ancestry create superior legal and civil entitlements than might arise from non-Maori origins?
3. That the Treaty of Waitangi Act should be amended so that the Crown's actions, and Maori entitlement for redress, must be assessed against the context of the full history of the early 19th Century (including the effects of tribal warfare prior to the effective establishment of Crown sovereignty)?
4. That there is, or isn't, a Treaty "partnership" between Maori and the Crown?

If "yes", does this mean that approximately 13% of the population are entitled to the ownership, control, or management of 50% or other share of public resources and political power?

5. That national parks, reserves, public conservation areas, etc. should not be readily available for settlement of Maori claims?
6. That the Department of Conservation is intended to administer public lands on behalf of all citizens, or is its role primarily to satisfy Maori aspirations ahead of wider public wishes?
7. That a formal public consultation process should be established before "the Crown" negotiates settlements involving public lands and waters?

8. That Maori "co-management", exclusive camping reserves ('nohoanga'), or 'Topuni' "overlay reserves" over national parks, etc., are justified as Treaty settlement mechanisms?

If so, to what extent do these protect the wider public interest in the management and recreational use of such areas?

9. That it is desirable to repeal provisions in the Ngai Tahu and other settlements allowing freeholding of nohoanga and surrounding public lands?
10. That it is desirable to remove any on-going rights of first refusal to surplus Crown lands after "full and final" settlements are made?
11. That the Government should not negotiate the transfer of ownership or control of public lands and waters to Maori without independent verification of claims by the Waitangi Tribunal or Courts?

12. That the Tribunal should be disbanded and replaced by the High Court acting as a commission of inquiry using normal rules of evidence and cross examination?

Explanation: The Tribunal is not well equipped to determine the truth, and not all of its findings and recommendations are valid.

13. That the sea, seabed, foreshores, and rivers are all part of "the commons" and must be retained in Crown ownership?
14. That, if the Government, you will legislate to overrule any Court determinations to the contrary?
15. That there are major differences in meaning and scope of the Treaty between its actual provisions and its "principles"?

16. That New Zealand citizens have equal rights and privileges?

17. Do the non-Treaty terms of “tangata whenua” and “indigenous” imply greater entitlements for Maori than other citizens?

What do you mean by these terms?

18. That there is little prospect of an end to Maori claims due to a growing number of non-historical ‘principles’ claims (e.g., radio frequencies, dog control, roading reform, dairy industry restructuring, kiwifruit marketing, etc.)?

19. That reference to “the principles” of the Treaty of Waitangi should be repealed from legislation?

A written constitution for New Zealand?

Does your party consider?

1. That there should be a written constitution for New Zealand replacing existing constitutional conventions and laws?

2. If so, should this include reference to the Treaty of Waitangi or “the principles” of the Treaty?

3. If the answer to #2 is “yes”, briefly what does the Treaty or its “principles” mean, and who will determine what they will mean for the purposes of a constitution?

4. That a constitution should have as its central canon equality of rights and duties for all citizens?

5. That discrimination on the grounds of race, descent, or ethnicity should be outlawed?

6. That there should be a citizen right to freedom of movement within New Zealand?

Department of Conservation and the Public Estate

Does your party consider?

1. That national parks, conservation areas, etc. are held in trust by Government for the benefit of all New Zealanders and should not be privatised?

2. That DoC should be retained as the primary administrator and manager of Crown owned public lands?

3. That “fostering” of recreation by DoC should have a greater priority?

4. That DoC’s name should be changed to Department of Conservation & Recreation (DCR) to better reflect its dual role?

5. That a Recreation Directorate should be established within DoC to provide national consistency in recreational policy and practice?

6. That sufficient Government funding be provided so that the DoC is not dependent on commercial operations and concessions to fund its conservation and recreation functions?

7. That the recent practice of issuing certificates of title for public lands be discontinued as a protection against future land sales?

8. That there should be no public entry charges to areas administered by DoC?

9. That access charges be prohibited for fresh and recreational sea fishing, recreational hunting, and walking access thereto?

The Queen’s Chain

Does your party consider?

1. That it should be a priority for the next Government to investigate the means of completing the Queen’s Chain around the shores of all major lakes, the seacoast, and along major rivers?

2. That public access and recreation should be restored as the primary functions of marginal strips and esplanade reserves?

