

What do you see as the role of the board, in relation to party members, the parliamentary wing and the party caucus?

Bruce Haycock:

Steward of the constitution and implementer of its aims and objectives. To grow the membership and give them opportunity to participate as they wish. The board is to deliver an organization capable of election campaigning on behalf of the parliamentary wing, oversee the selection of electorate candidates and to manage the ordering of the party list. To both support and be a counterweight to caucus.

Ivor Watson:

Establish the medium term (next election) and long term goals for the Party and the strategy to obtain these goals and the key tasks for the year ahead.

Kevin Campbell:

Every board member must be prepared to lead by example, contribute and become part of the rebuilding process to establish ACT as the third party in NZ politics.

It is up to the board to identify and manage the difficult issues we face, to seek innovative ways of attracting new members and quality candidates to our world class policy platform, thereby rewarding member loyalty through greater parliamentary influence.

The board must be up-to-speed and informed on policy issues being developed and progressed in government by caucus. Caucus must be 100% clear that ACT members of parliament are elected to represent the members of the ACT party and progress party policy for the benefit of all NZ.

Lech Beltowshi:

To provide leadership and direction to the parliamentary wing so as to ensure actions and decisions of MP's and the party consistently reflect core ACT philosophy and principles.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Peter Tashkoff:

I see the Board essentially in a similar fashion to a BoD of a company. It should be more concerned with governance, not operations. For that to be possible, there needs to be an operational framework set up and setting one is most definitely in the purview of the board. The Board should then manage that operational framework and set its agenda.

I would like to see the BoT reviewing KPIs at every meeting and receiving exception reports when KPIs are planned to be missed.

At the moment I really see very little value in the discussions at the Board level. At the end of every meeting do I see that the meeting has moved the party forward in any substantial fashion? No disrespect to the effort being put in to have better *process*, but no I do not.

In terms of relationships to the parliamentary wing and caucus, the BoT is the owner of the party's policies and is the group that appoints the leader and deputy leader. The parliamentary leadership is required under the constitution to promote ACT policy, not to change it unilaterally.

At the moment things work pretty much backwards in that respect.

Nick Kearney:

In relation to members, it is to represent them. In relation to the MPs, I prefer a "hands off" approach. MPs should do politics and the Board should govern and administer the Party.

Rob Douglas:

Party Members: I see the board as facilitating the local board structure and therefore encouraging local events, growing strong campaigning teams, as well as regional communications.

Parliamentary Wing: Communication and team work with the parliamentary wing will be an essential element to the success of the party. I consider the parliamentary wing will primarily take instructions from the caucus.

Party Caucus: I consider the board role as supportive of the caucus, but also guiding the caucus in terms of the opinions of the party members and assisting on policy matters.

What do you think the ACT party is most lacking and what do you bring to the board to address this?

Bruce Haycock:

We have been most lacking a clear plan which addresses our core constraints and weaknesses. This has been attentively dealt with by the 2009 board so we can now implement a concurrently developed 2010 to 2014 strategy to reach our electoral opportunities. I have strategic thinking skills which have contributed well to the direction of board thinking. I also have a large depth of grassroots campaigning and local electorate organization experience to ensure board awareness of on-the-ground realities.

Ivor Watson:

Active membership support. Support the efforts Roger Douglas is promoting with his “No second class citizens” style articles to try and change public perception of the Party.

I am promoting a Policy Development and Promotion Board subcommittee to identify a few key policies that will help the Party win support at the next election and to word these policies in simple succinct easy to understand language such as “Take farming out of the Emissions Trading Scheme Act”.

Kevin Campbell:

ACT is polling poorly, we struggle to recruit and retain members because we lack a unified vision and hands-on go-forward at the top end. To rectify these issues it is mandatory that the board and leadership acknowledge the problems exist, then and only then can they be addressed satisfactorily, so ACT can move on to achieving its polling potential and success at the ballot box.

