

# Selection drama ahead

Scott Robertson continues to find out the difference between Super and international rugby. He will be starting to feel uncomfortable as he realises the ABs do not have the talent to beat the world's best consistently; South Africa, Ireland, France. He, Scott, via his coaching will have to provide the difference. But can he do it at the very top level? Jury's out.

Time to let go of the Cantab loyalty. Aumua must start in place of Taylor. Clarke must start on the wing. Tasman's Jordan obviously must start. It's not just Christchurch you're representing Scott. It's the whole country. Stop wearing red and black. Just wear black.

**Michael Mead, Newlands**

## Cross at crossings

I am incredulous! The Thorndon Quay pedestrian crossings at the centre of this controversy – proposed to be raised and with signals! Why?

The Road Code has adequate road rules to manage the safety of pedestrians at crossings. If raising the road surface to slow the traffic is necessary to enhance safety, surely having signals is enough, and raising the road surface becomes unnecessary.

Sure, have ordinary crossings, with signals if necessary, and we all get a smoother ride with less wear and tear on our vehicles, and an enhanced environment for the emergency vehicles to save a life in the inevitable incident.

Oh, by the way, please do the road works after the pipes are replaced.

I feel empathy for the Wellington ratepayers, but glad to live in Lower Hutt.

**Arthur Davis, Waterloo**

## Water woes

Ray Deacon (*A lifeline for New Zealand's failing infrastructure*, August 9) describes Labour's Three Waters reform as "a Trojan horse for pushing ideological changes". What exactly was "ideological" about (1) accommodating Māori rights to water as a taonga under Article 2 of Te Tiriti, and (2) having central Government take on responsibility for the water assets, escapes me.

Both were pretty straight-up pragmatic responses to the two central issues of (1) upholding Treaty rights and obligations while (2) funding necessary investment without resorting to privatisation.

Alternative solutions to those two



All Blacks coach Scott Robertson following the loss to Argentina in Wellington on Saturday.

PHOTOSPORT

problems may well have existed. But the Taxpayers Union's prescription – ignoring Te Tiriti altogether while opening the door to privatisation – is not only transparently ideological, but also less pragmatic. The pretence that Māori rights can be tossed aside, and the hope that justified public opposition to privatisation can be manoeuvred around by creative accounting, may be intended as a Trojan horse, but could end up stuck outside the walls.

**Geoff Bertram, Karori**

## Not in good health

It should be no surprise to anyone who has seen National Governments operate previously in this country that this Government is deliberately underfunding health. Why would they do this, you ask?

Because then the general public will look at taking out private health insurance. Because they fear "quite rightly so". They will not get the service they need, at a crucial time in their life. Or the life of a loved one.

Who benefits? Well, the private health providers of course, also the top surgeons, and doctors, they relish private work, and charge exorbitant fees. When I arrived in New Zealand, the then Prime Minister was Sir Keith Holyoake. A National Government Prime Minister.

I had to quickly assess the health situation in my new country. I was married with an 18-month-old daughter. The situation in the health sector seemed shaky, so I opted to join Southern Health, a private health provider.

After a couple of years, I began to realise it was unaffordable for us, especially when looking at the projected costs as we grew older.

There was no way we could afford the payments to this private health provider. The National Party is a capitalist party,

Letter to *The Post* sent 9 August 2024

Ray Deacon (“A lifeline for New Zealand’s failing infrastructure” August 9) describes Labour’s Three Waters reform as “a Trojan horse for pushing ideological changes”. What exactly was “ideological” about (1) accommodating Maori rights to water as a taonga under Article 2 of Te Tiriti, and (2) having central Government take on responsibility for the water assets, escapes me. Both were pretty straight-up pragmatic responses to the two central issues of (1) upholding Treaty rights and obligations while (2) forestalling privatisation.

Alternative solutions to those two problems may well have existed. But the Taxpayers Union’s prescription – ignoring Te Tiriti altogether while opening the door to privatisation – is both transparently ideological, and at the same time less pragmatic. The pretence that Maori rights can be tossed aside, and the hope that justified public opposition to privatisation can be manouevred around by creative accounting, may be intended as a Trojan horse, but could end up stuck outside the walls.

Geoff Bertram