3. That provision for private managers over marginal strips should be repealed?

4. That all marginal strips should be made moveable with changes to rivers, etc.?

5. That provisions for private leases over marginal strips should be repealed?

6. That Land Information New Zealand should be required to record the existence of marginal strips on all relevant survey plans?

Explanation: existing notations that land “is subject to section 24 Conservation Act” does not tell the public if a strip exists, or is merely liable to be created in the future – this is a major deterrent for public use of existing strips.

7. That restrictions to public access introduced in 1993 via the 10th Schedule of the Resource Management Act should be repealed?

South Island pastoral leases and tenure review

Does your party consider?

1. That payment-for-entry, or exclusive, private parks should not become established because of freeholding of mountain lands?

2. That, in exchange for freeholding of other lands, public reserves should be created over areas of significant value for public recreation, with secure access rights provided?

3. That covenants should be confined to relatively small, isolated, non-critical natural areas because they don’t provide adequate protection of conservation values or security for public access and recreation?

4. That the Crown should decline the renewal or granting of new commercial recreation ventures until tenure review on individual properties is agreed?

5. That Government funding of the tenure review process should be increased?

6. That market rentals for pastoral leases should be introduced?

Budget a cap of \$200 million per year to meet grievances.
Set a time limit of 2010 for the settlement of *historical* grievances.

Encourage the Treaty to become an instrument of reconciliation between the different ethnic groups of New Zealand through promoting a sense of ownership of the Treaty by all New Zealanders.

Allow all New Zealanders the right to invoke the Treaty in the resolution of legitimate grievances.

Response to questionnaire:

As a prelude to your questionnaire I should explain that as a liberal democratic party United is totally opposed to one group of citizens enjoying any entrenched privileges over other groups. Our Treaty Policy explicitly says that any settlement must conform to the norms of our democratic society. In our policy on outdoor recreation we have as a firm principle that access is guaranteed to all Crown lands and natural resources. We will also maintain and enhance the existing Queen's chain provision.

Reply to specific questions.

1. The Crown *now* represents all the people but it did not when most of the Treaty grievances arose. New Zealand did not obtain full sovereignty until the ratification of the Statute of Westminster in 1948.

2. The law has only recognised descent but in practice nobody makes an issue of descent unless they feel that ethnically they are Maori. The law has to rest on what is potentially provable, namely Maori ancestry.

3. As an historian (Graham Butterworth) I would agree that the 'history' relied on by the tribunal is anachronistic and partial but this is not an easy area to litigate in. History does not consist of fact but of interpretation, the most you can say is that some interpretations are better supported by evidence than others.

4. No, the original Treaty did not propose a partnership, that was a legal fiction that the Court of Appeal created in 1987. However the Court argued for a right of consultation not a division of resources. In any democracy any division would have to rest on numerical weight.

5. See our prelude, we do not think these should be readily available for Treaty settlements.

6. The Department of Conservation's responsibility is primarily to administer the Conservation estate in the public interest. This includes giving maximum public access consistent with maintenance of the estate.

7. United considers that the present arrangements are unsatisfactory. There needs to be some opportunity for the public to express its opinion about the settlements. Certainly the situation whereby legislation is presented to Parliament to validate agreements that may not be modified in the select committee or parliamentary process is fundamentally undemocratic.

8. I think we have to wait to see how these are administered to see if the general public interest is being safeguarded.

9. See answer to 8. If these provisions are abused then they should be repealed.

10. Such a provision can so easily be built into the settlement that it seems impossible to deny. Possibly a time limit could be insisted on.

11. I understand in most of the negotiated settlements some independent evidence of the historical justification of the claims is required. Neither the Waitangi Tribunal, which espouses a very particular view of the history of our nation, and

the Courts which are totally ignorant of New Zealand history are suitable. It might be possible to create an independent Historical Commission to review and validate historical testimony.

12. The Tribunal is already a very legalistic institution, I doubt if going to a full High Court procedure would do more than increase the costs and slow down still further the resolution of claims. United believes that most of these claims are rooted in genuine historical grievances and they should be settled fairly and generously.

13. In principle yes, but you must be aware that by creating ITQs, the Crown created property in the sea. The Crown has too often not appreciated the consequences of its actions.

14. If the Courts fail to work within the commonly accepted democratic framework of values then their decisions must be overruled and United would not be afraid to do so.

