



SUPPLEMENT

TO THE

NEW ZEALAND GAZETTE

OF

THURSDAY, 11 DECEMBER 1986

Published by Authority

WELLINGTON: MONDAY, 15 DECEMBER 1986

**OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED ELECTORAL
BOUNDARIES:
1986**

Objections to Proposed Boundaries and Classifications of the General Electoral Districts of New Zealand

The Representation Commission appointed in pursuance of section 15 of the Electoral Act 1956 hereby publishes, in accordance with the provisions of Section 18 of the said Act, a summary of the objections to the proposed boundaries of the general electoral districts of New Zealand lodged with the Commission. The objections are available for public inspection at the offices of the Chief Electoral Officer, Levin House, 330 High Street, Lower Hutt, between the hours of 9 am to 1 pm and 2 pm to 4 pm each day, excluding Saturdays and Sundays, from today until the 24th day of December 1986 and thereafter from the 5th until the 14th day of January 1987.

A copy of any objection will be made available upon request and on payment of a copying fee set by the Chief Electoral Officer.

The Commission further gives notice that written counter objections to those objections or any of them will be received by the undersigned, the Chairman of the Commission, at the office of the Department of Justice, Private Bag, Wellington not later than Wednesday, 14th day of January 1987 for consideration by the aforesaid Commission.

The Commission will hear counter objections in Wellington, Christchurch and Auckland commencing late January 1987. If any counter objectors wish to appear before the Commission in support of their counter objections they must say so, indicating the venue they wish to be heard at, in their written counter objections.

A copy of this notice including the summary of objections may be seen at the offices of each Registrar of Electors throughout New Zealand and at each District Court.

Dated at Wellington this 15th day of December, 1986.

N. C. JAINE, Chairman of the Representation Commission.

SCHEDULE

HOBSON

Objection No. 206 I.C. Fife of Hokianga

Objects to the boundary which excludes South Hokianga from the Bay of Islands Electorate on the grounds of community of interest, geographic and communications. Recommends that the South Hokianga ridings of the Waihou, Horeke, Taheke, Rawene, Omapere, and the Western Bay of Island County Ridings of Tautora, Moerewa Rural and Matarau be included in the Bay of Islands electorate.

The change to balance the Hobson electorate be made by excluding Moerewa, Kawakawa and Towai from the Bay of Islands electorate.

Objection No. 228 Hokianga County Council

That the South Hokianga has been cut off from their community of interest, Kaikohe. The division of Hokianga into North and South is a strong attack on the prevailing unity of the county.

Objection based on geographical, cultural and social, commerce and government grounds.

Objection No. 466 Hokianga Electoral Boundary Change Committee

24 signatories

Similar to objection No. 206.

WHANGAREI

Objection No. 494 NZ Labour Party

The integrity of the Whangarei city limits is being broken for the first time. The Raumanga/Maunu area should be excluded from the Whangarei electorate in preference to the proposed exclusion of the Raumanga/Otaika area.

KAIPARA

Objection No. 216 Rodney County Council

Draw attention to some small discrepancies in the Albany/Kaipara/West Auckland electorates.

Since local authority electoral rolls are now derived from Parliamentary rolls, it is in the interest of local authorities to ensure that county and riding boundaries are the same as Parliamentary electorate boundaries.

Objection No. 232 9 signatories of Tangiteroria.

Suggest the Omana Riding of the Hobson County be included in the Hobson Electorate and make the boundary between the Kaipara/Hobson electorates to the southern boundary of the Hobson county on grounds of community of interest and the regional business centre based in Dargaville. Residents of the

Ruakaka area could make compensatory adjustments northwards.

Objection No. 249 Hobson County Council

Objects to the dismemberment of three Hobson county ridings south of the Northern Wairoa river.

The Commission should return the Hobson County Ridings of Arapohue, Omana and Okahu to the Hobson electorate.

EAST COAST BAYS

Objection No. 119 East Coast Bays City Council

Requests that the commission alter the boundary along East Coast Road so that it exactly follows the city boundary and include Windsor Park, Rangitoto College and the Councils pensioner flats, which have an affinity with the electorate.

GLENFIELD

Objection No. 130 J W Tisdall City Manager, Takapuna

Suggests that the boundary should be amended to conform with the Takapuna City boundary where it joins Northcote and Birkenhead Boroughs. An amendment would conform with the territorial local authority boundaries.

Objection No. 462 T. Purdy of Hillcrest

Wants to stay in electorate for more than one election.

WEST AUCKLAND

Objection No. 246 N. Clark of Parau

Objects to the new boundary along Big Muddy Creek as Parau is part of the Laingholm community.

Request that the Laingholm community not be split and permit Parau and Huia to remain part of Titirangi.

TITIRANGI

Objection No. 17 M. Frost and I. Way of Titirangi

Objects to the proposed name change of the former Waitakere electorate on the grounds that Waitakere is a neutral and natural description of the proposed new electorate which contains many urban areas, of which Titirangi is only one and not the largest.

Objection No. 522 NZ Labour Party

Objects to the electorate name as the original name of Waitakere is more appropriate because of its historical association with the area.

NEW LYNN

Objection No. 502 Jonathan Hunt, MP for New Lynn

Requests Kelston Boys High School is included in the electorate so that it is in the same electorate as Kelston Girls High School as both schools have always been in one electorate.

Objection No. 503 Jonathan Hunt, MP for New Lynn

The Western side of Gilletta Road be excluded from the New Lynn electorate.

AUCKLAND CENTRAL

Objection No. 124 R.W. Prebble, MP

Objects to the classification of this electorate for the determination of allowances under the Higher Salaries Commission Act 1977.

Electorate has been classified as Group A which is an electorate within which travel is the least onerous in its terms of time and distance.

Requests be classified as Group D because of the communications and travel problems

Objection No. 465 Auckland Regional Authority

Authority encourages commission to pursue options which will recognise regional interests. Does not favour the use of central Government electorates for regional government electoral purposes.

ROSKILL

Objection No. 236 Fred Gerbic, MP for Onehunga

Seeks the reinstatement in the Onehunga electoral district of that area of Hillsborough bounded by the Hillsborough cemetery to the west and to the north and Goodall Street to the Manukau Harbour. This area includes the west side of Goodall Street, Frederick Street (Goodall to the cliff) Bluff Terrace, Foote Street, Hoskins Avenue, Bagley Street and Filgate Street on the grounds of community interest with Onehunga, its shopping centre and other facilities.

The Hillsborough Cemetery forms a natural boundary between Roskill and Onehunga electorates.

Objection No. 513 Phil Goff, MP for Roskill

Objects to the placing outside Roskill of Fletcher Street, the west

side of Wainwright Avenue, part of O'Donnell Avenue and the west side of Gilletta Road.

OTARA

Objection No. 123 Town Clerk Borough of Howick

Objects to the name of Otara and requests consideration to altering the name to East Tamaki as a large part of the electorate is already known by.

