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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report summarises the results of a survey on Marine Fisheries Management in New Zealand. The survey was conducted between 14 and 24 October, 2016 among with 2,019 adults nationwide who are members of Horizon Research’s national online panels..

**Performance of marine fisheries management in New Zealand**

Respondents were asked to rate five areas of marine fisheries management performance in New Zealand:

* Limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks in your area
* Limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas
* Fairly allocating catch entitlements between commercial, recreational and customary fishers
* Reducing the bycatch of protected species like seabirds and marine mammals
* Reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch.

Across all five management areas, unsatisfactory performance ratings (“Poor” or “Very poor”) were significantly higher than satisfactory performance ratings (Good and Excellent).

Overall, management performance for limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks received the highest ratings, although results were still significantly unsatisfactory.

Managing a reduction in excess or unwanted catch dumping was rated lowest.

Across all five management areas, females had significantly higher “Average” ratings than males.

In general, Māori, other European (includes Australian, South African, and British) and NZ European/Pakeha respondents rated the management performance lower than other ethnic group members. Pacific Islander and Asian respondents were more likely to rate the performance as “Average”.

In general, respondents who had supported parties in the governing coalition in the 2014 general election rated management performance slightly higher than those who had supported opposition parties.

**Public opinions on an independent inquiry**

70% of respondents though that an independent inquiry into fisheries management and the Quota Management System was needed.

**Resource rental for natural resources**

Similarly, 70% of respondents felt that a resource rental should apply to individuals who took marine fish and other public natural resources for profit.

**REPORT**

Overall results were compared with results for individuals who were identified recreational fishers[[1]](#footnote-1). While there were some minor differences, they were not statistically significant.

Analysis also indicated minimal differences by age group.

# Performance of marine fisheries management in New Zealand

Respondents were asked to rate the performance of the current marine fisheries management in New Zealand across five areas.

Across all five, unsatisfactory performance ratings (Poor and Very poor) were significantly higher than satisfactory performance ratings (Good and Excellent).

## 1.1 Limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks

Across the five management areas, respondents rated the management of limiting catch and rebuilding fish stocks in their areas the highest.

18% of the total sample and 27% of recreational fishers rated the management performance in their areas as either “Good” or “Excellent”. This management area also received the most “Average” ratings from the total sample compared to other management areas.

Although the management of limiting catch and rebuilding fish stocks was rated the highest among the five management areas, unsatisfactory ratings (“Poor” or “Very poor”) were still significantly higher than satisfactory ratings (“Good” or “Excellent”).

Note that recreational fishers were less likely than the general population to rate the management performance as “Average”.

Note that:

* Significantly more males rated the performance as “Poor” compared to females, while significantly more females rated the performance as “Average”.
* Almost half of all Asian, Indian, Māori, other European (includes Australian, South African, British etc.), and NZ European/Pakeha ethnicities rated limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks as “Average”. Māori were more likely than other ethnic groups to rate the performance as either “Poor” or “Very Poor”.
* In general, respondents from the north half of the North Island were more likely than others to think that the management of limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks in their areas was unsatisfactory (Poor and Very poor).
* Respondents who had voted for United Future, National Party and Conservative Party at the 2014 general election were more likely to rate the management performance higher than those who had voted for the Māori Party, Internet-MANA Party, ACT New Zealand and Green Party.

A selection of comments from respondents follows:

*“We are not doing enough. Before we know it, the fish stocks will be gone and there will be no one to blame but ourselves.”*

*“We are now using a lowered baseline (the number of fish that were there prior to commercial fisheries) so that the destruction of fish stocks do not appear to be as bad as they actually are. Fisheries management plays with statistics to obscure the severity of the problem. This matter is urgent - as urgent as the need to accurately and openly monitor the cost of environmental degradation caused by intensive (land) farming.”*

*“While quotas were initially a good step towards managing resources sustainably, the Quota Management System is clunky and difficult. It's important that we have a system that ensures fish stocks are plentiful in the future. Commercial access to fisheries needs to be more stringent so that bycatch numbers are reduced, and more research into the health of fisheries and related species needs to be undertaken.”*

*“It is nearly too late already to properly manage marine fisheries to ensure on-going stocks and proper long-term management.”*

*“Ministry of Primary Industries cannot manage the fisheries quota system while they also are responsible for promoting trade. Trade functions need to be taken from Ministry of Primary Industries and given to* [*The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade*](https://www.mfat.govt.nz/) *so that Ministry of Primary Industries can manage primary production, biosecurity and food safety without a conflict of interest with trade promotion.”*

*“MPI management has been a joke. We need to relook the quota system and find a better management system.”*

*“I think we are doing OK in this area - commercial fishing is well managed, it is the public who need watching especially foreigners who help themselves well over allowed limits.”*

*“Strict enforcement of quota and catch, particularly offshore and foreign vessels, is needed to protect fish stocks. Current regulations sound good but without on-board monitors the roles will be broken whenever possible. The situation is similar for endangered species and particular attention must be paid to their protection even though this will require considerable investment in monitors and equipment. Technology is needed to ensure accurate and timely information gets back to the enforcing agencies. On board monitors are needed to protect the reporting equipment, which, in turn protects the monitors.”*

## 1.2 Limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas

The management performance of limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas was rated third lowest across the five management areas.

Similar to limiting catch and rebuilding fish stocks, this management area received high “Average” ratings, 43% of the total sample and 37% of recreational fishers respectively.