15. United agrees that the historic document is being lost sight of, while lawyers ingeniously extend the principles.

16. See introduction.

17. No greater entitlements. The normal definitions.

18. You are failing to understand the nature of the original 1975 legislation which was intended to give Maori the right to challenge a statute, policy or administrative practice to see if it conformed to the Treaty. The principles extension industry was not foreseen. However United believes that even some of this has been useful in setting limits to state power and setting standards that the state should observe towards its citizens. It seems to us there needs to be a review of the principles with an aim to codify them so that it is quite clear what is meant by 'principles' and prevent their endless extension. Insofar as they provide protection for all citizens in their dealings with government we would like to see other citizens being able to invoke them. Hence our view that the Treaty has to become an instrument of reconciliation not of division between New Zealand citizens.

19. See 18. We favour the creation of 'principles' being constrained.

A written constitution for New Zealand?

United has no policy about a written constitution for New Zealand and I think in the existing state of our political institutions it would be hard to create one. The positive rights you suggest could be created by legislation.

DOC and the public estate

ACT



No response to questionnaire. No 1999 policy, but no discernable change to previous privatisation policies.

Alliance



No response to questionnaire. Policy:

Funding will be increased for DOC to restore the department's ability to monitor ecosystems, protect endangered species and their habitats, control pests and contribute to heritage conservation.

Amendments to the Crown Minerals Act will be pursued to ensure that areas of particular ecological importance, such as national parks, conservation parks, wilderness and World heritage areas, reserves, ecological areas, water supply catchments and the coastal marine area will be closed to mining.

There will be a review of the Marine Reserves Act to ensure that it facilitates reserve creation. A programme to gazette at least 10% in each region of our coastline as marine reserves and marine recreational parks (by the year 2010) will be initiated.

The Alliance recognises the major contribution made by Maori in gifting land for national parks and reserves. We support the principles of *tino rangatiratanga*, *kaitiakitanga* and *kawanatanga*. Iwi and rohe poti will be assisted to *exercise their rights of partnership* under the Treaty of Waitangi and consulted at *all* stages of policy development.

Christian Heritage



Policy:

Christian Heritage recognises the need for the preservation of areas of outstanding natural beauty and scientific significance. We would therefore:

- ensure that citizens and visitors have *reasonable* access to public land and waterways;
- ensure that New Zealand national parks remain under New Zealand jurisdiction;
- encourage the tourist industry to accept its responsibility to help protect the environment;
- provide adequate funds to government agencies (eg the Department of Conservation) to ensure that resources are protected and used responsibly.

Greens



Response to questionnaire:

We strongly agree that national parks and conservation areas are held in trust by Government for the benefit of all New Zealanders and should not be privatised. DoC should be retained as the primary manager of Crown owned public lands. There needs to be a much greater focus on fostering recreational use of conservation lands and enjoyment of nature in general. The Greens see walking and other activities in natural areas as an essential part of environmental education, building an affinity with nature and developing physically and mentally healthier people. The visitor pressure of an increase in outdoor recreation should be more evenly spread across conservation lands, including a new network of high country parks and reserves.

The essential element in developing greater recreational opportunities is greater funding to enable central and local government agencies to provide appropriate facilities and information.

We believe that the public see recreation as an integral part of conservation, so we see no need to lengthen DOC's name. We would be prepared to consider structural changes to DoC that would help facilitate recreational use of conservation lands, within its conservation mandate. However we believe that recent restructuring of the Department has been detrimental to conservation and recreation interests, and are reluctant to force further change without compelling evidence of need.

It is important that legal ownership of conservation land is clear to avoid 'poaching' of trees by loggers working on adjoining properties, but we would take all appropriate steps to guard against privatisation.

There should be no public entry charges to areas administered by DoC. Any charging for the use of facilities such as huts should be kept to minimal levels. Access to private land should be promoted but continue to be at the discretion of the owner.

Conservation Policy:

Green thinking means thinking about connections. The measures presented here are inter-woven with the entire spectrum of Green policies. These include a waste-free new Zealand, commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi, promoting citizen participation in resource management, and our commitment to creating an organic nation free of GE foods.

Policy Principles–

Conservation policies and practices must foster people's awareness and enthusiasm for the plants and animals of New Zealand and their protection.

Conservation must extend beyond parks and reserves to become an integral part of the planning and management of the countryside, towns and cities, rivers and the sea.

The role of *tangata whenua as kaitiaki of natural areas* within their role must be recognised, respected and supported in conservation management.