Objection No. 507 C. Taylor of Manukau City and 5 others

The area of town bounded by Preston Road, Dawson Road, Matthews Road and Boundary Road has been cut out of Otara with which it has a community of interest. People of Howick have a closer affinity to Franklin electorate.

Objection No. 509 7 residents of Howick

Request boundary be redrawn by turning up Point View Drive after going north along Chapel Road continue straight along East Tamaki Road to the Botany Road roundabout which would leave Shelly Park and Point View Drive in Franklin.

MANGERE

Objection No. 500 Registrar of Electors, Mangere

The boundaries should have been increased, not decreased so the roll will compare more favourably with other electorates.

MANUREWA

Objection No. 499 Residents of Hillside Road Area

Wish to remain in Papatoetoe as they have an identity, existing boundaries, community of interest facilities of communication and topographical features.

FRANKLIN

Objection No. 171 Franklin County Council

Objects to the naming of the electorate and requests that it be renamed Hunua as the electorate only includes a small portion of Franklin County area, and is similar to the previous Hunua Electorate.

Objection No. 203 R.N. Smyth of Manukau

Objects to the naming of the electorate. Requests the name be changed to Manukau where 90% of the population lies.

Objection No. 223 18 signatories

The residents of Mangatangi—Miranda—Kaiua and Whakatiwai residents objects to the proposed boundary. The area of the Franklin County Council has a natural boundary with the Hunua Ranges severing our contact with the Clevedon area other than by the Coast Road. This physical natural boundary precludes any common community of interest with the proposed Franklin electorate.

Request placing their area into the Maramarua electorate with the boundary at the north-eastern part of the Franklin County boundary from the north of Thames to Mangatawhiri the Mercer riding of the Franklin County Council. An equal adjustment in population numbers could be made by including the Ramarama area south of Papakura in the proposed Franklin electorate.

Suggest Clevedon be the preferred name of the proposed electorate.

Objection No. 224 13 signatories of Drury

Object to the proposed boundary between Franklin, Maramarua and Papakura electorates in the Drury/Ramarama area. The proposed boundary divides community between three electorates with the largest portion lying in the Franklin electorate.

Propose that these three portions of the Drury and Ramarama area be united and brought as a whole into the Franklin electorate.

Suggest the boundary follow this current boundary between Franklin and Papakura electorates from the Great South Road at Ravenhorpe, along Ambush Road and Coulsons Road, across country westward to the Oira Stream and then follow that stream northward to its junction with the Drury Creek. It would then run eastward along that creek back to the Great South Road and join up with the proposed boundary again.

Objection No. 225 Hon W.F. Birch, MP for Franklin

The use of the name Franklin is a misnomer for the new seat east of Papakura. Suggests the most significant and most central name would be Clevedon as less than 20% of the population would be regarded as living in the Franklin District.

Objection No. 237 Colin Moyle, MP for Otara

Objects to the proposed boundary which lies along Dawson Road effectively cutting two primary and one secondary school off from their catchment areas.

Suggests either the boundary continue along Preston Road to the

Otara Creek or use Preston Road in its entirety to Ormiston Road and then down Ormiston Road to intersect with the proposed boundary. If a population exchange was required Whitford district could be included in the Otara seat thus including Whitford with Howick where it has a close affinity.

The electorate name of Franklin is now inappropriate and the name Hunua is more appropriate.

Objection No. 491 C.W. Bull of Clevedon

Similar to objection No. 225.

Objection No. 492 Manukau City Council

Similar to objection No. 225.

Suggest the names of Clevedon, Ardmore, Hunua, Takanai or Manukau East.

Objection No. 493 R.H. Arvidson of Pukekohe

Similar to objection No. 225.

Objection No. 1761 K.W. Hamilton and 6 others

Similar to objection No. 225.

Objection No. 1762 C. Cashmere of Ruakawakawa

Similar to objection No. 225.

Objection No. 1763 F. and J. Sanders of Clevedon

Similar to objection No. 225.

Objection No. 1764 Clevedon Progressive Association

Similar to objection No. 225.

Objection No. 1766 Federated Farmers Auckland Province

Similar to objection No. 225.

Objection No. 1782 A. Searle of Drury

Similar to objection No. 224.

Objection No. 1783 G. Hall of Drury

Similar to objection No. 224.

MARAMARUA

(Objections to be read in conjunction with Coromandel)

Objection No. 148 Matahura-Waiterimu Hall Association — Ohinewai

Objects to the area being split into the Maramarua and Waikato electorates by way of the Mangapiko, Waiterimu and Tahuna Roads and breaking a community of interest.

Objection No. 149 P.R. Moxon and 30 others—Ohinewai

Similar to Objection No. 148 and suggest an alternative electoral boundary which would retain the community of interest. From the Ratawera trig down the top of the Matahuru range to the Matahuru stream at the Matahuru hall, following the stream to T Murray's boundary then up Mr Murray's boundary to the ridge, down to Lake Waikare, across Lake Waikare to Balemi road, up Balemi road across the railway and Great South road to the Waikato river.

Objection No. 175 Waiterimu School Committee—Ohinewai

Similar to objection No. 148.

COROMANDEL

(Objections to be read in conjunction with Maramarua)

Objection No. 22—65, 77—177, 131—138, 151—165, 185—195, 283—459, 544—1750, 1801—1985 M. Mackay & 1687 petitioners of Thames

Object to proposed Coromandel Electoral Boundary District using a coupon inserted in the newspaper by Alasdair Thompson.

Wording of coupon

Objects to Thames being excluded from the proposed Coromandel electorate. Thames is the main service centre and also the seat of local Government and the community of interest is not with Pukekohe or the proposed Maramarua electorate. Thames, ahead of any other population centre in the proposed Coromandel electorate, ought to be included in it.

That in excluding Thames from the proposed Coromandel electorate, the Representation Commission has seriously disregarded existing electoral boundaries. The existence and future of Thames is interwoven with the Coromandel. The Thames Coromandel area should be represented as one unit in Parliament.

In terms of the Electoral Act 1956 Section 16(1)f, Thames ought to be returned to where it belongs, as the main/principal centre of the proposed Coromandel electorate. That the provisional

boundaries be adjusted to include Thames within the proposed Coromandel electorate which surrounds it.

Objection No. 66 R.J. and J. Souch of Coromandel Similar to objection No. 22-65.

Objection No. 76 Margaret Lewson

Similar to objection No. 22-65

Objection No. 122 Paeroa Borough Council

Notes the concern of the many in Thames to the town being included in Maramarua. Objects if the commission in attempting to redress the problem of Thames does it at the expense of Paeroa and its surrounding district.

Objection No. 139 D.J. Prosser

Similar to objections No. 22-65

Objection No. 146 Waihi Branch of Kaimai Electorate of the NZ National Party

Objects to being transferred to the Coromandel area on the grounds of geographic climate and communication disruption to the personnel and workings of the electoral party system.