48% of recreational fishers and 42% of the total sample rated the management of this area as unsatisfactory (“Poor” or “Very Poor”).

Note that:

* In a similar result to limiting catch and rebuilding fish stocks, significantly more females rated the performance as “Average” while significantly more males rated the performance as “Very poor”.
* In general, the further north in the country respondents resided, the more likely they were to think the management performance of limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas was “poor” or “Very poor”.
* Respondents who had voted for opposition parties at the 2014 general election generally rated the management performance of limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas lower than those who had voted for government parties.

A selection of comments from respondents follows:

*“The fisheries management has managed to deplete nearly all inshore species. It is the worst thing that has happened to our fish species.”*

*“MPI has recently shown mass ineptitude, bordering on corruption - with the commercial fishing industry seemingly in control of MPI decision making. A full independent inquiry is necessary and a complete overhaul of the QMS to place priority on smaller NZ boats using non industrial, smaller wastage techniques. The inshore fishery is especially susceptible to the commercial industries wasteful overfishing techniques. All trawling and purse seining should be pushed 10 miles out from any land in New Zealand, bottom trawling should be banned all together. Many countries worldwide are now ahead of us in fisheries management - Iceland for example. Also South American countries - Panama and Costa Rica who now have massively valuable tourism fisheries due to prioritising more fish in the water as opposed to bulk extraction of fish for the massive financial benefit of a very few select quota owners.”*

*“There should be no commercial fishing allowed within our 200 mile zone.”*

*“Needs an overhaul. Too many long-line operators, capturing all in their nets - small or large, are pillaging our waterways.”*

*“All commercial fishing should be totally banned in ALL inshore areas.”*

*“The inshore fishery requires to be protected for recreational fishing. Commercial fishing ought to be restricted to at least 5 kilometres off shore or more.”*

*“There should be no inshore industry fishing within 50km of our shores.”*

*“The one thing that I find really bad is the commercial vessels that turn up year after year 2 or 3 km off the Canterbury river mouths in the Salmon season. It's a well-known fact that for weeks on end the Salmon will school up in those areas waiting for the right time to enter the river systems to spawn. You generally will not see these boats at any other time of the year in those places. They claim that they are targeting other species and that any Salmon that are caught in their nets are just an unfortunate "bycatch". The Salmon numbers that are coming back to spawn have dropped so dramatically in the last 15 years that there has been talk of not having any Salmon season for a couple of years or more to try and build the stocks back up. The recreational Salmon fishermen, I would imagine, wouldn't make any effect on the stock numbers whatsoever. Most go an entire season without a fish. Surely this so called bycatch problem can be policed/controlled much better than they are doing now. It would be nothing short of criminal to have our Salmon stocks wiped out.”*

## 1.3 Fairly allocating catch entitlements between commercial, recreational and customary fishers

The management performance of fairly allocating catch entitlements between commercial, recreational and customary fishers was rated second highest by respondents.

17% of the total sample and 18% of recreational fishers rated the management performance as either “Good” or “Excellent”. Note the high “Average” ratings similar to previous management areas.

39% of the total sample and 40% of recreational fishers rated the management of this area as unsatisfactory (“Poor” or “Very poor”).

Note that:

* “Very poor” and “Poor” ratings were significantly higher from males than females, while significantly more females rated the performance as “Average”.
* Among respondents from the larger areas, respondents from Northland were the most concerned about fair allocation of catch entitlements (57% rated this as “Poor” or “Very poor”).
* Respondents who had voted for the National, Labour and Conservative Parties at the 2014 general election were more likely to rate the management performance higher than those who had voted for the other main parties.

A selection of comments from respondents follows:

*“Just have a fair system - one that allows recreational fishers to follow their recreational passion but with limits that reflect that it is recreation not an under the table way of income - also change legislation that means commercial fishers will lose their boats and haul if they continue to ignore the need to not fish sustainably i.e. they need to meet by catch requirements and also employ measures that means bird life isn't harmed.”*

*“It’s a disgrace and MPI have been in bed with the Commercial fisherman for too long. The fish belong to everyone not the commercial sector.”*

*“They need to reduce and closely monitor all foreign shipping vessels including NZ ones owned by overseas. They need to leave enough fish and good ocean beds for the local Kiwi fisherman both recreational and commercial.”*

*“Marine fisheries are the property of all New Zealanders, not the commercial companies. First priority must always be given to recreational/ customary fishing. What is left can be allocated (at a fair cost) to commercial interests. At present we have it around the wrong way.”*

*“They usually tend to target the casual and recreational fishermen for fish stocks dropping but seem to turn a blind eye to commercial fishermen.”*

*“The people running the government departments that look after our natural environments on both land and the ocean have one concern and one only, Profit. They are all in bed together, the fishing companies and the government department that are supposed to be keeping them in line. The hypocrisy is astounding. A member of the public who takes one extra scallop over his allowed quota can be fined $250.00. A commercial fisherman who dumps 1000 tons of fish gets nothing.”*

*“Management seems to be skewed towards greater restrictions on recreational fishermen, and turning a blind eye to any commercial breaches of the rules. It needs to be overhauled.”*

*“It is a resource for the whole country to benefit from, but it is just not happening that way currently - the big fisheries boats are taking too great a share of the overall supply, leaving little for recreational fishermen to hook.”*

## 1.4 Reducing the bycatch of protected species like seabirds and marine mammals

Across the five management areas, respondents rated the management of reducing the bycatch of protected species second lowest.