Key policies–

Ensure that the Department of Conservation and other agencies have the resources needed to do their job. We will argue strongly for a progressive and substantial increase in conservation funding as part of budget discussions over the next three years.

Preserve and enhance indigenous forest. Our country has already lost most of its indigenous forest cover. We seek–

- (a) an immediate end to all existing and planned indigenous forestry operations by Timberlands West Coast (including the beech scheme); and
- (b) the inclusion of all Timberlands West Coast's indigenous forests in the conservation estate.

Together with local communities, promote the creation of new national parks and conservation parks, such as a Fiordland Marine Park and additions to Paparoa and Kahurangi National Parks.

Enriching our marine life...

Give priority to the development of an Oceans Strategy, incorporating:

- a review of the law controlling our waters;
- establishment of an oversight body to co-ordinate marine management;
- overhaul of the Marine Reserves Act and development of a marine reserves strategy.

As well as restoring underwater ecosystems, marine reserves have proven to be very useful fisheries management tools both here and overseas, breeding bigger fish in greater numbers. The marine reserves strategy will ensure the early protection of a fully representative area of our coastal waters. Developing proposals in consultation with local communities, fishers and *tangata whenua*, we will work toward the protection of 20% of the coastline as marine reserves.

Support customary marine and freshwater fishing regulations and the creation of *taiapure* and *mataitai* reserves managed by *tangata whenua*.

Developing conservation networks from the mountains to the shore...

Foster conservation in the countryside

Restore intended funding (double the present levels) of the Nature Heritage Fund, *Nga Whenua Rahui* (to provide better protection for ecosystems on Maori land) and the QEII Trust (to enable landowner protection of ecosystems).

Explore options for developing the 'farm park' concept in New Zealand, to maintain ecosystems and landscapes and facilitate public access and tourism.

Adequately resource the process of high country tenure review in order to protect all pastoral lease land with significant conservation values in a network of high country parks and reserves.

Establish programmes to ensure the protection of a fully representative network of indigenous wetlands, dunelands and grasslands.

Encourage landowners to set marginal and unstable lands aside for restoration of native vegetation. Similarly, foster the provision of habitat corridors with the planting of indigenous vegetation on *unused road strips*, esplanade reserves and other areas.

Restore and adequately resource DoC's role in advocating for conservation and providing education about conservation to the wider community.

Strengthen the role of the conservation boards as an independent voice for conservation, providing input to policy from tangata whenua and community.

Support the continuing development of conservation partnerships between DoC and tangata whenua, environment groups and local communities.

We will tighten control over mining on conservation land, including full consultation with tangata whenua, environmental groups, local communities and the public generally on any mining proposals.

Labour



Response to questionnaire:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. No.
5. Undecided.
6. Yes. Labour will increase DoC funding. However concessions will continue to play a role in ensuring that commercial activities are compatible with DOC's role of protecting the area.
7. Yes.
8. Qualified yes. Labour will ensure that free public access is maintained to Crown lands where it *does not impede the functions* of the administrative organisation.
9. Qualified yes. Labour will not impose a recreational sea fishing licence as a condition of exercising the right to go fishing. Labour will ensure that New Zealanders continue to have access to the recreational fishery, and will increase free public access to our waterways. We will also protect public sports fishing and game bird hunting, and if necessary, close any loophole that permits the sale of access rights for fishing and hunting.

Policy:

Under Labour, the Department of Conservation will provide leadership and support to New Zealand communities working to protect our unique environment. Conservation creates employment as well as other benefits. Labour will reverse the trends of increasing privatisation and diminished central government responsibility characteristic of previous governments.

Labour believes strongly in maintaining DOC as an integrated state department. It is essential for conservation that

policy and operational functions remain combined within one department. However, DOC must be properly funded and efficiently run. Staff must be well trained and supported. Labour will expect the highest standards of management and performance from DOC.

Labour will—

- maintain DOC as a key state department with adequate funding to perform its core functions of managing its land and heritage buildings for conservation purposes, advocating the conservation of natural and historic resources generally and promoting the benefits, to present and future generations, of the conservation of the natural and historic resources;
- ensure DOC is able to play a full role in the implementation of the Resource Management Act 1991 through advocacy and by working with local government, communities, conservation groups, landowners and business;
- enhance the effectiveness of Conservation Boards, in providing guidance and direction on conservation management, by restoring board membership to 12 members and by encouraging them to develop an increased public advocacy role;
- develop a performance based system to monitor DOC funding of private conservation initiatives.