Objection No. 147 Chairman, Kaimai Electorate NZ National Party

Supporting objection No. 146 and suggests that the disecting of the present Kaimai electorate is in opposition to the statutory requirements to maintain communities of interest. Because of geographic, business and social activity Waihi, Kati Kati and Omokoroa centre their activities towards the Bay of Plenty.

Objection No. 166 T. Howard of Waitakaruru

Objects to the exclusion of Waitakaruru and Thames from the Coromandel electorate.

State Highway 25 is the main artery of the Coromandel being the main route for traffic from Auckland, and the commercial link from "the Coromandel" to Auckland. There is a community of interest to incorporate SH 25 from Waitakururu into the Coromandel electorate. Otherwise objection is similar to objections nos 22-65.

Objection No. 196 J.A., D.E. Green of Thames, and 62 others

Similar to objections No. 22-65

We wish to record our strong objection to Thames being excluded from the proposed Coromandel Electorate.

Objection No. 196, 253-282, 470-486, 535-543, 1752-1757. Printed form—63 signatories and wording as follows.

Thames has strong community of interest with the balance of Thames-Coromandel District. Thames is the undoubted centre for commerce, business and health for the Coromandel Peninsula. It is the most centrally sited major town.

Thames is also the administrative centre for local authorities serving the Coromandel Peninsula and is the major employment centre for many of the outlying smaller communities on the Coromandel Peninsula.

Thames is also the major centre for shopping and commerce for tourist on transit to the holiday/tourist resorts of the Coromandel.

Thames is a coastal community and has close links with the fishing industries of other coastal communities on the Coromandel.

There are excellent road links from Thames to the north of the Coromandel Peninsula via Coromandel; and to the east via the Kopu-Hikuai road. The inclusion of Thames in the Maramarua electorate creates a barrier to communication between the Thames Coast/Coromandel/ Colville regions and the remainder of the electorate.

We submit that the Representation Commission has failed to properly take account of the requirements of Section 16(1)(f) of the Electoral Act 1956.

We submit that the Thames Coromandel region should be represented as one unit in Parliament.

We therefore request that the provisional boundaries be altered to include the Thames Urban Area within the proposed Coromandel Electorate.

Objection No. 229 NZ National Party Hauraki Electorate

Request to have Thames retained in the Hauraki or Coromandel Electorate with any adjustment made to the southern section but not by moving Paeroa to Maramarua in exchange for Thames. Request that the Mangaiti Riding of the Ohinemuri County Council be included in Coromandel. An adjustment of the boundary of the Thames urban community by having the boundary with Maramarua continue north on the Waihou River to the

mouth of the Kauaeranga River. Then proceed up to the Kauaeranga River and turn north at the limit of the Thames residential area at the point immediately north of Tararu.

Objection No. 230 See Minutes of a Public Meeting in Thames 17/11/86.

Objection No. 469 NZ Labour Party

Similar to objection nos 22-65.

Objection No. 487 Thames-Coromandel District Council

Similar to objection nos 22-65.

Objection No. 488 Thames-Coromandel District Council

Similar to objection Nos 22-65.

Objection No. 489 NZ Democratic Party (Inc)

Similar to objection Nos 22-65.

Objection No. 1751 J.V. Devcih of Thames

Similar to objection No. 22-65.

Objection No. 1787 Petition from Kaimai 31 signatories.

We the undersigned seek reconsideration of the provisional boundaries of the Kaimai Electorate to ensure our community of interest is correctly placed. The changes sought relates to Mesh Blocks 11891000 and 11893100 which are in the Whakamarama District, east of Whakamarama Road, including all those persons resident in the west and south of Youngston Road, Sinclair Rd, Laurel Drive, Ross Rd up to Sinclair Rd, Coodall Rd, Leyland Rd, Odey Rd and Te Tui track and the top end of Kumi Kumi Rd on the other side of meshblock 11893100.

Whakamarama is a close knit rural community, with its own well appointed community hall centre. It is closely identified with the Kaimai Mamakau Forest Park. The two mesh blocks, in the judgement of the community leaders, if moved into the Kaimai Electorate would enable us to maintain our district community of interest.

WAIKATO

Objection No. 531 Ohinemuri County Council

Object to the transfer of the Mangaiti Riding to Waikato. The residents of this riding recently petitioned to be part of the new Paeroa-Ohinemuri. They also desire to be part of the Coromandel electorate.

RAGLAN

Objection No. 176 Raglan County Council

Objects to the exclusion of the Pukemiro Riding and that portion of the Waingaro Riding of the Raglan County situated between the Waikato River and the Eastern boundary at the Pukemiro Riding on the grounds of community of interest, previous boundaries, communications and the commissions objectives.

HAMILTON WEST

Objection No. 226 Trevor Mallard, MP for Hamilton West

In considering boundary changes the commission has given undue weight to existing boundaries and has not given proper weight to community of interest, physical boundaries and local authorities boundaries.

MATAMATA

Objection No. 501 R.C. Feist of Cambridge and 163 others

The voting residents of the Fencourt—Te Miro area object to exclusion from the Waikato electorate on the grounds the old electorate followed the Waikato County boundary. Business and communication is centred on Hamilton. Our area is separated from Matamata region by the Mangakawa range with one connecting road.

TONGARIRO

Objection No. 523 Tokoroa Borough Council

Request to extend the northern boundary to the Tongariro electorate to coincide more closely with the areas of community interest of Tokoroa. The proposed district council should be all in the one electorate.

Objection No. 533 Taupo Borough and Taupo County Council

Objection on the basis of a lack of community of interest that is required to be considered.

Submitted that Parliamentary boundaries should take major consideration of established regional local government boundaries. The proposed boundaries has separated the Borough of Taupo from the satellite communities of Wairakei, Kinloch and Acacia Bay which have a community of interest with Taupo. The main

objection would be met by the inclusion of Acacia Bay and Wairakei in the Waikaremoana Electorate.

Objection No. 1998 Acacia Bay Ratepayers' Progressive Assn (Inc)

Object to being removed from the Waikaremoana Electoral District as they have no affinity or connection with the Tongariro electoral area. The boundary has caused a division of the Taupo township.

Objection No. 1999 NZ National Party Taupo Branch

Similar to objection No. 1998.

TARAWERA

Objection No. 212 N.W. Morrell of Galatea

Requests the commission to revise the proposal boundary and leave the Murupara, Galatea, Waiohau, Matahina district in the East Cape electorate because of the need for stability and the community of interests criterion.

Objection No. 213 Galatea Branch of Federated Farmers of NZ

Similar to objection No. 212.

WAIKAREMOANA

Objection No. 227 H.S. Logan of Hastings

Objects to an area of prime farming land on the southern sides of the Ngaruroro River being joined to the then electorate which is huge and very different in character from the Hawkes Bay country. It will be difficult to have a close association with the Member of Parliament.

Objection No. 1769 Petition by Maraekakaho Home & School Association, 15 signatories.

Wish to remain in Hawkes Bay electorate.

Objection No. 1792 Petition from Raukawa Hall Committee 6 signatories from Ruakawa who have no community of association with Waikaremoana and wish to be included in the Hawkes Bay electorate.