Compared to previous management areas, “Average” ratings decreased while “Poor” and “Very poor” ratings increased.

50% of recreational fishers and 48% of the total sample rated the management of this area as unsatisfactory (“Poor” or “Very poor”).

Note that:

* As with the other management areas, significantly more males than females rated the performance as “Very poor”, while significantly more females rated the performance as “Average”.
* 54% of Māori, 47% of “Other European” and 49% NZ European/Pakeha respondents rated the performance as unsatisfactory (“Poor” or “Very poor”).
* 49% of respondents who had voted for government parties in the 2014 general election rated performance in this area as “Poor” or “Very poor”. 17% of this group of respondents rated the performance as “Good or “Excellent”. By comparison, 56% of respondents who had voted for opposition parties in the 2014 general election rated performance in this area as “Poor” or “Very poor” with only 7% rating the performance as “Good or “Excellent”.

A selection of comments from respondents follows:

*“All marine species, fish or mammals need greater protection and the general public need more education and information in regards to all marine species.”*

*“It is becoming obvious that due to over fishing and global warming that fish stocks worldwide are in decline. I feel that we should not allow foreign companies to fish in our waters and that local companies need to be closely watched in order to prevent over fishing and needless killing of fish and dolphins and other protected species.”*

*“I am very concerned about the bycatch of threatened and endangered species.”*

*“Needs a major shakeup to protect our fish stocks and also endangered species e.g. dolphins.”*

*“I find Ministry of Primary Industry’s (and our Government as a whole) lack of respect for our fisheries very disturbing. It concerns me that the Maui's and Hectors Dolphins are critically endangered. More needs to be done.”*

*“Marine Fisheries Management should protect the very endangered Maui`s Dolphin and albatrosses.”*

*“I think that net sizes should be strictly monitored more. In addition to this, I think that drag trawling of the seabed should be outlawed. Much more preservation of endangered species is needed. I realize that NZ has a huge coast line but until we exercise controls in these matters, our stocks will diminish and threaten extinction.”*

*“I am very concerned about the impact the fishing industry is having on Maui's dolphin and I would like to see some positive action occurring to ensuring these mammals in particular are being protected from being caught in fishing nets - I am concerned about other mammals as well as I don't like to hear about mammals being caught and killed through our fishing and I feel this is a very important issue that needs to be addressed.”*

## 1.5 Reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch

The management performance of reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch was rated lowest across the five management areas.

Only 11% of both the total sample and recreational fishers rated the management performance as either “Good” or “Excellent”. This management area received the lowest “Average” ratings given the increase in “Poor” and “Very poor” ratings.

58% of recreational fishers and 57% of the total sample rated the management of this area as unsatisfactory (Poor and Very Poor).

Note that:

* As with the other management areas, “Very poor” ratings were significantly higher among males than females, while significantly more females rated the performance as “Average”.
* More than half of Māori, other European and NZ European/Pakeha respondents felt that the management performance of reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch was unsatisfactory (“Poor” or “Very poor”). 30% of Pacific Island respondents felt the management of this area was “Good” or “Excellent”.
* 59% of those who voted for government parties at the 2014 general election felt that the management performance of reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch was unsatisfactory (“Poor” or “Very poor”), compared with 63% of those who had voted for opposition parties.

A selection of comments from respondents follows:

*“The laws for dumping and overfishing are in place, so public opinions are not the matter. Enforcement of those laws is the problem, even when the perpetrator admitted liability, no action was taken.”*

*“It seems to be poorly managed given the current news regarding dumping bycatch.”*

*“Overfishing and dumping of fish by both commercial and recreational/customary needs to have harsher penalties.”*

*“In some areas fishing stock has become almost non-existent. Drag net fishing and taking everything that ends up in the net. I've been appalled by some of the programmes I've seen on TV and it appears a lot of companies have never been held accountable. Additionally, the dumping of fish waste is an even bigger problem. Who allows these foreign companies to access our waterways and seas and then deplete fish stocks? I could write heaps on this subject.”*

*“It is the quota system that causes the dumping of bycatch. We have to invent a better way.”*

*“Allowing dumping is the pits. The world needs the food and we throw it away. The economic incentives causing dumping are wrong. Too many areas are being overfished. Many species are threatened with extinction by our exploitation of resources in such wasteful ways.”*

*“The lack of a prosecution for dumping is scandalous. I wonder if there was some corruption there.”*

*“The dumping of unwanted species of fish by commercial operators should be clamped down on by way of severe penalties.”*

# Public opinions on an independent inquiry

Respondents were asked whether or not they thought an independent inquiry was needed into fisheries management and the Quota Management System.

As indicated in the following chart, a majority of respondents, both overall and recreational fishers, stated that they felt an independent inquiry was needed.

A majority of both males and females said an independent inquiry was needed. However, significantly more females (33%) were unsure compared with males (21%).

Māori were the most likely to think an independent inquiry was needed, with Asian and Indian respondents being the most unsure.

Across all regions, the main consensus was that an independent inquiry was needed.

62% of respondents who voted for parties that formed the government after the 2014 general election felt that an independent inquiry was needed. By comparison, 76% of those who voted for parties that make up the parliamentary opposition felt that an independent inquiry was needed.

61% of respondents who voted for the National Party in 2014 felt an independent inquiry was needed, while 11% disagreed. 28% were unsure.