The public conservation estate plays a leading role in this regard, but legal protection on private land is also important.

Labour will—

- make additions to the public conservation estate, and upgrade the protective status of existing areas as appropriate;
- establish a network of high country tussock land parks and reserves and promote ecologically sustainable land use under the Crown Pastoral Land Act;
- develop the role of DOC and Conservation Boards to work with the public, tangata whenua and local government to identify and protect regional ecosystems through the Protected Natural Areas Programme;
- encourage non governmental sector initiatives to protect native species, habitats and ecosystems;
- support private land owners seeking to protect conservation areas through the Nature Heritage Fund, Nga Whenua Rahui, Landcare, Queen Elizabeth II National Trust and other conservation trusts. Encourage local authorities to exempt from rating the areas protected through such organisations;
- ensure that the Conservation Act 1987 and Crown Minerals Act 1991 provide adequate protection from mining activities for areas of significant conservation value;
- amend the Crown Minerals Act 1991 to establish an appropriate process for consideration of prospecting, exploration and mining applications on conservation land not covered by the mineral activity ban, as occurs with other commercial activities such as tourism and recreational concessions.

MARINE MANAGEMENT

Labour will—

- develop an integrated approach to marine protection strategies. Review the Marine Reserves Act 1971 to widen the purposes of the Act to include biodiversity protection, education and recreation;
- increase opportunities for public involvement in marine management and ensure genuine consultation with interest groups;
- review other reserves legislation such as the National Parks Act to ensure the interface between the land and the sea is appropriately protected;

- involve Conservation Boards and community groups in the creation of marine reserves to cover 10% of coastline by 2010, ensuring representation of the different types of coastline found in New Zealand, with associated land reserves where possible. This will involve full consultation with New Zealand communities, recreational and commercial fishers and the tangata whenua.

Labour will also consider establishing an Oceans Commission to bring fisheries, environment, scientific, conservation, Treaty and other issues together in a more holistic approach to marine management.

CONSERVATION FUNDING

Funding Priorities

1. Threatened species conservation, habitat protection, weed and pest control and conservation advocacy by the Department of Conservation.
2. Implementing a national policy on biodiversity to maintain and enhance New Zealand's natural habitats and indigenous biodiversity.
3. Increased research on New Zealand's biodiversity, marine management and fisheries.

National



No policy. Response to questionnaire:

New Zealand is unique in its open approach to access of our mountains, beaches and rivers, and it is something we should be proud of and want to keep and pass on to future generations. Free public access is a core concept of the National Parks Act, and National is committed to that principle.

The Department of Conservation has been working on better information systems, as well as closely liaising with the visitor industry and the community.

The Department of Conservation has set out its five year business plan.

It sets out a clear direction for the department.

Spending on recreation (huts, campgrounds, tracks and other recreational facilities) under DOC has increased from \$29 million in 1990 to \$42 million in 1999.

NZ First



No response to questionnaire. No known policy.

United



No response to questionnaire. Policy:

Guarantee access to all Crown lands and natural resources important for recreation...

Ensure that public fisheries and wildlife reserves are not captured by exclusive access arrangements that deny the general public free and reasonable access.

The Queen's Chain

ACT



No response to questionnaire. No known policy.

Alliance



No response to questionnaire. Policy:

Public access to conservation lands, coast, rivers and lakes will be guaranteed by maintaining the Queen's chain where it exists and creating it where land is subdivided. The sale or leasing of

it to private interests will be prohibited except where existing uses cannot be relocated. Traditional public access will be maintained and where appropriate enhanced *over* Crown and SOE lands.

Christian Heritage



No response to questionnaire. Policy:

Ensure that citizens and visitors have *reasonable* access to public land and waterways.

Greens



Response to questionnaire:

We agree that it should be a priority for the next Government to investigate means of completing the Queen's Chain around the shores of all major lakes, the seacoast, and along major rivers. Public access and conservation should be the primary functions of marginal strips and esplanade reserves. The Green Party does not have detailed policy on marginal strips. We would expect any significant management issues with marginal strips to be resolved as part of a strategy to complete and safeguard the Queen's Chain.