Objection No. 1793 Petition from Raukawa School Association and Raukawa Cricket Club

20 signatories, similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1797 Petition from Maraekakaho Sports Club

12 signatories. Object to Maraekakaho area being in Waikaremoana and wish to remain in Hawkes Bay to which they readily identify.

Objection No. 1798 Petition Maraekakaho Womens Institute

13 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1799 Petition Poukawa Social Committee

24 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1800 Petition Maraekakaho Red Cross

39 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1987 Petition Maraekakaho

Branch Federated Farmers, 133 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1988 Petition Maraekakaho Play Group

15 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1989 Petition Ngatarawa Water Race Committee

4 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1990 Petition Rankawa School Committee

2 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1991 Petition Maraekakaho Hall Board

12 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1992 Petition Maraekakaho School Committee

Similar to objection No. 1792. 5 signatories.

Objection No. 1993 Petition Mangatahi School Committee

6 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1994 Petition Maraekakaho Young Farmers Club

6 signatories. Similar to objection No. 1792.

Objection No. 1995 Petition Maraekakaho Sports Club

18 signatories. Similar to 1792.

GISBORNE

Objection No. 143 Waikohu County Council

Object to the division of the county between the Gisborne and East

Cape electorates. Requests that the whole of the Waikohu County be placed into one rural electorate on the eastern side.

HAWKES BAY

Objection No. 1768 Petition by Residents of Tamatea West

44 signatories object to the continued division of Tamatea between the Napier and Hawkes Bay electorates and want to be in the Napier electorate.

HASTINGS

(Objections to be read in conjunction with Hawkes Bay)

Objection No. 172 Havelock North Borough

That the Hastings electorate boundary should be altered to include the entire Havelock North Borough as it is a totally urban area which identifies with the Hastings urban electorate and not the Hawkes Bay electorate.

Objection No. 495 Hawkes Bay County Council

The inclusion of three large ridings, namely Okawa, Maraekakaho and Poukawa into the Waikaremoana electorate is illogical. Breaks community of interest, topographical limitations and electorate communications difficulties. Similarly in Hawkes Bay and Pahiatua electorates.

Similar to objection No. 172.

These areas of Hastings, i.e., Havelock North Main Road and the general area of St Georges and St Andrews Road should be transferred to Hawkes Bay. Flaxmere should be in Hastings Electorate and Havelock North in Hawkes Bay Electorate.

Objection No. 496 Hastings City Council

Similar to objection No. 495.

PAHIATUA

Objection No. 1781 Registrar of Electors, Dannevirke

Small portions of Hawkes Bay County are in Pahiatua.

The descriptions of the portions concerned are:

- 1 Area of land between Tutituki River—Papanui Stream; Meshblock 01 523 300 222 (no electors)
- 2 Area of land (56.4 hectares) west of Hawea Stream; Meshblock 01 523 000 236 (no electors)
- 3 Middle Road; ESD Te Aute Trust Road for 300 m South; Meshblock 01 523 000 201 (no electors)
- 4 Te Aute Trust Road; SSD Middle Road for 300 m West; Meshblock 01 523 000 201 (no electors)
- 5 Waipoapoa Road; 2K E Kahuranaki Road for 3.5K E; Meshblock 01 523 600 243 (3 electors)

Transfer of the above 5 items would result in no part of the Hawkes Bay County remaining in the Pahiatua electorate.

KING COUNTRY

Objection No. 207 Eltham District Council

Previously the district was neatly divided between two electorates with which we have a community of interest. We wish to retain the existing boundaries.

The former borough and county have united to consolidate the district and promote its future. The proposal fragments the area with our major urban centre and part of our rural area being included in an electorate with which the residents have no community of interest.

The council requests the commission to alter the boundary of King Country to coincide with the northern boundary of the Eltham District Council area which would leave the whole of the Eltham urban ward and the whole of the East rural ward within the Waitotara electorate. An adjustment between King Country/Taranaki boundaries in the north and the Taranaki/Waitotara boundaries in the south would overcome the 5% quota problem with the adjustments suggested. The balance in the Waitotara electorate can be retained by transferring that portion of the Waimate West County proposed to be included in the Waitotara electorate into the Taranaki electorate.

Objection No. 2002 Stratford County Council

Objects to the proposed boundaries on the grounds of community of interest, topographical features and facilities of communication, regard to existing boundaries, split up of Stratford County, retention of provincial and regional affiliation and appropriateness of name. Suggests splitting area up into three electorates, New Plymouth—the bulk of New Plymouth city; Taranaki—include the balance of New Plymouth city; North Taranaki District—Clifton County, Egmont County and Inglewood District.

Egmont—Stratford and Patea Boroughs, Manaia and Weverley

Towns, Stratford, Patea and Waimate West Counties and Hawera District.

TARANAKI

Objection No. 11 County Manager, Waimate West County Council

Objects to the dividing of the county between electorates. Opposed to the district including Manaia being split and that the county and town with their very strong sense of community should be represented by one MP.

Objection No. 178 North Taranaki District Council

The majority of territorial authority areas within Taranaki are unnecessarily split into two or more electorates and that with closer investigations only a minimum number of bisected areas would have been necessary.

Objection No. 1774 Taranaki United Council

Similar objection No. 178.

WAITOTARA

Objection No. 150 I. Satherley, Wanganui

Object to remaining in the Waitotara electorate.

Objection No. 179 K Hines of Wanganui

Object to the proposed boundary for the Wanganui Electorate excluding an area of Wanganui East from the district and requests that the boundary in respect of that area be reinstated on the line of the existing boundary.

Objection No. 180 Eastown Community Group of Wanganui—315 petitioners

Objects to the inclusion of the Eastown area in Waitotara on the grounds of no community of interest with the area. Community of interest is in the area covered by Wanganui where residents feel part of Wanganui East and Wanganui City and that their interests can best be represented by the MP representing these areas.

It would be more appropriate to absorb a further part of St John's Hill, than to annex an area on the opposite side of the city into Waitotara electorate.

Objection No. 1789 R.F. McDronle and 283 signatories

We wish to object to the proposed boundary change to the Rangitikei electorate in so far as it affects the Hunterville township and outlying area to the North West.

The existing boundary between the Waitotara and Rangitikei electorates, from North to Marton up to Papaunui and across to Mataroa, follows a natural topographical division between the two electorates in that areas either side of the boundary gravitate naturally towards communities within those electorates by virtue of access routes, etc. There has always been a strong sense of identity and community of interest based on Family, Historical, Trade and Servicing ties within the area defined. These links favour the area towards the east which is encompassed by the present Rangitikei electorate.

The proposed changes have the affect of splitting the small rural township of Hunterville down the middle by placing part of it in one electorate and part in another. This seems completely illogical having regard to the size of the township (population 548).

Objection No. 530 Residents residing around the Lake Virginia Reserve.

Object to the continuing exclusion from the Wanganui electorate on the grounds of community interest and population.