Lech Beltowshi:

A clear practical philosophy that is applicable to the ordinary voter. That’s why we don’t stand out, are often accused of hypocrisy and why we constantly remain at under 5%.

I have a high level of problem solving analytical skills as well as a principled and fair minded approach to life.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



With my eastern European and English background I am very aware of how important freedom is, how freedom works and how the rights of ordinary citizens have been gradually eroded by the state. I would want the ACT Party and its parliamentary wing to start working in a co-ordinated manner to redress this.

Peter Tashkoff:

The answer to this question is legion. But I'll have a poke at a few areas:

1. Lack of urgency and ownership at the BoT level
 - a. I'll be in the gun for saying this, but the BoT for the most part is a social club. (OK shoot me now)
 - b. The attitude at the Board level seems to me to be all care and no responsibility.
2. Lack of coherent vision
 - a. I have been agitating for over a year now for the ACT party to actually state what it stands for. This is seen as a threat by many people.
 - b. There are at least two separate visions held in the ACT party.
 - i. One is the vision that I joined for in 1995, and rejoined for in 2008. I don't think I need to detail what that vision is. (It's what we pretend to stand for).
 - ii. The other says that the best we can hope for is to be a peripheral party on the fringes propping up National and taking whatever wins we can at the margins.
 - c. These two visions are not actually compatible, and their continuing existence is in my view the single major cause of ACT's inability to gain traction. (I've been told by the way that agitating to define a single vision for ACT is divisive! The rationale for this is because if a Vision was so defined, the holders of the other Vision would be left out. Try as I might I can't seem to convince enough people of the fact that this is actually a positive outcome.)
 - d. In this respect the holding of the Epsom seat is actually in many ways a negative. It forces many ACT people into the second vision perspective.
3. Lack of self belief
 - a. Many people that hold that Lilliputian vision of ACT do so because they have themselves succumbed to the media propaganda about ACT. It's passed off as *realpolitik* but it is nothing more than a quiet kind of despair. It is actually quite gutless in my opinion as well.
4. Structural issues mitigating against growth

We claim to be the Party that stands for individuals and against central control and planning but we run our affairs in the opposite fashion.

 - a. No reason to be a member
 - i. We continually struggle with membership. You have to ask yourself, other than waving the flag – what reason is there to be a member?
 - b. No reason to grow membership

ACT Board Candidate Survey



- i. The BoT is always wringing its hands over membership – which flows onto electoral support and financial viability, but does nothing structurally to address it.
 - ii. Board members have no incentives to grow membership. I think we need to find ways to turn that around structurally. One approach is the list selection, but that is just one idea. There are other structural avenues that can be followed as well.
- c. No incentives for candidates
 - i. See above. The only incentives for candidates at the moment is to get on the right side of as many BoT members as possible, to ensure a high list vote. This means offending as few BoT members as possible, which is one of the reasons why real issues are so seldom debated at the BoT level.

Nick Kearney:

People and money. I don't intend to give all my money! But I will try to recruit new people and make them feel useful.

Rob Douglas:

There is no lack of good policy, but ACT are poor at presenting those policies to the public. I will work to grow our branch structure, growing ACT support from the grass roots, which will assist spreading our message. I will also work to ensure we have the right mix of candidates, who possess the right balance of charisma, articulation and intellect. Aged just 31, I also represent a new generation, and now a large portion of ACT's target market.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Do you support the party list being determined by a guiding membership vote and board final decision, or by board guiding vote and membership final decision?

Bruce Haycock:

I support the first option. Although technically less democratic there is more chance that a board interview process can provide useful and informed awareness of candidate attributes. I could live with the second option provided that the board process for producing the guidance was a quality one, something which is of course also necessary for the first option to go well. Similarly I would like to see a more communicative method for members to produce either guidance or final decision than the current method of a 150 word bio – hey, like this survey!

Ivor Watson:

Board guiding vote and membership final decision.