A selection of comments from respondents follows:

*“One of the reason I love living in NZ is the ability to access the natural resources during my time off work. I love fishing and being in the outdoors. I follow the rules and am happy about only being able to obtain smaller quantities -it is enough to feed a family and you can fish on a number of days. I want to see this resource improve so future generations won’t miss out on the same lifestyle I have been lucky to enjoy and I hate to hear of the damage to our sea bed and over fishing through commercial fishing.. We don't want to empty the sea of fish and need to make tough decisions if that is what is required to balance access to fish verses numbers of fish stock. I highly support an independent review. I’m also concerned about other countries fishing in our waters and don't want to see an effort made by Kiwis to find other countries come in and reap the rewards of our fish stock.”*

*“As a retired fisheries scientist, up until recently I was very supportive of our QMS system. However, now that it has become apparent that MPI is not particularly interested in enforcing dumping at sea, I think we need to have an independent enquiry.”*

*“I think the recent findings about how Ministry for Primary Industry ignored ships throwing away their bycatch is disgusting - there should be an independent inquiry with the power to make binding recommendations to change the way fisheries are managed by Ministry for Primary Industry. We are short-sightedly destroying one of our most precious natural resources.*

*“There is a serious lack of transparency with the fishing industry, both those that catch and those that are supposed to monitor. I believe that MAF - or whatever it is called for now - have made a conscious decision to opt out of their responsibility to prosecute and maintain our fisheries under their mandate. We are well overdue for an independent inquiry and in depth look at what is really happening and to change some of the laws including what happens with by-catch, if we should still be using nets, particularly for inshore and harbours. Look forward to seeing it happen but not holding my breath.”*

*“Given the recent events that has happened in regards to the unlawful dumping of unwanted fish and the manner in wish the fisheries is monitored I think corruption is rift in the industry at many levels and a public enquiry at all levels needs to be conducted by an independent body. Our fisheries are being raped…”*

*“The Ministry of Primary Industries needs to be fully investigated independently and cleaned up to remove corruption.”*

*“So many other organisations/businesses have independent assessments and inquiries, marine fisheries should be the same.”*

*“There is a great deal of conflicting messages given to the public, an independent inquiry focusing on environmental sustainability and care of our marine life is essential.”*

# Resource rental for natural resources

Respondents were asked whether or not they thought individuals who took marine fish and other public natural resources for profit, should pay a resource rental.

Significantly more respondents thought that a resource rental for natural resources should apply.

While a majority of both males (74%) and females (63%) thought individuals who took marine fish and other public natural resources for profit, significantly more females (28%) than males (17%) were unsure.

Pacific Islander respondents were the most likely to felt most that a resource rental should apply (80%), with Asian (54%) and Indian respondents (53%) least likely to feel that way[[2]](#footnote-2).

By area, the majority of respondents from all regions thought that a resource rental should apply.

Respondents who had voted for parties that became the parliamentary opposition after the 2014 general election were more likely (72%) to think a resource rental should be paid than those who had voted for parties that formed the government (68%).

A selection of comments from respondents follows:

*“Something needs to be done but I'm not sure that resource rental is the answer. Further discussions and thoughts are needed. I am a recreational fisher so I have a vested interest in this topic!”*

*“Taking resources rental would be an idea. Sadly the consumer would be suffering with rising prices.”*

*“If you charge a resource rental the costs will just be passed onto consumers. It will also encourage fishing companies to lie about their activities so they can avoid the cost.”*

*“A resource rental should depend on the amount of fish caught, differentiating between leisure/small scale fishing and commercial, for-profit fishing, with the latter having to pay a rental.”*

*“I would like to know where the resource rental monies will go too. I think that the marine fisheries need a huge overall, and definitely more transparency and accountability.”*

# APPENDIX 1 – METHODOLOGY AND SAMPLE

2,019 members from Horizon Research’s national online panels, representing the New Zealand population 18+, responded to the survey between 14 and 24 October 2016.

The sample was weighted on age, gender, personal income, education, employment status and party vote at the 2014 general election. The survey has a maximum margin of error, at a 95% confidence level, of ±2.2% overall.

Respondents were identified as “recreational fishers” from responses to previous surveys.

**Contact**

For more information about this survey, please contact:

