

144

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 9/04/2013 10:41 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: KEVIN MURRAY ANSLEY Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: waikato Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission:
Any constitution that names age sex race or religion is a recipe for future bloodshed. The current
apathy of the general population cannot last in the face of continual provocation by minorities
especially with our current immigration levels. New citizens
cannot be expected to support apartheid as supported by our government. We must have one law for
all regardless of current minority opinion if the document is to last.

Sent on the 9 April 2013 at 10:41

4221

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 30/07/2013 4:23 p.m.
Attachments: Constitution submission.docx

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Grace Louina Aporo Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB:
Postal City: Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: Submission Upload: Constitution submission.docx

Submitted on the 30 July 2013 at 16:22

1. Do you think our constitution should be written in a single document? Why?

I think our constitution should stay as separate documents with clear links to each one. Why – can the governing body of the day guarantee that if the documents are combined to make one document that the mana of each document will not be 'swallowed up' by another which the government of the day decides has more thrust than the others. Can they guarantee that the Treaty of Waitangi will not be lost amongst the rest of the documents that we will not have to continue to fight for the rights of Te Tiriti.

2. Do you think our constitution should have a higher legal status than other laws (supreme law)? Why?

I'm not sure how to answer this but if we should give our constitution a higher legal status what does that mean for the other steps of law, do they simply slot in below the constitution. I am not a legal minded person but won't there be a domino effect with the other steps of law and how time and money will that take to put things in place to reflect the governance of our constitution.

3. Who should have the power to decide whether legislation is consistent with the constitution: Parliament or the Courts? Why?

Parliament, because they are the elected representatives of the people.

914

From: ~
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 27/05/2013 9:16 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Shirlev Ann Bryant Arabin Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Mount
Maunganui Postal Region: Bay of Plenty Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: I think our constitution should remain as it is based on existing legislation.

I do not think the constitution should have a higher legal status.

I believe the Courts should interpret the legislation.

I do not think the Treaty of Waitangi should be incorporated in the constitution due to the lack of precision in its terms which seem to be constantly re interpreted.

Sent on the 27 May 2013 at 09:14

4296

From: Anne Archer"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
CC: "Anne Archer"
Date: 30/07/2013 10:29 p.m.
Subject: CAP submission
Attachments: CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW SUBMISSION Anne.docx

CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW SUBMISSION

Do you think our constitution should be written in a single document?

No. The arrangement we have is flexible and has a substantial body of case law that resolves its limitations. Nothing would be gained by writing it into a single document.

Do you think our constitution should have a higher legal status than other laws (supreme law)?

No. This would take it outside the authority of the parliament and therefore that of the public at large.

Who should have the power to decide whether legislation is consistent with the constitution: Parliament or the Courts?

Only parliament. The judiciary in NZ have their own political/social agenda they wish to push, they are more interested in social engineering according to their views than remaining objective and independent.

How should Māori views be represented in Parliament?

Only by the normal democratic process. Maori views should carry no more weight than any other view. Everyone should be equal before the law.

How could Māori electoral participation be improved?

By abolishing separatist representation at all levels.

How should Māori views and perspectives be represented in local government?

Only by the normal democratic process. Maori views should carry no more weight than any other view. Everyone should be equal before the law.

Should the number of MPs stay the same, increase or decrease?

No strong view, but I don't think we need any more!.

Should the parliamentary term stay at 3 years or increase to 4 years?

Four years.

Should the election date stay flexible or be fixed?

Flexible

Should the number of electorate stay the same?

No strong view

Should the method of calculating the size of electorates be changed?

No strong view

Should electoral integrity legislation be re-introduced?

Yes

(5.a) Should the Maori electoral option (separate Maori roll) be retained or abolished?

The Maori Electoral option should be abolished. There should be equality before the law for all New Zealanders.

Should the parliamentary Maori seats be retained or abolished?

The parliamentary Maori seats should be abolished. I want equality before the law.

Should local government Maori seats be retained or abolished?

The local government Maori seats should be abolished. I want equality before the law.

Should the Treaty of Waitangi have a more central role in our constitutional arrangements?

The Treaty should have no role in our future constitutional arrangements. Our constitutional arrangements should not be based on race.

Should the protection of property rights be included in Bill of Rights?

No opinion

Should New Zealand retain our present flexible constitutional arrangements with the ultimate law-making power held by elected Members of Parliament, or should a new written constitution, which gives the ultimate law-making power to judges, be introduced?

We should most definitely retain the present arrangement.