Kevin Campbell:

I support a guiding membership vote and board final decision for candidates ranked 1 to 20.

Members do not get enough time or information to interpret each candidate's level of policy knowledge, political judgment, character and depth of general capability, not sufficient enough to make an informed decision for party list ranking purposes.

I do not support a mystery candidate or vacant list placing as occurred with number 5 in 2008.

Lech Beltowshi:

Board guiding vote and membership final decision.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Given the bad decisions/selections made by the board in the past I believe the membership should decide- because even if they collectively get it wrong at least its a democratic process and absolves the board of any responsibility. We presently have the worst of both worlds- elitism AND bad decisions.

The responsibility of the board should be to ensure accurate up to date information on candidates is provided to all members and to formally remove any candidate who has lied or withheld important information.

Peter Tashkoff:

For the reasons given above I support a BoT recommendation and final decision by members. It is also in my view in keeping with the principles that we espouse as a party.

Nick Kearney:

Guiding membership vote, Board final.

Rob Douglas:

I believe the board needs to make the final decision. I do not believe a membership decision would be unable to adequately consider the overall balance of the party list. One of the strengths of the current caucus (decided by board vote) is its balance of skills.

If you could have dinner with one deceased person, who would it be and why?

Bruce Haycock:

Hmmm, would that be Ronald Reagan, Adam Smith or Carl Menger. Let's go for Menger, he figured out the role of the subjective in rational decision making thus inventing marginal utility theory. An economist who beat the behavioral and psychology types by a few hundred years

Ivor Watson:

Milton Friedman. To gain a better insight into his ideas and philosophies.

Kevin Campbell:

My mother – family comes first.

Lech Beltowshi:

The Polish and American War of independence freedom fighter and patriot General Tadeusz Kosciuszko.

Because he not only understood freedom, he understood that it is not just given to a people but needs to be fought for. And that is a lesson every generation has to learn or suffer the consequences

Peter Tashkoff:

Gaius Iulius Caesar

There have been scores of them by that name but I think you know which one I mean. I would like to ask him what he had intended doing next.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Nick Kearney:

Adolf Hitler. To learn more about why fascist dictatorships are to be opposed at all costs.

Rob Douglas:

Abraham Lincoln. During his presidency, cut short by his murder, he achieved so much good, for the USA. I believe those principles of freedom for all, have also benefited the world.

If you could repeal two laws tomorrow, what would they be and why?

Bruce Haycock:

The central planning power which resides in RMA – freedom is being genuinely restricted, economic activity genuinely repressed

The recent ETS – it's an exercise in futility and duplicity and very pernicious

Ivor Watson:

Emissions Trading Scheme Act because it has the potential to spread bureaucratic government controls throughout our economy with no net benefit to the environment.

Zoning of public schools because it is holding back the education of our poorest students and thereby limiting their potential to contribute to society.

Kevin Campbell:

The emissions trading scheme legislation - it is scientifically and fundamentally flawed, politically motivated and destructive in its impact on freedom and property rights.

Section 59 – its repeal would send a clear message to politicians - meddle with the family unit and democracy at your own peril, parliament enacts laws for the justice system to interpret, not for prime ministers to play politics.

Lech Beltowshi:

Only two – geez that's tough !!

The gun laws- because they move a society towards state controlled tyranny and also increase violent crime by disarming victims but not criminals.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



The smacking legislation- because it is simply social engineering, because it sends the dangerous and erroneous message that the state is the best and most caring parent and because it has disenfranchised millions of good parents without doing anything to restrict the handful of bad and brutal parents who physically abuse their children.

Peter Tashkoff:

Hard question.

Rather than repealing laws I'd like to pass a law that made every law passed have a sunset clause, which unless extended, meant the law automatically expired.