WANGANUI

Objection No. 526 NZ Labour Party

Objects to the dividing of the city in two places rather than the present one which disrupts the community of interest. Suggests that a further incursion should be made into the St John's Hill area.

HOROWHENUA

Objection No. 14 W.E. Young of Waikanae

Objects to the splitting of Waikanae between the Horowhenua and Kapiti electorates.

Objection No. 74 Horowhenua County Council

Objects to the proposed common boundary of the Horowhenua and Manawatu electoral districts and the exclusion of the Opiki and Tokomaru areas from the Horowhenua electorate.

Objection No. 174 K.C. and G.H. Edwards of Waikanae

Object to the further division of Waikanae between the Horowhenua and Kapiti electorates. Waikanae being a coherent

unit with a strong community of interest that centres much more on rural Horowhenua than the more urban Kapiti.

KAPITI

(Objections to be read in conjunction with Porirua and Western Hutt)

Objection No. 16 J.R. Matheson Principal Waitangirua Intermediate School

Objects to a settled well identified intermediate school district being split into three electorates and the school being served by three MP's.

Objection No. 73 K.J. Cross of Whitby

Objects to her area of Whitby being transferred from the Kapiti to the Western Hutt electorate.

Objection No. 204 R.P. and H.A. Goodman of Waikanae

Objects to the carving up of a small town.

The Waikanae River is the logical boundary for the south of the town and the area has strong links with Horowhenua as it has been the local decision maker.

Objection No. 205 A.J. Goodman of Waikanae

Similar to objection on 204.

Objection No. 231 J.E. Whitcombe of Papakowhai

Objects to the splitting of the Waitangirua community which has a community of identity and spirit.

Suggests Waitangirua and Ascot Park Areas stay in the Kapiti electorate and move the Papakowhai area into the Porirua electorate.

Objection No. 460 R.F. Gillespie of Porirua and 3 & 4 others

Objects on the grounds of community of interest and the effect on the southern boundaries of the electorate will have on the Tairangi ward of Porirua city.

Objection No. 510 Fellowship of the Samoan Community in Porirua

Recommends the maintaining of the existing southwestern southern and southeastern boundaries of the Kapiti electorate as well the Porirua electorate.

Objection No. 534 NZ Labour Party

Objects to the proposed boundaries for the Kapiti, Porirua, and Western Hutt electorates because they converge to split the community of Waitangirua. To preserve its community of interest as much as possible this isolated community should be retained within the Kapiti electorate. This could be achieved by shifts of population in the Papakowhai, Pautahanui and Waitangirua areas.

Objection No. 1784 Porirua City Council

Similar to objection No. 16, 17 and 534.

PORIRUA

(Objections to be read in conjunction with Kapiti and Western Hutt)

Objection No. 19 D.F. Marchant of Porirua

Objects to the Waitangirua community being split between three electorates.

Objection No. 120 R.L. and P.L. Shannon of Porirua

Similar to objection No. 19.

Objection No. 511 Tawa Borough Council

The council considers that the borough as a whole should be within one electorate irrespective if it be joined with other areas to the south or north.

WESTERN HUTT

(Objections to be used read in conjunction with Kapiti and Porirua)

Objection No. 181 R.C. Lewis of Whitby

Objects to Whitby being part of Western Hutt when it is currently split between Porirua City and Hutt County for local body government. When Hutt County is dismantled, Whitby will become part of Porirua for local body affairs and yet be moved into Western Hutt. If Whitby is not to be part of Porirua or Kapiti a name change to Pauatahunui would reflect the geographic region concerned.

Objection No. 524 NZ Democratic Party (Inc) Western Hutt

Objects to the inclusion of parts of Hutt County, Pauatahunui, Whitby and Waitangirua which divides those areas arbitrarily, these areas have no community of interest with any Hutt Valley community, are geographically separate. In the plan of the local

authority boundaries all of the included areas not already in Porirua City will be included.

Suggest excluding the Hutt County/Porirua areas and bring the boundary to be coincident with the Lower Hutt City boundary. Includes the areas known as Omega and Newlands north from Newlands. The south-western boundary would then follow the northern motorway and include Newlands, Horokiwi and Lower Hutt. In Porirua the southern boundary would be moved north to include more of Tawa into Ohariu.

Objection No. 1775 K. Huntington of Whitby
Similar to objection No. 181.

Objection No. 1776 K and J Bannatyne of Whitby

Consider themselves to be part of Kapiti coast and the boundary bears no relation geographically, socially or economically with Western Hutt. Want to retain present boundary and if numbers have to be reduced from Kapiti electorate then Papakowhai join Porirua.

Objection No. 1785 Parumoana Community College

Suggest that Waitangirua area from Kenepuru Stream be included in the Kapiti electorate.

Objection No. 1786 T.K. Royal of Silverstream
Similar to objection No. 1785.

Objection No. 1795 Petition concerning

Eastern Hutt/Western Hutt/Pencarrow 10 signatories

Requesting changes to proposed boundaries of

—Eastern Hutt

—Western Hutt

—Pencarrow

The objectives of the changes requested in Lower Hutt are to:

- (a) retain the new electorate populations set by the Commission;
- (b) preserve existing communities of interest where possible; and
- (c) retain existing boundaries or retain areas in existing electorates where possible.

The three changes suggested to the proposed boundaries should approximately balance one another in their effect on electorate populations. However if necessary, the Commission could change a few streets from the boundaries suggested while following the broad intention of the suggestions.

1 Western Hutt—Pencarrow Boundary

Suggest that this boundary follow the Hutt River northwards until opposite Hutt Valley High School on its east bank; run along the south-east side of this school to Woburn Road; Wellington-Wairarapa Railway line; then north-east along this line to Epuni Railway Station.

2 Western Hutt—Eastern Hutt Boundary

Suggest that this initially follow the existing boundary from Epuni Railway Station northwards along Mitchell Street; then westwards along High Street to and along Melling Road, to and along the Hutt River north to the existing boundary.

3 Eastern Hutt—Pencarrow Boundary

Suggest retaining the existing boundary, namely, generally eastwards from the Epuni Railway Station along Hampton Court, Durham Crescent and Tilbury Street to and along the Eastern Hills.

EASTERN HUTT

Objection No. 1767 Lower Hutt City Council

Object to the location of the Eastern Hutt/Pencarrow boundary near the corner of Waddington Drive and Hammerton Street, Naenae.

OHARIU

Objection No. 21 M.R. Kilpatrick of Ngaio

Comments that it would have made some sense to join Karori with Wellington Central boundary.

Objection No. 75 North Johnsonville Progressive Association

Objects to the proposed boundary between Ohariu and Wellington Central electorates as it is against the interests of the community of the area. The northern suburbs of Wellington: Ngaio, Khandallah, Johnsonville and Newlands form a compact group with common interests that should be represented by one MP.

Objection No. 183 The Johnsonville Progressive Association

Similar to objection No. 219 and 75 plus it accentuates a problem by adding part of Tawa to an already diverse and elongated strip

from Karori to Newlands which makes up the electorate and does not assist in the rationalisation of local body areas and districts.