Should the DECLARATION OF EQUALITY be enacted by Parliament?

Yes

Should constitutional change be dictated by MPs or subjected to a public referendum?

Subject to a binding public referendum.

Anne Archer

Papakura

2146

From: David Archer <
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.gov...
Date: 3/07/2013 10:21 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Please abolish maori seats.

We are one people, one country. Lets have one set of rules for all. Do not split us to the detriment of everyone.

2nd April, 2013

Constitutional Review Panel, Wellington.

One of your panel members Dr Ranganui Walker spoke to the monthly meeting of U3A Browns Bay this morning.

While Dr Walker itemised the aims of the Constitutional Review Committee we mostly heard about Maori grievances stretching over 170 years.. We were told about the bad effect Pakeha's actions had on Maori development, how victimised Maori folk were as a result, and how beneficial the welfare payments were for many Maori. No mention of the billions of dollars that have been poured into Maoridom over the past decades resulting in large investments both here and overseas. However this money does not appear to have improved the lives of many who still live in ignorance and the resulting poverty.

Dr Walker told us that because of this treatment, those New Zealanders with Maori heritage are entitled to special privileges and laws to redress their grievances. I bitterly regret that I marched and stood up for Maori and their right to play in NZ rugby teams in South Africa for it is now very clear that they wish this current government to continue its policies of separatism in New Zealand. Special privileges and ownership of natural resources are to be given to Maori but not to the rest of us. (In Africa this was called apartheid). **I always thought a democracy was about treating ALL people fairly and that all our laws should apply to all of us equally.** Well the establishment of the Maori Statutory Board attached to the Auckland Council has proved me wrong. It is just one more Maori group, NOT-ELECTED by Aucklanders, but certainly affecting our lives – just another well-paid gravy train for Maoridom. (And this despite the fact that at least 3 of the elected councillors have Maori heritage).

Nor was any acknowledgement given to the fact that that the British and European "invasion" over the past 200 years has taken this country from a land with little development to a country that can compare itself and its people's achievements with the best in the world.

I think it's about time Maoridom publicly acknowledged the contributions made by the people who came from Britain and Europe (mostly) bringing centuries of knowledge and technical skills and above all a willingness to work as hard as they could to achieve a better life for their children and their children's children. Kiwis are some of the most notable people in the world in education, the sciences, space research, education, sport, the arts and all this accomplished in 200 years. Our top students compare with the best in any university you like to name. Is that not an achievement that all of us can be proud of? I was sad that Dr Walker did not acknowledge the fact that New Zealanders of Maori heritage have reached the highest posts in our land. It should be noted that same degree of progress has not been made by our Pacific neighbours where a lack of knowledge and ignorance still abides. This means that these people still live in poverty and misery.

And I am so very tired of hearing about "the wide-ranging breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi" when no one (not even Maori) can agree a translation and its meaning has long been twisted by modern day Maori activists to mean anything they want it to.

On the radio today (9th) the Chairman of the Tūwharetoa Trust Board who own the Taupo lake bed is asking for more money for the use of the lake water from Mighty River. The chairman, Mr John Bishara said he "hoped that New Zealanders wouldn't see the discussions as just one more Maori money grab". Well I do and I believe many other kiwis would too. I understand that millions are already being paid to this Board for the use of **their** water - (similar to the recent Ironman grab, the results of which are being kept secret of course - I do wonder why – and so the claims go on and on and on.. the greed is sickening. And this situation could be multiplied the length and breadth of New Zealand.

One of U3A's members told Dr Walker that New Zealanders want the same laws for everyone and our members clapped his statement. **Any laws based on race are wrong, wrong, wrong.**

In conclusion any recommendations you make to the Government should be **about equal rights for all New Zealanders.** The Deputy Prime Minister Bill English has stated, "*Significant change will not be undertaken lightly and will require either broad cross-party agreement or the majority support of voters at a referendum.*"

Yours sincerely,

Jasmine Archer,

3091

Submission to the New Zealand Constitutional Advisory Panel 2013

As a supporter of Amnesty International, I write to add my voice in support of its submission to the current constitutional conversation.

I am concerned that all our human rights are not adequately protected in New Zealand law.

For example, our Bill of Rights Act 1990 only incorporates civil and political rights. Yet, it is widely recognised that human rights are interrelated, interdependent and indivisible; this means that one set of rights cannot be enjoyed in a meaningful way if the other set of rights is not also adequately protected and respected too.