But if I had to choose laws to repeal I suppose the ones that I would choose (without too much thought) would be:

- The ETS, because of the economic ill effects and because Climate Change is a scam.
- For the second it would be a tossup between the Sue Bradford's changes to the Crimes ACT (Anti-smacking) or the recent changes to search and surveillance. The former because it is actually counter-productive and an unjustified interference with parental rights, and that latter because it is just a bad idea to give police those powers and then just hope they will play nice.

Nick Kearney:

Too many to decide. What I would do is introduce two laws: "Taxpayer Rights Act" and "Regulatory Responsibility Act" – both limit the state's powers.

Rob Douglas:

Not a law per se, but I would remove working for families and other social welfare schemes which trap individuals and families into government dependency. Frequently these schemes result in effective marginal tax rates in excess of 100% removing the incentive of self advancement.

The Minimum Wage Act, but ideally this would need to be coupled with the introduction of a guaranteed minimum family income scheme.

Do you support MMP, FPP, or another electoral system and why?

Bruce Haycock:

I think a proportional system is better. MMP may have a chance for delivering better parliamentary politics now Winnie is not there. I think leadership can help overcome the tendency of MMP avoid hard issues/ reform. Parliament is genuinely more reflective of community make up under MMP, something almost impossible under FFP

Ivor Watson:

I support MMP

Kevin Campbell:

I support the Swiss style of referenda electoral system, then STV.

Lech Beltowshi:

No system is perfect because the people using it are not perfect. MMP has the advantage of having been tried over the past decade and could be made to work, FFP failed us for over 50 years. I don't really care what system is used provided it is democratic, minimizes the possibility of manipulation by those in power and delivers accurate undistorted proportional representation

Peter Tashkoff:

I prefer MMP over FPP for the diversity of views it has brought to parliament. There would be no ACT party under FPP that's certain. Is MMP the best proportional system? I'm not sure. I don't like the way it has centralized power over the list to party elites. If there was a rule that said every party had to pick their list by Members final vote I think that would be a good enhancement to the process.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Nick Kearney:

I hear STV is good or even SM, but I don't know enough about them. I don't like MMP, but like FPP even less.

Rob Douglas:

I actually support FPP. While under FPP, based on the last election ACT would be limited to Epsom, FPP has proven more effective at producing needed reform, as undertaken by Roger Douglas and Ruth Richardson. Further, MMP by its very nature results in politicised policy compromise, rather than advancing policy based on its merit. A single transferable vote system also has merit.

Do you support New Zealand becoming a republic?

Bruce Haycock:

Eventually yes, it will be a natural generational thing. Wouldn't put energy into it now.

Ivor Watson:

Yes I support New Zealand becoming a republic provided some additional checks on Parliamentary power is put in place like an upper house.

Kevin Campbell:

No to a republic but I would like to see NZ develop its own constitution as a uniting document to resurrect our unique Kiwi culture and foundation values. The Treaty of Waitangi has come to mean division to the majority and an endless income stream for an opportunistic minority.

Lech Beltowshi:

In principle, YES, BUT the move is potentially dangerous-more dangerous than is realized- as it could give certain individuals currently in power an unacceptable advantage for the future.

I would want us to have a properly enforced constitution first and see that it is truly capable of preventing abuse and seizure of power (but also see my comments on repeal of the gun laws)

A right you cannot enforce is after all not a right.

Peter Tashkoff:

If it meant a written constitution that bound the legislature then yes I would, otherwise I am not fussed.

Nick Kearney:

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Yes.

Rob Douglas:

I have no strong opinion on becoming a republic. There are advantages in both options.

Would you have voted for or against the Wanganui gang patch ban legislation?

Bruce Haycock:

I would have voted against and then looked at deficiencies in existing law and order practice in Wanganui. However the argument about the rights of a community to determine its situation has some weight but with limits, because communities can become very prejudiced to the point over overriding human rights and freedom

Ivor Watson:

Against

Kevin Campbell:

Against the gang patch legislation because I see it as an example of yet another “ambulance at the bottom of the cliff” distraction when government should be addressing the foundation causes of gang related recruitment and criminal activity. As I understand it there are existing laws that could have been enforced.

