

Queensland Governance – Part Four – The KARTERS have screwed karting

Yep, with one exception, the things that are wrong now and that we all complain about are our own doing. That's democracy for you and the current AKA system is inarguably democratic.

Crazy ? Not at all. What was the central plank of part three ? YOU get outvoted at a club meeting, your club gets outvoted at State Council, your view is back in vogue. Qld gets rolled at the NKC, your view is 'outvoted' again.

All over Australia, karters are asked to vote on matters at their clubs. Their clubs vote at their SKC meeting and the NKC delegate is instructed how to vote at the NKC. The ultimate decision is not of a majority of karters or even, necessarily, a majority of clubs. AKA rules are made by a majority of state votes where NT gets the same voting block of one for 60 karters as NSW gets for 2,500 karters.

That's plain wrong, but the theory is to give NT a boost so it's not suborned to the bigger states. Unfortunately, it hasn't worked and has in a number of cases seen QLD and NSW who represent more than 50% of the karters outvoted by the other states who represent less than 50%.

While we're at it, let's torpedo another myth, that karters don't get a say. Again, with one exception, when rules are made, you have had a say in it. The item for discussion makes it's way from the club or SKC that wants it to the National office where it is disseminated to all states and then all the states' clubs. You go to a club meeting, you get a say. If you don't go, you've only got yourself to blame for not getting a say.

The exception to both situations is where the NKC makes decisions that have not previously run the two way street. JMax is one, the sell out to CAMS another. By and large though, the rules have been formulated according to the due process and we've got what we ostensibly asked for but in fact didn't.

So, you say, just realign voting rights on the NKC according to states' karter numbers and voting rights on the SKC's according to clubs' karter numbers. That wont work either because most karters don't attend club meetings and some clubs' executives either don't consult their members or do as they think anyway. (And Dave, I don't include Townsville in that, I have no idea nor care how Townsville works internally)

But that completes the circle back to how to best manage sport and means electing a skilled board to oversee the sport itself and the business of the sport. Have each Board member chair a committee of hopefully skilled personnel in that area and have the karters, direct, and/or through the clubs, work the two way street.

Proportionality and parochiality ? Just eliminate it. The debate was raged in the national arena in 2003. You can see the arguments in the report I wrote in October 2003. You just cant satisfactorily resolve the problems so remove them altogether. **The karters benefit** in that. Club strength and abuse of club executive positions is redundant.

The issue of junior voters

This was also dealt with on a national level in 2003 and in the State model rollout to Queensland clubs, in 2004 and 2005.

Firstly, what do you get to vote on ? Just 3 things as discussed in part three.

If it's important to you to vote at elections and general meetings, get a licence.
(That was the national view)

It's suggested parents of minors (under 18's) are contributors and therefore should get a vote and I can see that view but I understand the opposing view too, which is it's inconsistency. Meaning, when the minor turns 18, the previous voter is dispossessed and an entirely new voter comes in who's views and contributions might be totally opposite those THAT PERSON has expressed through his parent.

There is no one answer except this, in 2005, the Queensland clubs, after consulting their members (because we required them to do that) voted 11 to 1 in favour of licenced karters 18 and over have the vote.

The right to vote is different to a parent's say or contribution because a parent can be nominated for a board position or committee and that doesn't end when his child turns 18.

Mark Hogan raised some questions as posted in part one (Qld Governance – Questions for Mr Spanner) To avoid you having to go there to see what Mark asked, his post is in *italics* below. Some of Mark's questions allow me to traverse under age and other 'voting', democracy, proportional voting and other things in a slightly different way. Excuse me please Mark if I take them out of order.

At present, a motion, agenda item, subject etc is forwarded to us by the State Secretary, it is discussed not only at club meetings but at practice, race days etc between the members. Then at a club meeting, the members, (those who attend 😊) vote and the Club Delegate is instructed on how to vote on these matters at the next state meeting. Or if a member feels they have a problem, they can raise it at a Club meeting and the same procedure can be followed.

In the model presented, how does a karter get their vote on a matter? Is correspondence forwarded to all karters over 18 on the state register? Or is it sent to clubs for distribution? Then do they have to post, e-mail, fax or whatever their vote? Or do the clubs then have to forward it?

You now know from part three, that whoever is the voter, you only vote on three issues, elections, resolutions for a general meeting and special resolutions. The Board is empowered with the entire control of governance and management. There is no longer an issue by issue vote as it were.

Ergo: all members of a voting age has a chance to have his/her say, it is not restricted to AKA licence holders over 18. And it's one club, one vote.

As to the move by Qld to go towards governance, the only and I stress only sticking point in our club was how a vote structure was to be organised. The model put forward stated that licenced karters be the voters when required, so A/ They must hold an AKA competition licence and B/ they would have to be 18 + yo. This leaves out senior licence holders below 18, Juniors, or at least the parents of juniors who do have an interest and ALL various club members who do not have a licence but are the stewards and volunteers etc. Without which, clubs could not run a race meeting

*and which Clubs and the AKA rely on to handle nominations, licences etc, which is the money that we and the AKA rely on to operate.
Without these people, who also have an interest in karting we would be nowhere.*

A concern of some of our members was also that if the model was followed, clubs with a larger proportion of members compared to others does have a possibility to sway any vote. (However paranoid that may be.)

Nothing is perfect and there's nothing you can do about a bigger club lobbying for its member voters to go a certain way and therefore having more "say". No reason a club cant lobby beyond its members either. But karters being the voters removes the lack of democracy in one club one vote. You only have to look at how the minority have screwed the majority on the national scene over and over to follow why the national working party plumped, as one of a number of reasons, for karter voters. It is democratic and it also removes parochiality completely so you don't have to entertain things like proportional voting.

I covered more of that in my report in October 2003. Some organisations have interesting ideas on it. The report is available through rvengines.com. I have also addressed junior voters earlier in part four and will come to other points Dave made on the subject in a moment.

Reading Pt 2 of your essay, does that mean the votes or concerns are directed to the committee responsible and they take note of the forwarded votes or requests but the final decision is made by them?

No, answered in part three and above. There are only 3 matters a voter votes on.

This is one of Dave's points.

If as proposed, the "Karter" gets a vote as repeatedly argued by VD, then those "karters under the age of 18" (approximately 48% of the karters in Qld), are not represented. There is no avenue for them to have their rightful say as to how the sport is run. Parents of these karters, almost half the voice is deemed unworthy of being heard !!!

The law is that minors have no say at all, let alone some notion that a minor has a rightful say. I am not being critical because I think I know what you mean and it's not the minor's say, it is the minor's parents say you are making a case for. That is a different question.

My answer to those who argue for under 18's to have a say/vote of their own, apart from the fact that they have no legal standing, is 2 questions:

If you were on trial for murder, would you want under 18's on your jury ?
If you could, would you leave your estate to under 18's in your will without being held in trust until majority ?

Parents. That's what you're on about. They **do get a say** and may contribute regardless of whether they get a vote and if they had a vote for a minor until the minor turned 18, then they are dispossessed. How is that rightful ?

I repeat. Queensland members voted 11 to 1 for 18 and over licenced karters to be the voters in 2005.

I must say, I am pleased at the number of viewers following these threads. Even RV is surprised. Probably 3 times as many as followed my national governance series as we tip-toed from meeting to meeting from March 2005 to February 2006. Having said that, it is becoming more and more apparent that the background of materials available haven't been read or have been forgotten. A re-visit of the rollout presentation to clubs is also in order for everyone who's been with the program since 2004 and more so, any newcomers.

Maybe, just maybe, I'll be able to wrap up the topic in part five.