Objection No. 235 H. Warren-Jones of Johnsonville

Objects to the proposed boundary changes under the heading of community of interest.

Objection No. 1780 Petition Tawa Borough Residents

40 signatories

We wish to record an objection to the proposed boundary between the Ohariu and Porirua Electorates.

We, the undersigned, are Tawa Borough residents. We wish to convey to you that a survey conducted in 1985 confirmed overwhelmingly that Tawa residents are opposed to an amalgamation of the Tawa and Porirua communities. Further, we recognise that the population criterion does not allow the entire Tawa Borough to move to the Ohariu Electorate. However, we are concerned that the provisional electoral boundary divides the recognised Tawa suburb of Redwood. In order to preserve this community of interest, we believe that the new electoral boundary should be on a west-east line north of Redwood.

We strongly recommend that the new boundary be on the line of Larsen Crescent, The Drive and Tawa Terrace.

WELLINGTON CENTRAL

Objection No. 144 L.M. Brown

Objects to the splitting of Mt Victoria into three electorates. Suggests that Mt Victoria is all in one electorate preferably Wellington Central.

Objection No. 529 Mt Victoria Residents Association Inc

Petition of 891 signatories at the unnatural splitting of their suburb which divides the community of interest that exists in Mount Victoria and also that which exists between Mount Victoria and the Central City area.

Suggest unifying the Mount Victoria area bounded by Kent Terrace, Paterson Street, the Town Belt, and Moeller Street, so that it is in only one electorate and incorporating this area into Wellington Central.

Objection No. 532 I Buxton of Mt Victoria

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 1778 Federation of Wellington Progressive Association

Similar to objection No. 529 and also changes which have placed part of Johnsonville into Wellington central.

Objection No. 1779 Petition residents of Wellington Central 566 signatories

We the residents of Wellington City, currently residing within the Wellington Central and Ohariu Electorates, object to the proposed boundaries between our two electorates. With Ohariu stretching around Wellington Central and now proceeding to the southern part of Tawa, no due consideration has been given to community of interest, to facilities of communication, and to topographical features, as is required under Section 16 of the Electoral Act.

We recommend that the boundary between our two electorates run up the Ngaio Gorge, Kenya Street, Ottawa Road, and Awarua Street. This splits the two electorates into a Northern (Onslow) and a Southern (Karori), each with a population of a little over 33,000. Both have a close community of interests, good communication lines and clearly defined and understood geographic boundaries. Such boundaries are not dissimilar to electoral boundaries in the 1960's.

Objection No. 1794 A. Hill of Wellington

Similar to objection No. 144.

WAIRARAPA

Objection No. 527 NZ Labour Party

The boundary between Wairarapa and Pahiatua electorates should return to that drawn by the 1977 commission which would reinstate the historic contiguity of the Opaki riding boundary with the electoral boundary. Where possible Parliamentary boundaries should follow those of local government.

WEST COAST

Objection No. 245 D. and O.C. James and 384 signatories of Murchison

Object at being moved from the Tasman electorate to the West Coast electorate. Murchison and the Maruia area and all the surrounding valleys have always identified with the Nelson region and are part of the Waimea County Council and Nelson United Council. There are also natural boundaries to the South

East and South west which divide the region from the West Coast.

Objection No. 525 NZ Labour Party

The community of interest criterion is better served by including Murchison in the Tasman electorate. Supported by a petition of 355 residents.

NORTH CANTERBURY

Objection No. 512 NZ National Party Rangiora Electorate

Object to the name of the electorate, inclusion of part of Oxford County in Selwyn electorate and inclusion of part of Kaikoura county in Marlborough electorate.

Objection No. 515 NZ Labour Party

Submits that the Risely Subdivision, an integral part of Kaiapoi township, be kept in North Canterbury. Oxford should be transferred in to Selwyn to compensate.

Objection No. 1777 Rangiora District Council

Objects to the name change for Rangiora.

SELWYN

Objection No. 239 NZ National Party Selwyn Electorate and Ruth Richardson, MP for Selwyn

The proposed Selwyn boundaries fail to reflect the statutory requirements of existing boundaries of electoral districts, community of interest, facilities of communications, and topographical features.

The preferred remedy should be that the commission take a policy decision to cope with the loss of population to the South of Selwyn, by the elimination of an electorate to the South of Selwyn or failing this the commission should make a decision to go to the limit of the tolerances, both high and low, in order to restore a semblance of community of interest to the Selwyn boundaries.

Objection No. 518 Eyre County Council

Object to the siting of the northern boundary of the Selwyn electorate where it joins the North Canterbury electorate. The proposed boundary takes in the whole of Eyre County which is unrealistic. Suggest the northern boundary be the Waimakariri River.

Objection No. 519 Oxford County Council

Object to the south east riding of Oxford County on the grounds of existing grounds not being adhered to, community of interest which is with Oxford and Rangiora, communications and topographical features.

Objection No. 521 Double Hill School of Methven

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 1790 Petition Electors of Region 30 signatories

Object to becoming part of Selwyn instead of North Canterbury.

Objection No. 2000 Ellesmere County Council

Objections to the boundaries proposed would be met—by their abandonment, particularly as regards to the South Canterbury/Selwyn proposals, and the present boundaries including all of Ellesmere County in the Selwyn electorate being retained. If the proposal is proceeded with a more appropriate name being given to the proposed South Canterbury electorate.

Objection No. 2001 Federated Farmers of NZ Ellesmere Branch

Similar to objection No. 2000.

ST ALBANS

Objection No. 463 David Caygill, MP for St Albans

Suggests Parklands and Avondale areas proposed to be exchanged

with Avon Electoral be left as they were. The urban areas of Cranford Street, Philpotts Road, Hills Road and Clearbook Street remain in St Albans.

YALDHURST

Objection No. 184 G.J. Robinson of Rangiora

Objects to southern boundary drawn for the Yaldhurst and Fendalton electorates. As there is no community of interest between the areas north and south of Riccarton—Yaldhurst road especially between the Avonhead area and the Hornby-Hei Hei-Islington area. In summary the southern boundary for the Yaldhurst and Fendalton electorates be Yaldhurst-Riccarton road.

Objection No. 2003 Petition Russley Residents

72 signatories. Object to the removal of Russley from the Yaldhurst district. Suggest instead that the southwest corner bounded by Pound Road, Roberts Road, Gilberthopes Road, Parker Street, Seymour Street, and Shands Road be excluded in favour of Selwyn.

FENDALTON

Objection No. 1765 P.J. Lindsay Returning Officer, Fendalton

That the boundary in the North West of the electorate be aligned to follow the centre line of Brodside Terrace from Hooker Avenue to Greers Road. The boundary in the South West of the electorate be realigned to follow the centre line of Annex Road from the Junction of Hallswell Road and Lincoln Road to Blenheim Road.