Lech Beltowshi:

Against- because it goes against core Act philosophy. While the intent is laudable, the potential for abuse by police and other petty officials is too high

Peter Tashkoff:

Part of the reason I belong to ACT is because we (say we) are a party of principle. That’s a really useful bulwark to fall back on when the going gets tough. In this case the situation was clear – if people are being intimidated and if that is done to a criminal extent then the police need to do their job. But it is the behavior that is the issue, not the clothing. I would not have voted for this law.

Nick Kearney:

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Against.

Rob Douglas:

I probably would have supported the legislation, although the principle troubles me greatly. To me, the gangs collective actions over many years have reduced their entitlements, and banning the patches is for the greater good of Wanganui society.

What is your conception of 'equality'?

Bruce Haycock:

Definitely on the equality of opportunity, equality before the law, equality before God side etc rather than on equality of outcomes. Enough govt activism is associated with equality of opportunity let alone the lunacy that goes with trying to intervene for equality of outcomes for various socio groups. Equality of opportunity facilitates individuals, equality of opportunity only facilities sociological groupings

Ivor Watson:

Equal opportunity based on merit and not status in society or wealth.

Kevin Campbell:

Equality achieved through freedom and choice – not through privilege and regulation.

Lech Beltowshi:

I believe the only societal equality we should be striving for is equality of opportunity. All other so called moves towards equality end up as tyranny and exploitation of the productive citizen.

Peter Tashkoff:

Equal opportunity.

That does **not** mean positive discrimination, although I would be prepared to support the true principles of EEO which state that in a situation where two individuals are of exactly equal level then the position should fall to the one who is a minority. I'm not wedded to that but I ain't agin it too much.

Nick Kearney:

ACT Board Candidate Survey



There is no such thing. It is a fallacy.

Rob Douglas:

I believe in equality of opportunity, rather than equality of outcome. I firmly believe everyone should have the same opportunities of education, employment, and provision of health care, and welfare, etc. However not everyone will take equal advantage of their opportunities.

Do you think there are too few or too many people in jail?

Bruce Haycock:

Too many, because of the recidivism. I support truth in sentencing and 3 strikes. Parole needs to be turned on its head and not used for muster management but for post-release management where post release is still part of the sentence.

Ivor Watson:

Too many

Kevin Campbell:

Too few and the vast majority are not in jail for long enough.

Lech Beltowshi:

Given the high violent crime rate and the high rate of recidivist offending then probably too few- or at least they are not kept in jail for long enough.

But Victimless crimes should never attract a jail sentence.

We also need to remember that it's not society that sends criminals to jail, it's the actions and choices of criminals that sends them to jail.

Peter Tashkoff:

Too many and not enough.

We lock up too many people for minor crimes when we should be making sure they are actually involved in some form of real pay-back. I am a fan of restorative justice, not the airy-fairy, let's be nice to offenders end of end, but the hard nosed, alright you bastards – get out there and make real amends end of it.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



I'm about to get shot again, but I think we could gain a real benefit by bringing back the cane for criminals. I don't think there would be a taggers problem if the little shits were getting sore arses from it.

On the other hand, we don't lock the really bad bastards up long enough. I am a supporter of the original three strikes.

Nick Kearney:

Too many.

Rob Douglas:

While it is admirable to say there are too many people in jail, unfortunately sentences in NZ are far too lenient. If people commit crime, they need to be punished accordingly and that often means jail. That said, we need to break the cycle of crime. Tougher sentences will act as one deterrent, but this needs to be coupled with ACT's families at risk policy, returning families dignity and greater employment opportunities (through a stronger economy).

Do you support the death penalty?

Bruce Haycock:

No. There are certainly crimes which justify it as a matter of justice but in itself it is not a significant deterrent and the potential of miscarriage of justice is all too real

Ivor Watson:

No

Kevin Campbell:

No, death is final and evidential mistakes occur. I support truth in sentencing, preferably two strikes and the max for the most serious violent offences. I also support three strikes and the max if twenty five years cannot be legislated.