I believe civil and political rights, such as the right to life, cannot truly be achieved without the equal right to work, accessible health care, adequate housing and education, which are enshrined in the concepts of economic, social and cultural rights.

Despite having ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in 1978, successive New Zealand Governments have failed to fulfill their obligations to respect, promote and fulfil these human rights.

While the Government says economic, social and cultural rights are currently protected by subject specific statutes, current issues involving these rights, such as child poverty, show that the current system is not working to adequately protect our rights. The maze of laws and policies around economic, social and cultural rights make it difficult for New Zealanders to understand and access their rights.

Without a clear framework to guide legislation and policy it also makes it difficult to see if laws policies are actually working to recognise New Zealanders rights. In addition many human rights in New Zealand lack avenues to remedies if they are breached, which limit New Zealanders' access to justice - an essential right of victims of all human rights violations.

I therefore submit the following recommendations:

- The incorporation of economic, social and cultural rights into the Bill of Rights Act 1990;
- The entrenchment of the Bill of Rights Act 1990 so that the weight and importance of these rights is adequately recognised;
- The explicit inclusion of the power for judges to provide remedies when the Bill of Rights Act is violated;
- That New Zealand ratify the Optional Protocol for International Covenant of Economic Social and Cultural Rights, including opting in to its inquiry and inter-state mechanisms, so that New Zealanders have access to an international remedy;
- The establishment of a Human Rights Select Committee to ensure that the impact of legislation on human rights is sufficiently considered;
- The requirement of all levels of Government to take a human rights approach to addressing human rights issues; and
- Increased human rights education initiatives to increase awareness of economic, social and cultural rights.

I believe these recommendations will provide for stronger protections within our constitutional framework for economic, social and cultural rights.

Taking these measures will ensure a strong legal framework in which all rights are equally protected. It will ensure that the Government can take a rights-based approach to addressing rights issues in New Zealand such as child poverty.

New Zealand has an obligation to take steps to progressively realise such rights as the rights to health, education, and adequate housing. Ensuring they are explicitly protected in New Zealand law is a significant step in ensuring that New Zealand is a place where human rights are protected, respected and fulfilled.

Peter Archer
Tauranga
New Zealand

3091a

From: P B Archer
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 9:52 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission.

Submission for the Constitution Conversation

Name: Peter Bernard Archer

Name of organisation : Pax Christi International

Postal address & email address:

, Mt. Maunganui. *Email:*

*

SUBMISSION:*

There is much work for New Zealand to complete if it is to be a human rights leader in the world..

Thank you for the opportunity provided by the constitutional review to let me tell my aspirations for the future of New Zealand..

It is possible to bring of a future where the human rights of all New Zealanders are protected by incorporating economic, social and cultural rights into the Bill of Rights Act. To do so would assist New Zealand's desire to be a member of the United Nations Security Council, further strengthening its position for this bid.

Therefore I urge

- * the inclusion of economic, social and cultural rights into the Bill of Rights Act.
- * the entrenchment of the Bill of Rights Act;
- * for judges to have the power to provide remedies; and
- * ratification of the Optional Protocol (a complaint mechanism) to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), including opting into its inquiry and inter-state mechanisms;
- * the establishing of a human rights select committee, and increased accountability around select committees to ensure that human rights issues are noticed and taken seriously;
- * the requirement of all levels of Government to take a human rights approach to addressing human rights issues and mainstreaming rights through their decision and policy making.
- * increased human rights education initiatives to increase public awareness of economic, social and cultural rights.

However, if New Zealand were to have a credible constitution, whether it be in writing or otherwise, it would need to uphold fundamental human values and virtues expressive of a free and just society.

At present, in relation to Aotearoa New Zealand these values and virtues are evident in

- * the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948.
- * Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007, endorsed by New Zealand in 2010)
- * Bill of Rights Act 1990
- * the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975
- * Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (see following).

If a written constitution were to emerge from the present "Constitutional Conversation", the fundamental human values and virtues as expressed in the above documents could form the basis of a written constitution against which all future legislation could be tested. This will ensure that all legislation will reflect those values and virtues, and work for the common good and dignity of the human person.

An important part of considering a written constitution for this country is that the Treaty of Waitangi and Maori should merit a special position in the constitution.

The constitution should confirm the Treaty of Waitangi as the Nation's founding document and the Treaty should be an integral part of the constitution..

As such, the constitution should protect the interests of Maori and their unique status both as Tangata Whenua and Treaty Partners.