Grant McInman, 021 076 2040, email gmcinman@horizonresearch.co.nz

# APPENDIX 2 – TABLES

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks in your area | ALL | GENDER | |
| Male | Female |
|  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 12% | 13% | 11% |
| Poor | 22% | 25% | 19% |
| Average | 48% | 44% | 52% |
| Good | 16% | 16% | 17% |
| Excellent | 2% | 2% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,904 | 876 | 1,027 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks in your area | ALL | ETHNIC GROUP MEMBER | | | | | |
| Asian | Indian | Māori | Other European (includes Australian, South African, British etc) | Pacific Islander | NZ European/Pakeha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 12% | 6% | 5% | 15% | 11% | 8% | 11% |
| Poor | 22% | 24% | 11% | 25% | 23% | 27% | 23% |
| Average | 48% | 50% | 51% | 49% | 49% | 39% | 49% |
| Good | 16% | 20% | 29% | 11% | 15% | 23% | 16% |
| Excellent | 2% | 1% | 5% | 1% | 2% | 3% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,904 | 34 | 21 | 456 | 137 | 57 | 1,334 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks in your area | ALL | LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northland | Auckland | Waikato Region | Bay of Plenty/Rotorua | Hawkes Bay/  Gisborne | Taranaki | Wanganui/Mana-watu/ Rangitikei/Horo-whenua/  Palm-erston North | Waira-rapa | Wellington | Nelson/  Tasman/  Marlborough | Canterbury | Westland | Otago | Southland |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 12% | 19% | 16% | 11% | 16% | 14% | 9% | 10% | 13% | 12% | 2% | 12% | 34% | 7% | 11% |
| Poor | 22% | 18% | 24% | 19% | 34% | 28% | 21% | 18% | 6% | 21% | 21% | 20% | 28% | 15% | 8% |
| Average | 48% | 47% | 44% | 52% | 35% | 50% | 47% | 60% | 74% | 42% | 57% | 48% | 34% | 60% | 50% |
| Good | 16% | 15% | 15% | 19% | 15% | 8% | 21% | 10% | 7% | 25% | 18% | 17% | 4% | 16% | 28% |
| Excellent | 2% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 4% | 0% | 2% | 3% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,904 | 156 | 326 | 191 | 156 | 108 | 60 | 143 | 35 | 345 | 79 | 249 | 15 | 128 | 128 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limiting overall catch and rebuilding fish stocks in your area | ALL |  | PARTY VOTE 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ACT New Zealand | | Conservative Party | Green Party | Internet-MANA Party | Labour Party | Māori Party | National Party | New Zealand First Party | United Future | Other party | Chose not to vote | Was not eligible to vote | Don't know or can't remember |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 12% | 33% | | 11% | 16% | 28% | 16% | 37% | 9% | 21% | 9% | 10% | 9% | 3% | 8% |
| Poor | 22% | 0% | | 15% | 30% | 17% | 19% | 28% | 20% | 23% | 13% | 14% | 12% | 37% | 28% |
| Average | 48% | 67% | | 54% | 45% | 52% | 51% | 29% | 49% | 44% | 59% | 48% | 55% | 49% | 43% |
| Good | 16% | 0% | | 20% | 7% | 4% | 13% | 7% | 22% | 11% | 19% | 0% | 24% | 11% | 21% |
| Excellent | 2% | 0% | | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 28% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1904 | 5 | | 51 | 237 | 23 | 378 | 37 | 424 | 144 | 8 | 14 | 48 | 30 | 65 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas | ALL | GENDER | |
| Male | Female |
|  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 18% | 20% | 15% |
| Poor | 24% | 26% | 23% |
| Average | 43% | 39% | 48% |
| Good | 13% | 13% | 13% |
| Excellent | 2% | 2% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,851 | 860 | 990 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas | ALL | ETHNIC GROUP MEMBER | | | | | |
| Asian | Indian | Māori | Other European (includes Australian, South African, British etc) | Pacific Islander | NZ European/Pakeha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 18% | 7% | 9% | 20% | 16% | 14% | 17% |
| Poor | 24% | 28% | 13% | 22% | 27% | 9% | 25% |
| Average | 43% | 57% | 13% | 44% | 37% | 49% | 44% |
| Good | 13% | 8% | 46% | 13% | 19% | 21% | 12% |
| Excellent | 2% | 1% | 20% | 2% | 2% | 8% | 2% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,851 | 33 | 21 | 436 | 135 | 53 | 1,306 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas | ALL |  | LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northland | | Auckland | Waikato Region | Bay of Plenty/Rotorua | Hawkes Bay/  Gisborne | Taranaki | Wanganui/Manawatu/ Rangitikei/ Horo-whenua/  Palmerston North | Waira-rapa | Wellington | Nelson/  Tasman/  Marlborough | Canterbury | Westland | Otago | Southland |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 18% | 28% | | 19% | 16% | 24% | 16% | 21% | 12% | 15% | 16% | 10% | 16% | 25% | 22% | 13% |
| Poor | 24% | 30% | | 24% | 21% | 34% | 34% | 12% | 22% | 20% | 26% | 11% | 18% | 45% | 16% | 20% |
| Average | 43% | 29% | | 39% | 49% | 30% | 46% | 43% | 58% | 49% | 42% | 67% | 45% | 26% | 48% | 43% |
| Good | 13% | 13% | | 15% | 14% | 12% | 5% | 24% | 8% | 15% | 16% | 11% | 15% | 4% | 13% | 21% |
| Excellent | 2% | 1% | | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 6% | 0% | 2% | 2% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,851 | 152 | | 317 | 183 | 148 | 105 | 57 | 141 | 35 | 339 | 76 | 242 | 15 | 124 | 124 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Limiting industrial scale fishing in inshore areas | ALL |  | PARTY VOTE 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ACT New Zealand | | Conservative Party | Green Party | Internet-MANA Party | Labour Party | Māori Party | National Party | New Zealand First Party | United Future | Other party | Chose not to vote | Was not eligible to vote | Don't know or can't remember |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 18% | 0% | | 16% | 21% | 41% | 22% | 39% | 14% | 26% | 13% | 15% | 8% | 9% | 8% |