Lech Beltowshi:

In theory YES, because I also firmly believe in a right of self defence and that may certainly end in injury or a fatality. BUT, given the incompetent way police have investigated many high profile crimes and the way courts distort justice I believe the risk of a miscarriage of justice is too high.

But life should actually mean life and ofcourse if we had a robust right of self defence then the need for the state to use the death penalty would be largely removed...

Peter Tashkoff:

Because I don't trust the police; No. That's not the only reason; it's also because *genuine* mistakes can be made. I don't think that we are that hard up as a nation that we can't make the choice to – really – lock someone up for life.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Nick Kearney:

No.

Rob Douglas:

That is not a policy I would support, although can understand and appreciate the calls for the death penalty.

What do you believe ACT's policy on the alcohol drinking/purchase age should be?

Bruce Haycock:

Happy to stick with 18. Under 16 binge is a real issue of our culture, I don't have convenient solutions for this but shifting the age back out only keeps young adults as children in adult bodies for longer

Ivor Watson:

Age of purchase for alcohol should remain as it is.

Kevin Campbell:

Reluctantly, I would support lifting the drinking/purchasing age to 20 and 18 for teenagers on licensed or private premises under parental supervision.

I agree that it is ultimately the personal responsibility of individuals to act responsibly but it is clear that many teenagers have proven they lack the social maturity to be responsible with alcohol at 18.

Lech Beltowshi:

ACT philosophy is about self control not state control. So minimal restriction but adequate enforcement of laws against disorderly conduct, brawling, vandalism etc. And this would include full restitution for any damage etc not the token penalties the courts currently impose. So we would once again start to reward self control and punish properly those out of control. And regain our freedoms and choices

Peter Tashkoff:

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Tricky questions. Falling back on principle, if someone can vote at 18 and die for their country at 18 why not have access to alcohol as well. But the negative effects of lowering the drinking age cannot be denied either, though I think most of that is to do with the under-18s.

I think my final position would be to leave it as it is but implement stronger penalties for people (of any age) that disturb the peace through drunkenness, who are found drinking underage, or supply alcohol to under age persons.

Nick Kearney:

16.

Rob Douglas:

No change to the present rules.

What do you believe ACT's policy on alcohol sales restrictions should be?

Bruce Haycock:

About what it is now except not being able to buy spirits in supermarket is silly.

Ivor Watson:

No additional restrictions on alcohol sales but reinforcement of current laws.

Kevin Campbell:

Restricting alcohol sales seems pointless in reality because it can be purchased from many licensed and off licensed outlets until late. Limiting choice and convenience for the vast majority of law abiding responsible drinkers because of a very small number of wayward delinquents or the criminally inclined does not seem fair and just.

Lech Beltowshi:

Same principle (as above) - its not the alcohol that's the problem, it's the fact that people "off their face" do stupid, dangerous, antisocial things.

The present "solution" restricts and punishes the majority for the lack of self control of a minority.

Let's turn it around, start to target the problem by proper enforcement of existing laws against vandalism etc while leaving as much freedom and choice for the majority

Peter Tashkoff:

As above

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Nick Kearney:

16.

Rob Douglas:

No change to the present rules.

What do you believe ACT's policy on drugs should be?

Bruce Haycock:

Genuinely not sure. My instincts are for some liberalisation

Ivor Watson:

Legalise all drugs but impose harsh penalties on any drug taker who breaks laws protecting the safety of other citizens and their property rights. Eg driving under the influence of drugs. Drug takers should have the opportunity to participate in Government funded rehabilitation programmes provided they fulfill their obligations under such programmes.

Kevin Campbell:

My attitude to illegal drugs and our law enforcement against the importing and manufacture thereof is hard line and conservative, especially when it comes to class A drugs and methamphetamine. The current sentencing laws must be toughened up to act as a genuine deterrent.