LYTTELTON

Objection No. 233 Register of Electors, Lyttelton

Position of the 'Sign of the Kiwi' straddles local body and proposed electoral boundary. Suggested alteration attached by way of map to objection.

Objection No. 238 Mount Herbert County Council

Object to Governors Bay township surrounds being included in Lyttelton and not Selwyn. The community of interest in this area is with Charteris Bay and Diamond Harbour which are in Selwyn electorate. The area of Rapaki has their community of interest with the Lyttelton Borough.

Suggests that the boundary between Selwyn and Lyttelton should be realigned more to the east and closer to Rapaki at a point between the properties of Mrs S E Rhoes and D N Turner on Governors Bay Road.

Objection No. 251 Lyttelton Borough Council

Similar objection No. 238.

Objection No. 498 Ann Hercus, MP for Lyttelton

The Diamond harbour area as defined by the Lyttelton Borough Council should be included in the new electorate boundaries. That the area to the left of Worsley Road and Hoon Hay Road be excluded from the new boundaries. Similar objection to No. 238.

Objection No. 514 C.E. Stanley of Diamond Harbour

Similar objection No. 498.

Objection No. 1996 The Diamond Harbour Community Association

There is a strong community of interest with all of the residents in the harbour basin area. Under the proposed changes, the harbour

area would be split between two electorates. Residents want to be part of the same electorate.

Objection No. 1997 NZ Democratic Party (Inc) Lyttelton

Similar to objection No. 1996.

SOUTH CANTERBURY

Objection No. 1 D.M. Stocker of Ashburton

Objects to the name change of the electorate.

Objection No. 2 E.A. Quigley of Ashburton and 5 others

Similar to objection No. 1. Ashburton belongs to Mid Canterbury.

Objection No. 3 A. Patterson of Ashburton

Similar objection No. 1. Should be either Ashburton or Mid Canterbury.

Objection No. 4 E.J. Watson of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 5 R. Cleaver of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1 and objection No. 3.

Objection No. 6 E.E. and A.P. Thomson of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 7 M. Walton of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 8 M.M. Lill and R.H. Lill and R.H. Armstrong of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 9 D.B. Lloyd of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 10 A. Pethig of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 12 G.E. Smith of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1 and objection No. 3.

Objection No. 13 N. Campbell of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1 and objection No. 3.

Objection No. 20 L.E.M. Chesterman of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 67 N.M. King of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 68 J.T. and G.B. Hunt of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 69 Signature indecipherable of Rakaia

Similar to objection No. 1 and objection No. 3.

Objection No. 70 Ashburton County Council

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 71 J.D. Tilson of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1 and objection No. 3.

Objection No. 72 Ashburton Guardian Co Ltd of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1 and objection No. 3.

Objection No. 125 Waimate County Council

Similar to objection No. 1 and objection No. 3.

Objection No. 126 E.M. Glanville of Geraldine

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 127 J.M. Sandrey of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 128 E.F. Freeze of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 129 J. Leng of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 140 Ashburton Electric Power Board

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 140A Winchmore branch of the Womens Division of Federated Farmers of NZ

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 141 F.N. Newton of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1 and No. 3.

Objection No. 142 Rotary Club of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 170 M. Mackerras of Dunedin

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 177 R.L.G. Talbot MP for Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 209 Kiwanis Club of Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 210 J A Middleton of Temuka

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 211 Waikanui branch of NZ Country Women's Institute

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 240 Ashburton Borough Council

Similar to objection No. 1 and objection No. 3.

Objection No. 241 Ashburton Hospital Board

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 242 Mid Canterbury Womens Division of Federated Farmers

Similar to objection No. 3.

Objection No. 243 Timaru City Council

Similar to objection No. 3.

Objection No. 244 Ashburton Jaycee (Inc)

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 517 NZ Democratic Party, Selwyn electorate

Object to the proposed change which places Dunsandel in South Canterbury instead of Selwyn.

Objection No. 520 Mid Canterbury, Lismore Branch of Women's Division of Federated Farmers

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 1791 NZ National Party Ashburton Electorate

Similar to objection No. 1.

Objection No. 2004 Jenny Shipley National Party candidate for Ashburton

Similar to objection No. 1.

WAITAKI

Objection No. 15 M. McCone of Oamaru

Objects to being transferred from the Waitaki electorate into the Otago electorate on the grounds of community of interest and geographic factors and logic.

Objection No. 18 Temuka Borough Council

Objects to the borough being included in the Waitaki electorate on the grounds that only population has been considered and not community of interest communication facilities existing boundaries and topographical features.

Objection No. 125 Waimate County Council

Object to the inclusion of Temuka in the Waitaki electorate as its community of interest lies closer to Timaru than the rest of the Waitaki proposal.

Recommend that Timaru electorate be reduced to meet more closely the boundaries of Timaru city, and that a corridor be included out to Temuka and include it in the Timaru electorate. Also considers that Waitaki is an inappropriate name and should be renamed South Canterbury.

Objection No. 126 E.M. Granville of Geraldine

Objects to the conflict of community interest if those in the county remain in the proposed South Canterbury electorate while objector is in Waitaki electorate.

Objection No. 170 M. Mackerras of Dunedin

Suggests that the name be changed to South Canterbury.

Objection No. 182 M. and S. Davis of Oamaru

Object to the proposed boundaries of Otago and Waitaki as it divides a community of interest namely Oamaru. What happens in Waitaki county directly affects Oamaru and vice versa and should be represented by one MP.

Objection No. 214 Geraldine Borough Council

Objects on the grounds that the commission in the interests of establishing a uniform population for each of the proposed electorates has given no consideration to the matters contained in Section 16(1)(f) of the Electoral Act. That in naming the proposed electorates it has not taken into account the traditional names of districts in our area and consequently the names given to electorates in our immediate area bear no resemblance to the actual areas they serve.

The commission should incorporate the area covered by Geraldines local community of interest into the one electorate. The name of the proposed Waitaki electorate should be changed to Aorangi or South Canterbury. The proposed South Canterbury electorate should be named Ashburton.

Objection No. 215 Waimate Borough Council

The proposed Waitaki electorate should be renamed South Canterbury.

Objection No. 247 NZ Democratic Party Waitaki Electorate Branch

Object on the grounds that the community of interest has been ignored. Wrong to remove Weston and the other communities of the Waitaki country from Oamaru for representation.

Objection No. 248 Waitaki County Council

Similar to objection No. 247

Suggest that the proposed boundary be altered to exclude a small portion of the Kakanui Riding south of Oamaru from the

Waitaki electorate and to include the community council area of Weston in the Waitaki electorate.

Objection No. 504 E.M.P. and A.R. Anderson

The area of Weston should not be included in Otago.

Objection No. 528 L.S. Kane of Oamaru

Similar to objection No. 182.

Objection No. 1796 Petition from Oamaru

14 signatories object to the proposed changes to the Waitaki and Otago electorates.

Objection No. 1986 Strathallen County Council

Object to the proposed electoral boundaries for the Waitaki, Timaru and South Canterbury electorates. There is no community of interest between Oamaru, and the northern end of the electorate.