| Poor | 24% | 0% | | 45% | 32% | 13% | 21% | 37% | 25% | 26% | 24% | 12% | 25% | 15% | 37% |
| Average | 43% | 50% | | 18% | 39% | 34% | 43% | 18% | 45% | 37% | 63% | 64% | 51% | 50% | 45% |
| Good | 13% | 0% | | 21% | 7% | 13% | 12% | 6% | 16% | 8% | 0% | 8% | 16% | 25% | 10% |
| Excellent | 2% | 50% | | 0% | 2% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,851 | 5 | | 50 | 233 | 23 | 369 | 37 | 413 | 142 | 7 | 14 | 46 | 29 | 62 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fairly allocating catch entitlements between commercial, recreational and customary fishers | ALL | GENDER | |
| Male | Female |
|  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 13% | 15% | 12% |
| Poor | 26% | 29% | 22% |
| Average | 45% | 41% | 48% |
| Good | 15% | 14% | 16% |
| Excellent | 2% | 2% | 1% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,877 | 866 | 1,010 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fairly allocating catch entitlements between commercial, recreational and customary fishers | ALL | ETHNIC GROUP MEMBER | | | | | |
| Asian | Indian | Māori | Other European (includes Australian, South African, British etc) | Pacific Islander | NZ European/Pakeha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 13% | 18% | 5% | 17% | 11% | 11% | 12% |
| Poor | 26% | 11% | 13% | 30% | 25% | 11% | 28% |
| Average | 45% | 55% | 30% | 39% | 43% | 49% | 46% |
| Good | 15% | 15% | 44% | 14% | 19% | 25% | 13% |
| Excellent | 2% | 1% | 8% | 0% | 2% | 3% | 2% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,877 | 34 | 20 | 451 | 134 | 55 | 1,315 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fairly allocating catch entitlements between commercial, recreational and customary fishers | ALL | LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northland | Auckland | Waikato Region | Bay of Plenty/Rotorua | Hawkes Bay/  Gisborne | Taranaki | Wanganui/Manawatu/Rangitikei/Horowhenua/  Palmerston North | Waira-rapa | Wellington | Nelson/  Tasman/  Marlborough | Canterbury | Westland | Otago | Southland |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 13% | 25% | 17% | 13% | 17% | 9% | 13% | 14% | 4% | 12% | 3% | 12% | 21% | 7% | 19% |
| Poor | 26% | 32% | 24% | 24% | 25% | 34% | 12% | 19% | 40% | 26% | 37% | 19% | 35% | 27% | 19% |
| Average | 45% | 32% | 42% | 45% | 44% | 49% | 52% | 55% | 31% | 45% | 49% | 48% | 40% | 49% | 27% |
| Good | 15% | 11% | 16% | 18% | 15% | 8% | 23% | 11% | 25% | 15% | 11% | 16% | 4% | 17% | 36% |
| Excellent | 2% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 6% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,877 | 153 | 322 | 185 | 155 | 107 | 60 | 141 | 35 | 342 | 78 | 243 | 15 | 125 | 125 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Fairly allocating catch entitlements between commercial, recreational and customary fishers | ALL |  | PARTY VOTE 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ACT New Zealand | | Conservative Party | Green Party | Internet-MANA Party | Labour Party | Māori Party | National Party | New Zealand First Party | United Future | Other party | Chose not to vote | Was not eligible to vote | Don't know or can't remember |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 13% | 0% | | 14% | 16% | 33% | 20% | 31% | 9% | 25% | 11% | 10% | 2% | 15% | 6% |
| Poor | 26% | 41% | | 42% | 32% | 53% | 21% | 48% | 22% | 29% | 27% | 20% | 30% | 22% | 25% |
| Average | 45% | 59% | | 32% | 47% | 11% | 44% | 11% | 48% | 36% | 59% | 41% | 50% | 49% | 47% |
| Good | 15% | 0% | | 12% | 4% | 4% | 14% | 10% | 19% | 5% | 3% | 30% | 18% | 13% | 22% |
| Excellent | 2% | 0% | | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,877 | 5 | | 51 | 234 | 23 | 374 | 38 | 414 | 144 | 8 | 14 | 48 | 30 | 61 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reducing the bycatch of protected species like seabirds and marine mammals | ALL | GENDER | |
| Male | Female |
|  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 20% | 24% | 16% |
| Poor | 28% | 28% | 27% |
| Average | 38% | 35% | 41% |
| Good | 12% | 11% | 13% |
| Excellent | 3% | 3% | 3% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,875 | 868 | 1,006 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reducing the bycatch of protected species like seabirds and marine mammals | ALL | ETHNIC GROUP MEMBER | | | | | |
| Asian | Indian | Māori | Other European (includes Australian, South African, British etc) | Pacific Islander | NZ European/Pakeha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 20% | 8% | 2% | 22% | 19% | 17% | 20% |
| Poor | 28% | 31% | 27% | 32% | 28% | 10% | 29% |
| Average | 38% | 45% | 19% | 30% | 37% | 38% | 39% |
| Good | 12% | 15% | 30% | 11% | 14% | 28% | 10% |
| Excellent | 3% | 1% | 23% | 5% | 2% | 7% | 2% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,875 | 32 | 21 | 447 | 135 | 56 | 1,316 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reducing the bycatch of protected species like seabirds and marine mammals | ALL |  | LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northland | | Auckland | Waikato Region | Bay of Plenty/Rotorua | Hawkes Bay/  Gisborne | Taranaki | Wanganui/Manawatu/Rangitikei/Horowhenua/  Palmerston North | Waira-rapa | Wellington | Nelson/  Tasman/  Marlborough | Canterbury | Westland | Otago | Southland |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 20% | 34% | | 17% | 21% | 23% | 24% | 14% | 19% | 21% | 24% | 10% | 17% | 20% | 29% | 17% |