Lech Beltowshi:

As above. Drug abuse is 95% a medical issue and 5% a legal issue. Anyway, show me a drug law that has worked- or even kept drug use stable!!! But they do seriously restrict our liberty and have given police and govt immense powers to stop us, search us, test us and to enter private property and to seize private property. Once again, while the intention may have been laudable, the cost is far too high- and keeps rising.

Peter Tashkoff:

I used cannabis when I was in my 20's. For a while I regarded it as a recreational drug. I came to the realization in my own mind that it is not. I am not urgent to change things from their current position but would need to do more research.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Nick Kearney:

Decriminalise Marijuana for personal use. Personally I would decriminalise virtually all drugs and remove the gangs income. Drug use is mostly a health issue, not a criminal issue.

Rob Douglas:

No change, but tougher sentences, especially for class A & B drugs.

What do you believe ACT's policy on internet censorship should be?

Bruce Haycock:

No. But the usual pressure on the child porn stuff because those guys are for real out there. While they get their stuff anyway I wouldn't like to culturally normalize it.

Ivor Watson:

No censorship

Kevin Campbell:

I am opposed to governmental filtering of the internet in any way as there are appropriate laws in place and parental responsibility should prevail with education at an early age. I do not yet see a problem that requires any political interference whatsoever.

Lech Beltowshi:

I am against this on principle. Once again govt and those with power believe they are better able to decide on the choices and opinions of "lesser" beings. This is totally at odds with ACT philosophy.

Govt also sees the free speech and dissemination of opinions and ideas that the internet allows as a threat and so on principle anything that they want to restrict is something we need to fight to keep

Peter Tashkoff:

I like the idea of being able to self-censor. Other than that criminal activity should be censored, nothing else.

Nick Kearney:

ACT Board Candidate Survey



None.

Rob Douglas:

No change. There should be no greater censorship of the internet, it is impractical given the global nature of the net.

What do you believe ACT's policy on the legalisation of prostitution should be (or should have been)?

Bruce Haycock:

I would have voted for legalization but would have wanted to vote against the typical govt activism that we seem to get lumped in with liberalization moves. Similarly would have voted for homosexual law reform in the 80's but not wanted all the sector activism by the state. Rather, I have a more 'live and let live' approach. Silly young girls in Papatoetoe are a reflection of family dysfunction which community service groups should be getting at, not lawmakers

Ivor Watson:

Legalise prostitution.

Kevin Campbell:

I support legalised prostitution in licensed premises within a strict council zoning criteria.

Lech Beltowshi:

Who made it illegal in the first place. And did it work??? This is probably better than driving it underground but the ability of local govt to clip the ticket again is something I view with concern.

Again we in ACT argue that people should have maximum choice and this is surely one of the oldest choices in history

Peter Tashkoff:

Another tough one. I am a supporter of women's rights and from that perspective this could be seen as a woman's right but there is the opportunity for vulnerable people to be abused. If it was to be made illegal then visiting a prostitute should also be made illegal.

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Nick Kearney:

Current law seems okay. I would not support tighter laws/restrictions.

Rob Douglas:

No change to the present legislation.

What do you believe ACT's policy on student loans should be?

Bruce Haycock:

These have to be on at least a semi-commercial basis as originally. The key to a better solution for any govt based programme is tax reform and economic growth, to put the wealth with people and reduce the need for intervention

Ivor Watson:

Loans to students on favourable commercial terms with repayment obligations.

Kevin Campbell:

I support interest bearing student loans for all economically productive tertiary qualifications, especially for those occupations on the skilled and long-term skilled shortages lists.

Lech Beltowshi:

Once we have an ACT style taxation system with a flat 15% tax rate then market forces should apply to student loans. Until that time, any tightening up of student loans would punish people striving to better themselves. I believe there is however a good case of making welfare payments a loan in the same way.....