The Temuka/Winchester/Geraldine areas have interests based in Timaru.

Waitaki should be renamed South Canterbury. South Canterbury should continue with the name Ashburton or be called Mid Canterbury.

Objection No. 2005 Oamaru Borough Council and Waitaki County Council and Petition of Residents

Boundary between the Otago and Waitaki electorates be altered so as to include in the Waitaki Electorate the Western Community Council District.

The councils believe that the boundary can be redrawn very simply as follows:

'From the point where the boundary of the Waiareka and Kakanui Ridings meet the Oamaru Borough boundary at the south end of Oamaru establish that riding boundary as the electoral boundary until it meets Airedale Road (or also known as White Rocks Road) thence north to meet the boundary of Weston Community Council following it round to where it meets up with Homestead Road thence along Homestead Road to meet up with the Papakaio Riding Boundary'.

OTAGO

Objection No. 170 M. Mackerras of Dunedin

Suggests the electorate name be changed to North Otago.

Objection No. 234 W.A. Gordon, N.G. Watson and D. Mackenzie of Garston

Residents of the Garston/Kingston districts object to the portion of the proposed boundaries which transfers most of the residents from the Wallace to the Otago electorate.

On the grounds of dividing a small community and that the community of interest is towards Southland and the Wallace electorate. A poll was conducted of all those registered as parliamentary electors as at 1 August 1986 numbered 104 electors. Eighty-eight were in favour of remaining in Wallace. Six were in favour of the new boundaries. Eight were of no fixed opinion.

Objection No. 508 L. and J.C. Mathieson of Oamaru want Waiameka Riding in the Waitaki electorate.

Objection No. 1758 H.D. and J.M. Growers of Omakau

Object to proposed changes in Otago Central.

Objection No. 1788 E.C. Willetts of Oamaru

Object to the removal of Weston from the Waitaki electorate.

CLUTHA

(*Objections to be read in conjunction with Otago*)

Objection No. 118 C. Mouat and 2059 petitioners

A petition to allow the residents of Alexandra Borough, Clyde Township, Galloway, Springvale, Fruitlands, Earnsclough districts to remain in the Otago Electorate with which they have a community of interest and a strong geographical base.

Objection No. 121 R.R. Macfie, Chairman Manuherikia Irrigation Scheme

Objections on behalf of 225 irrigators which removes a scheme area from the electorate where there is intense interest in irrigation to an electorate where there is no interest in irrigation.

Objection No. 145 Alexandra Jaycee Inc

Similar to Objection No. 118 and 121.

Objection No. 167 Alexandra Country Women's Institute

Object to changing of electorate from Otago as they are the heart of

Central Otago and have nothing in common or identify with a coastal electorate.

Objection No. 168 J.L. Sanders, Alexandra

Similar to objection No. 167.

Objection No. 169 D. Kemp, Alexandra

Similar to objection No. 167.

Objection No. 170 M. Mackerras of Dunedin

Suggests name should be changed to South Otago.

Objection No. 197 R.L. Waters of Waikouaiti

Similar to objection No. 167.

Objection No. 198 Earnscleuth Fruitgrowers Assn Inc of Alexandra

Similar to objection No. 118.

Objection No. 199 A Morrison of Alexandra

Objects to new boundary. Currently in Vincent County and the new line excludes her rightful geographical and home area.

Objection No. 200 A. Kemp of Alexandra

Objects to the change of boundary for Otago. Alexandra has been the centre of business and administrative Government departments and the electoral centre for the Otago electorate.

Objection No. 201 M.A.R. Nesbit of Queenstown

Similar to objection No. 200.

Objection No. 202 K.R. Love of Alexandra

Objects to the omission of Alexandra and surrounding districts from Otago electorate because of the regional difference and the growth rate of Alexandra.

Objection No. 208 L Cooper of Otago

Alexandra and the surrounding area is the heart of Central Otago. To take it out of the Otago electorate would be most illogical and disruptive to the community's common interest. The electorate office is set up in Alexandra the only logical place for it to be. There are alternatives that would prove more viable and the proposed boundaries make the MP for Otagos job a mammoth one.

Objection No. 217 Vincent Hospital Board

Objects to the boards district being cut into two halves. People in the entire board's district have common interests such as fruit-growing, irrigation, hydro electric development. They share no common interest with the people in the Clutha Electorate.

Otherwise similar to objection Nos 118 and 121.

Objection No. 218 A.D. Tyrrell of Clyde

Similar to objection Nos 118 and 121.

Objection No. 219 R.C. and C.M. Dempster of Waikouaiti

Similar to objection No. 167.

Objection No. 220 J.M. Orbell of Otago

Similar to objection No. 167.

Objection No. 221 R.J. and C.M. White of Alexandra

Similar to objection No. 167.

Objection No. 222 W.D. Whitney of Alexandra

Similar to objection No. 118.

Suggests that the Alexandra-Clyde area be maintained in the Otago electorate and a portion of Coastal Otago be included in the Clutha electorate instead.

Objection No. 252 Queenstown—Lakes District Council

Suggest Alexandra be included in the Otago Electorate to assist polling arrangements.

Objection No. 461 G. Anderson of Alexandra

Similar to objection No. 118 and 121.

Objection No. 467 Vincent County Council

Similar to objection No. 118.

Objection No. 468 NZ Labour Party

The community links between the dormitory suburb of Brighton/Ocean View and the western areas of Dunedin city mean that

the community of interest is better served by the suburb being included in the Dunedin West electorate.

Objection No. 490 M. Clapton

Similar to objection No. 118.

Objection No. 505 Otago Central Electric Power Board

Similar to objection nos 118 and 167.

Objection No. 506 Maniototo County Council

Similar to objection nos 118 and 167.

Objection No. 516 Alexandra Borough Council

Similar to objection nos 118 and 121.

Objection No. 1759 Central Otago Pest Destruction Board Council

Similar to objection No. 118.

Objection No. 1760 D.A. and J. Jolly of Alexandra

Similar to objection No. 118.

WALLACE

Objection No. 250 Southland County Council

Would prefer to see the boundaries of Wallace and Awarua electoral districts coincide with the eastern boundary of the Southland County for its full length.

INVERCARGILL

Objection No. 173 G.C. Meffin, Invercargill

The commission to consider boundaries that cover the biggest area of the city occupied by the biggest number of urban electors as per Map No. 3 published in the Southland Times on 27 November 1986.

Objection No. 464 NZ Labour Party

The city of Invercargill is unnecessarily divided three ways between two electorates.

Objection No. 497 N Lambert of Invercargill

Similar to objection No. 464.

Objection No. 1770 J. Sullivan of Invercargill

Similar to objection No. 464.

Objection No. 1771 President of Nga-Hau-E-Wha-Marae

Similar to objection No. 464.

Objection No. 1772 R.M. Jefcoate of Invercargill

Similar to objection No. 464.

Objection No. 1773 M. Mitchell of Invercargill

Similar to objection No. 464.