| Poor | 28% | 25% | | 30% | 28% | 32% | 20% | 18% | 20% | 44% | 25% | 29% | 23% | 45% | 24% | 27% |
| Average | 38% | 31% | | 36% | 30% | 39% | 48% | 48% | 43% | 34% | 41% | 54% | 39% | 21% | 33% | 36% |
| Good | 12% | 8% | | 14% | 19% | 6% | 9% | 18% | 12% | 2% | 9% | 6% | 15% | 13% | 13% | 10% |
| Excellent | 3% | 2% | | 3% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 7% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 6% | 0% | 1% | 10% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,875 | 153 | | 319 | 187 | 152 | 107 | 60 | 141 | 35 | 343 | 79 | 242 | 15 | 126 | 126 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reducing the bycatch of protected species like seabirds and marine mammals | ALL |  | PARTY VOTE 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ACT New Zealand | | Conservative Party | Green Party | Internet-MANA Party | Labour Party | Māori Party | National Party | New Zealand First Party | United Future | Other party | Chose not to vote | Was not eligible to vote | Don't know or can't remember |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 20% | 33% | | 21% | 34% | 53% | 26% | 36% | 14% | 33% | 12% | 19% | 5% | 19% | 13% |
| Poor | 28% | 6% | | 22% | 35% | 34% | 24% | 31% | 34% | 23% | 2% | 19% | 21% | 24% | 26% |
| Average | 38% | 12% | | 41% | 27% | 0% | 43% | 27% | 35% | 36% | 86% | 54% | 58% | 41% | 36% |
| Good | 12% | 50% | | 12% | 3% | 13% | 5% | 6% | 14% | 8% | 0% | 8% | 14% | 16% | 22% |
| Excellent | 3% | 0% | | 5% | 1% | 0% | 3% | 0% | 3% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 2% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,875 | 5 | | 51 | 234 | 23 | 372 | 38 | 413 | 142 | 8 | 14 | 47 | 30 | 63 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch | ALL | GENDER | |
| Male | Female |
|  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 30% | 33% | 27% |
| Poor | 27% | 29% | 26% |
| Average | 32% | 28% | 35% |
| Good | 9% | 8% | 10% |
| Excellent | 3% | 2% | 3% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,879 | 867 | 1,011 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch | ALL | ETHNIC GROUP MEMBER | | | | | |
| Asian | Indian | Māori | Other European (includes Australian, South African, British etc) | Pacific Islander | NZ European/Pakeha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 30% | 24% | 8% | 34% | 27% | 17% | 30% |
| Poor | 27% | 8% | 6% | 31% | 33% | 25% | 29% |
| Average | 32% | 54% | 42% | 23% | 24% | 28% | 32% |
| Good | 9% | 13% | 38% | 10% | 14% | 26% | 7% |
| Excellent | 3% | 1% | 6% | 2% | 2% | 4% | 3% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,879 | 34 | 21 | 451 | 135 | 55 | 1,312 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch | ALL |  | LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northland | | Auckland | Waikato Region | Bay of Plenty/Rotorua | Hawkes Bay/  Gisborne | Taranaki | Wanganui/Manawatu/Rangitikei/Horowhenua/  Palmerston North | Waira-rapa | Wellington | Nelson/  Tasman/  Marlborough | Canterbury | Westland | Otago | Southland |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 30% | 47% | | 29% | 28% | 32% | 28% | 26% | 27% | 37% | 35% | 18% | 26% | 37% | 30% | 27% |
| Poor | 27% | 29% | | 26% | 28% | 37% | 22% | 31% | 27% | 50% | 21% | 26% | 22% | 13% | 29% | 24% |
| Average | 32% | 20% | | 34% | 26% | 24% | 43% | 30% | 33% | 12% | 36% | 41% | 37% | 36% | 32% | 29% |
| Good | 9% | 4% | | 10% | 10% | 8% | 6% | 13% | 11% | 2% | 8% | 13% | 10% | 0% | 8% | 10% |
| Excellent | 3% | 1% | | 2% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 6% | 13% | 1% | 10% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,879 | 155 | | 322 | 186 | 153 | 106 | 59 | 142 | 35 | 344 | 76 | 244 | 15 | 128 | 128 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reducing the dumping of excess or unwanted catch | ALL |  | PARTY VOTE 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ACT New Zealand | | Conservative Party | Green Party | Internet-MANA Party | Labour Party | Māori Party | National Party | New Zealand First Party | United Future | Other party | Chose not to vote | Was not eligible to vote | Don't know or can't remember |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Very poor | 30% | 33% | | 21% | 42% | 72% | 37% | 48% | 24% | 45% | 16% | 28% | 5% | 26% | 22% |
| Poor | 27% | 14% | | 31% | 31% | 28% | 21% | 46% | 33% | 20% | 2% | 11% | 29% | 28% | 38% |
| Average | 32% | 3% | | 36% | 22% | 0% | 37% | 1% | 31% | 29% | 82% | 34% | 51% | 29% | 25% |
| Good | 9% | 0% | | 8% | 3% | 0% | 4% | 6% | 11% | 6% | 0% | 20% | 15% | 15% | 2% |
| Excellent | 3% | 50% | | 5% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 0% | 1% | 13% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,879 | 5 | | 50 | 236 | 23 | 377 | 38 | 416 | 142 | 7 | 14 | 48 | 29 | 64 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you think an independent inquiry into fisheries management and the Quota Management System is needed? | ALL | GENDER | |
| Male | Female |
|  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68% | 72% | 65% |
| No | 5% | 7% | 2% |
| I’m really not sure | 27% | 21% | 33% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,933 | 888 | 1,044 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you think an independent inquiry into fisheries management and the Quota Management System is needed? | ALL | ETHNIC GROUP MEMBER | | | | | |