Labour



Response to questionnaire:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Undecided.
4. Yes, within reason to enable land use near marginal strips.
5. Undecided.
6. Yes.
7. Labour will improve the esplanade provisions of the RMA to improve public access to our waterways and coastline. The 10th Schedule may be part of this review.

National



You asked for National's position on the protection of the Queen's chain. The amendments to the Conservation Act which have been in operation since 1996 have led to no erosion of the protection of the Queen's chain and *none was intended*.

The amendments provided for leases of marginal strips to be permitted but in early 1999 there were *only two such arrangements*. There have also been few easements, to enable landowners to have legal access to their properties. These arrangements have not generally interfered with the rights of the public to use the marginal strips.

NZ First



No response to questionnaire. No policies.

United



No response to questionnaire. Policy:

Existing Queen's Chain provisions will be maintained, and *where appropriate* enhanced so that all New Zealanders have access to waterways and coastline.

South Island high country

ACT



No response to questionnaire. No policy, but public statements strongly in favour of mass freeholding and opposition to public reserves.

Alliance



No response to questionnaire. Policy:

A comprehensive programme for high country lands in the South Island is needed which will include substantial transfer to DOC of those parts of the high country which have ecological and recreational value and which must be protected from grazing, including adequate reserves for tussock grassland, shrublands and wetlands. The additional funding for DOC will ensure it can take responsibility for these lands.

Christian Heritage



No response to questionnaire. No policy.

Greens



Response to questionnaire:

We agree that exclusive private parks should not become established because of freeholding of mountain lands. Where there is freeholding, public reserves should be created over areas of significant value for conservation or public recreation, with secure access rights provided.

We support the use of covenants as a means of fostering conservation and recreation on private land. However they are not the appropriate option for the protection of large areas, in the context of the South Island high country.

No long term agreements should be entered into that might compromise the protection of conservation and recreation values through tenure review.

Government funding of the tenure review process should be increased to allow the creation of a network of high country parks and reserves.

Rentals for pastoral leases should reflect any restriction on the use of the land that compromises financial returns. Otherwise rentals should be set at market rates.

Labour



Response to questionnaire:

1. No policy.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. No policy.
5. Yes.
6. Labour has no plans to change lease arrangements.

Policy:

Labour will:

Establish a network of high country tussock land parks and reserves and promote ecologically sustainable land use under the Crown Pastoral Land Act.

National



Response to questionnaire:

National's policy on Crown Pastoral Leases is to promote sustainable land management and to safeguard the conservation, historic, landscape, cultural, recreation and public access interests of the land.

Our policies aim to:

- facilitate the freeholding of Crown pastoral land capable of sustaining productive uses through voluntary, negotiated land tenure review;
- to ensure that the Crown's obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi are upheld, and;
- to provide greater accountability and transparency in the process.

NZ First



No response to questionnaire. No policy.

United



No response to questionnaire. No policy.

Outdoor recreation

ACT



No policies.

Alliance



Press Release:

Jim Anderton announced the Alliance sports and recreation policy which will see a network of sports academies set up, recreational fishing areas created and live free to air broadcasts of major sports events.

The Alliance wants a network of Sports Academies which would be planned in partnership with sports bodies and national sports funding organisations. They will be part of the Alliance regional development investment programme.

Jim Anderton said recreational fishing is too often ignored by the government when it comes to sports.

'Not many people realise that recreational fishing is one of the biggest participatory sports in the country. We need to develop marine areas where recreational fishers can take advantage of protected stocks of fish.'

The Alliance will establish recreational fishing reserves which will be restricted to non-commercial fishing.

Christian Heritage



Policy:

New Zealanders are blessed with a beautiful country, and bountiful natural resources which should be enjoyed and used responsibly.

We would—

- ensure that citizens and visitors have reasonable access to public land and waterways;
- provide adequate funds to government agencies (eg the Department of Conservation) to ensure that resources are protected and used responsibly.

Greens



Policy:

There needs to be a much greater focus on fostering recreational use of conservation lands and enjoyment of nature in general. The Greens see walking and other activities in natural areas as an essential part of environmental education, building an affinity with nature and developing physically and mentally healthier people. The visitor pressure of an increase in outdoor recreation should be more evenly spread across conservation lands, including a new network of high country parks and reserves.

The essential element in developing greater recreational opportunities is greater funding to enable central and local government agencies to provide appropriate facilities and information.