Peter Tashkoff:

Interest at current bank rates.

Nick Kearney:

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Students should be permitted to borrow as much as they like, with interest. I would also remove the restriction on part-time income when a student is receiving an allowance. If a student can work many jobs then good on them.

Rob Douglas:

Provide some partial government guarantee of private bank loans to students. This guarantee should be limited to a similar loan amounts as the present system. Interest on loans is needed to deter wasteful student borrowing (or borrowing for personal investment gains), and remove the tax burden from the tax payer and ensure efficient use of resources. Students will benefit from lower taxes and a stronger economy once they reach the workforce!

Assuming ACT campaigns on 3 bottom lines at the next election, what do you think they should be?

Bruce Haycock:

Tax reform / Govt Expenditure Cap, School Choice, Property rights recognized in RMA, would be my favourites at this stage. But mostly these are a bit boring to capture public imagination for campaigning purposes.

Ivor Watson:

Take farming out of the Emissions Trading Scheme Act.

Abolish School zoning

Set company and top personal income tax rate to 28%.

Kevin Campbell:

Superannuation – A million reasons to vote ACT!

Health – ACT says death to the waiting list!

Education – ACT says give parents the power!

Lech Beltowshi:

1) Tax cuts- because high taxes lower productivity and cost everybody (except the govt which rather explains things!) The best way to reduce tax is to make sure Govt is reduced to 1999 levels and is forced to live within its new reduced income

2) Law and order - Law-abiding citizens need to regain their full right of self defence while at the same time we need to make police legally accountable for their behaviour as well as their failure to reduce crime. Also, parole and mental health systems need to be (finally) held properly accountable

ACT Board Candidate Survey



3) Fight global warming hysteria and its associated tax and freedom grab to save money, jobs and ultimately our society.

Peter Tashkoff:

For a start you won't have me agreeing that it's about elections, IMO it's about the hard yards you do in between elections.

I think that we need to incentivize our people to get out now and start selling ACT messages. The relevant message will vary according to the audience and to the current events at any one time.

When the election rolls around it is current events that will dictate our 1,2,3s, but they should all be based soundly on ACT policies and principles that have been consistently reinforced in the between period.

Nick Kearney:

Too early to say.

Rob Douglas:

I believe it is too early to determine this, however based on current issues:

Taxation

Superannuation

Welfare

That is not to say these issues are of greater importance, than other. But are better campaign material than other topics.

Any other comments?

Bruce Haycock:

We have major thinking to do in the area of voter segments to target and how to keep alive and communicate the benefit of our policies to all New Zealanders – aka Roger Douglas vision

Our core support is about 2% within the population. I think good marketing can position us in the minds of another 2% (the thinking centre-right voter), to provide a base line support of 4%. This makes 8% plus reachable in a campaign

AOC is important for ACT, I'd hate to think of our survival struggle after 2005 without AOC smarts and voluntary help

Ivor Watson:

-

Kevin Campbell:

ACT is a party with huge potential if a unified vision and growth strategy can be sold to NZ.

Lech Beltowshi:

ACT needs to become a principled and outward looking Party, a socially active grass roots movement. To do that it must show itself to be a Party that understands its core messages of freedom, choice and personal responsibility and that clearly follows its own philosophies in its statements and in its voting.

It needs to start to practice what it preaches

Just that would mark ACT out as a party that's different from all the others!

ACT Board Candidate Survey



Peter Tashkoff:

-

Nick Kearney:

-

Rob Douglas:

NZ is underachieving, and only ACT represent the policies needed to achieve our potential.

Why vote for Rob Douglas? To achieve at a national level, ACT need to survive at a local branch level. We need to develop and grow our local branch structure, encouraging participation and securing funding for our election campaigns. I will work with local branches to assist this process. Aged just 31, I also see my role as growing the next generation of supporters. We need to identify with the People. Attracting the right people to the party will be critical to our success.