| Asian | Indian | Māori | Other European (includes Australian, South African, British etc) | Pacific Islander | NZ European/Pakeha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68% | 53% | 58% | 77% | 65% | 64% | 67% |
| No | 5% | 11% | 2% | 4% | 4% | 0% | 6% |
| I’m really not sure | 27% | 36% | 40% | 19% | 32% | 35% | 28% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,933 | 34 | 21 | 459 | 140 | 58 | 1,352 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you think an independent inquiry into fisheries management and the Quota Management System is needed? | ALL |  | LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northland | | Auckland | Waikato Region | Bay of Plenty/Rotorua | Hawkes Bay/  Gisborne | Taranaki | Wanganui/Manawatu/Rangitikei/Horowhenua/  Palmerston North | Waira-rapa | Wellington | Nelson/  Tasman/  Marlborough | Canterbury | Westland | Otago | Southland |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68% | 80% | | 70% | 61% | 60% | 62% | 67% | 71% | 55% | 66% | 73% | 66% | 95% | 74% | 62% |
| No | 5% | 5% | | 5% | 6% | 7% | 2% | 5% | 2% | 22% | 7% | 5% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 2% |
| I’m really not sure | 27% | 15% | | 25% | 33% | 33% | 36% | 28% | 27% | 23% | 27% | 21% | 30% | 5% | 22% | 36% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,933 | 157 | | 330 | 191 | 162 | 107 | 60 | 142 | 35 | 357 | 80 | 251 | 15 | 130 | 130 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you think an independent inquiry into fisheries management and the Quota Management System is needed? | ALL |  | PARTY VOTE 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ACT New Zealand | | Conservative Party | Green Party | Internet-MANA Party | Labour Party | Māori Party | National Party | New Zealand First Party | United Future | Other party | Chose not to vote | Was not eligible to vote | Don't know or can't remember |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68% | 86% | | 59% | 83% | 96% | 72% | 73% | 61% | 76% | 39% | 50% | 38% | 65% | 59% |
| No | 5% | 6% | | 1% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 6% | 11% | 2% | 0% | 20% | 7% | 3% | 2% |
| I’m really not sure | 27% | 8% | | 40% | 16% | 4% | 26% | 21% | 28% | 22% | 61% | 30% | 56% | 32% | 39% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,933 | 5 | | 53 | 238 | 24 | 382 | 38 | 431 | 147 | 9 | 14 | 48 | 30 | 68 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you think that people taking marine fish and other public natural resources for profit should pay a resource rental? | ALL | GENDER | |
| Male | Female |
|  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68% | 74% | 63% |
| No | 9% | 9% | 10% |
| I’m really not sure | 22% | 17% | 28% |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,899 | 865 | 1,033 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you think that people taking marine fish and other public natural resources for profit should pay a resource rental? | ALL | ETHNIC GROUP MEMBER | | | | | |
| Asian | Indian | Māori | Other European (includes Australian, South African, British etc) | Pacific Islander | NZ European/Pakeha |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68% | 54% | 53% | 77% | 65% | 81% | 67% |
| No | 9% | 15% | 19% | 7% | 11% | 9% | 10% |
| I’m really not sure | 22% | 31% | 28% | 17% | 24% | 11% | 23% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,899 | 34 | 21 | 448 | 139 | 56 | 1,333 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you think that people taking marine fish and other public natural resources for profit should pay a resource rental? | ALL |  | LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Northland | | Auckland | Waikato Region | Bay of Plenty/Rotorua | Hawkes Bay/  Gisborne | Taranaki | Wanganui/Manawatu/Rangitikei/Horowhenua/  Palmerston North | Waira-rapa | Wellington | Nelson/  Tasman/  Marlborough | Canterbury | Westland | Otago | Southland |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68% | 71% | | 70% | 65% | 68% | 67% | 78% | 66% | 83% | 66% | 74% | 66% | 71% | 71% | 50% |
| No | 9% | 8% | | 8% | 8% | 9% | 8% | 5% | 10% | 10% | 15% | 7% | 12% | 3% | 12% | 16% |
| I’m really not sure | 22% | 21% | | 22% | 27% | 23% | 25% | 18% | 23% | 7% | 19% | 19% | 22% | 26% | 18% | 33% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,899 | 156 | | 323 | 186 | 160 | 105 | 59 | 143 | 35 | 345 | 78 | 249 | 15 | 125 | 125 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Do you think that people taking marine fish and other public natural resources for profit should pay a resource rental? | ALL |  | PARTY VOTE 2014 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ACT New Zealand | | Conservative Party | Green Party | Internet-MANA Party | Labour Party | Māori Party | National Party | New Zealand First Party | United Future | Other party | Chose not to vote | Was not eligible to vote | Don't know or can't remember |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes | 68% | 42% | | 42% | 75% | 96% | 74% | 70% | 69% | 73% | 29% | 53% | 55% | 65% | 38% |
| No | 9% | 0% | | 24% | 7% | 0% | 6% | 16% | 9% | 12% | 0% | 16% | 9% | 16% | 18% |
| I’m really not sure | 22% | 58% | | 34% | 18% | 4% | 20% | 14% | 22% | 16% | 71% | 31% | 36% | 19% | 44% |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| N (unweighted) | 1,899 | 5 | | 53 | 239 | 23 | 378 | 38 | 420 | 142 | 9 | 14 | 48 | 30 | 65 |

1. See Appendix A for identification of “recreational fishers”. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Small sub-sample: Asian and Indian respondents total 55 people. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)