Labour



Policy:

New Zealand's unique natural heritage offers a wide range of exciting recreational opportunities from the mountains to the sea. Labour believes that our mountains, forests, wetlands, lakes, rivers and coastal waters must be accessible to New Zealanders of all ages and lifestyles. Time spent in the outdoors improves physical and mental health, awareness of the environment and pride in ourselves as a nation.

As the population becomes more urbanised, people will seek areas in which to enjoy a variety of outdoor recreation. The increase in outdoor education programmes in schools and training courses has also increased awareness of the recreational capacity of our forests and natural landscape.

Access to waterways and wilderness areas will give us a unique advantage as both New Zealanders and tourists seek new and different forms of recreation.

Co-existence between the natural environment and recreational activities is essential if we are to gain maximum benefit from outdoor recreation.

Labour will—

- protect the quality of outdoor recreational experiences for all New Zealanders, including those who are currently under represented among those who enjoy outdoor recreation, including people with disabilities or on low incomes;
- develop a strategy for the extension of the Queen's Chain to ensure New Zealanders have improved access to our waterways and coastline;
- undertake an urgent review of the condition of back country huts and tracks with a view to restoring them to a state that will ensure safe access to the back country;
- ensure that free public access is maintained to Crown lands where it does not impede the functions of the administrative organisation;
- increase free public access to our waterways and coastline by improving the effectiveness of the esplanade provisions of the Resource Management Act;
- ensure that New Zealand's natural recreational resources *are not captured for exclusive commercial use* but remain freely available for *reasonable* public enjoyment;
- protect public sports fishing and game bird hunting, and if necessary amend the provisions of the Conservation and Wildlife Acts relating to the sale of fishing and hunting rights to close any loophole that permits the sale of access rights for these activities;
- increase promotion of outdoor recreation;
- ensure that DOC's visitor policy is consistent with DOC's paramount focus on conservation "to foster the use of natural and historic resources for recreation, and to allow their use for tourism";
- encourage the completion of Te Araroa, "the long pathway" from North Cape to Bluff, in the South Island.

National



No policy.

NZ First



No policy.

United



Outdoor Recreation and Leisure Policy

United New Zealand recognises the unique role outdoor recreation and leisure activities play in the New Zealand way of life. Despite this outdoor recreation has been the poor cousin of conservation for the past decade.

The time is ripe for new policy that is built on a base of national pride and New Zealand's unique identity as a great place for enjoyment of and recreation in the outdoors.

New Zealand is unashamedly a green conscious nation with strong environmental credentials. However, we cannot rest on our laurels, and if we are to maintain our reputation then we need to be the leader of the pack, rather than a follower.

Outdoor recreation dovetails with other aspects of United New Zealand's policy. It promotes strong conservation values, reinforces our environment policy, is consistent with our education policy and is healthy. It will also ultimately engender confidence, self-esteem and pride in the New Zealand heritage. United will—

- Establish a separate department or arm of government with specific responsibility for protection and promotion of outdoor recreation. Currently there is no organisation currently dedicated to this task, so initiatives are not being developed that expand the range of opportunities available to New Zealanders.
- Guarantee access to all Crown lands and natural resources important for recreation, for example, legislation to protect access to State Owned Enterprise land would be introduced.

Existing Queen's Chain provisions will be maintained, and where appropriate enhanced so that all New Zealanders have access to waterways and coastline.

Extend the role of the Hillary Commission to more widely promote outdoor recreation activities, particularly for young people.

Ensure that public fisheries and wildlife reserves are not captured by exclusive access arrangements that deny the general public free and reasonable access.

Develop a healthy lifestyle theme campaign with outdoor recreation as a key plank of that policy.

Encourage, promote and provide stimulus funding for development of green belts in towns and cities.

Develop partnerships with local government to develop and maintain outdoors recreational areas, for example creation of bush tracks, seating, and sports areas.

Encourage outdoor recreation, conservation and heritage issues to be an integral part of school curriculums.

Give sanctuary status to specified areas for specific outdoor recreation purposes, for example observation of bird and plant life.

Public Access

Published by Public Access New Zealand Incorporated.
R D 1, Omakau 9182, Central Otago.
Phone & Fax (03) 447 3554. Approx. 2 issues per annum.
Single copy \$3.00 (incl. GST), plus \$1.00 postage.
Overseas rates on application. Free to PANZ Supporters.
Editor: Bruce Mason. Email: panz@es.co.nz

This issue is free of copyright. You are welcome to reproduce.