The term "principles of the Treaty of Waitangi" has been established in some courts of law. Consideration should be given to these principles in the constitution when integrating the Treaty and Maori as Tangata Whenua into the constitution. These Treaty principles can be described as: "partnership... each party accepts the positive duty to act in good faith, fairly, reasonably and honourably towards each other" and "where these principles have to be applied to give fair results in today's world".

The Maori Constituency Seats in Parliament:

The Maori Constituency seats are a practical and vital means of ensuring that Maori as Treaty partners can elect Members of Parliament who will represent them and who can focus on the ongoing special areas of concern to Maori. This will ensure that the Maori voice is heard and concerns are expressed throughout the parliamentary process. The Maori Constituency seats should be entrenched by suitable legislation and remain as long as Maori want them to remain.

Maori Constituency Seats in Local Government:

In recent years, Maori have negotiated Treaty claims relating to wrongful confiscation of land by the Crown with great generosity and

This should be taken into account by the Crown's ensuring Maori representation in wards in Local Government where they may to continue to exercise their Mana Whenua and Kaitiakitanga under the aforementioned Treaty. The decision to do this should made solely by Maori electors, not by a majority of all electors as at present.

The Status of the Waitangi Tribunal

Since 1975, the Waitangi Tribunal has provided a means for Maori to seek redress for historical and current breaches of the Treaty by the Crown. While, with a few exceptions, the recommendations of the Tribunal have not been binding on the Crown, the quality of its research and the mana of its members have given the Tribunal's findings and recommendations a high level of moral standing and many of those findings and recommendations have formed the basis of Treaty of Waitangi settlements between Maori and the Crown.

I therefore believe that the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, evident in Waitangi Tribunal recommendations and findings, form an essential part of the Constitution, whether written or unwritten.

Furthermore that the existence of the Waitangi Tribunal should immediately be protected by Parliamentary entrenchment and that the Crown should agree that the Tribunal will continue to exist as long as that is the wish of Maori.

Peter Archer.

On Behalf of Pax Christi International, Mt. Maunganui Group.

[illegible]

4040

From: "Dick"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 29/07/2013 1:17 p.m.
Subject: my submissions

I list here my submissions regarding the questions asked by the constitutional review.

- 1a. The number of M Ps should be reduced to 99.
 - 2a The Parliamentary term should remain at three years.
 - 3a. The sixty-three general seats should remain, Maori seats should be abolished.
 - 4a. The Electoral Integrity law should be re-introduced.
 - 5a. The Maori Roll should be abolished.
 - 5b. Maori seats should be abolished, they have long since outgrown the intention that created them.
 - 5c. Local Government Maori seats should be abolished for the same reason.
 - 6a. Under no circumstances should the Treaty of Waitangi have any role in our constitutional arrangements.
- We are one nation, one people, race should play no part in governing this country
- 7a Private property should be included in The Bill of Rights
 - 7b. No
 - 8a. New Zealand should retain the present flexible constitutional arrangement, it is the most democratic way to run the country.
 - 9a. The declaration of Equality should be enacted by Parliament.
 - (b. A referendum is the only fair and reasonable way to initiate constitutional change.

Richard Archer

4327"

From: "Richard Archer"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 7:25 a.m.
Subject: Submission on constitutional review
Attachments: CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW SUBMISSION.pdf

CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW SUBMISSION

Do you think our constitution should be written in a single document?

No. The arrangement we have is perfectly satisfactory and has served us well. It remains flexible and has a substantial body of case law that resolves its limitations. Nothing would be gained by writing it into a single document.

Do you think our constitution should have a higher legal status than other laws (supreme law)?

No. Because that makes it open to the interpretation by the courts and takes it outside the authority of the parliament and therefore that of the public at large.

Who should have the power to decide whether legislation is consistent with the constitution: Parliament or the Courts?

Only parliament. The judiciary have proven themselves to be capricious political appointees beyond the reach of the opinion of the public.

How should Māori views be represented in Parliament?

Only by the normal democratic process. Maori views should carry no more weight than any other view. Everyone should be equal before the law.

How could Māori electoral participation be improved?

By abolishing separatist representation at all levels and encouraging maori to acknowledge their dominant non maori ancestry.

How should Māori views and perspectives be represented in local government?

Only by the normal democratic process. Maori views should carry no more weight than any other view. Everyone should be equal before the law.

Should the number of MPs stay the same, increase or decrease?

Decrease. It should be no more than 90. My preference though is for it to be no more than for a Board of Directors for a private enterprise of comparable turnover to NZ GDP.

Should the parliamentary term stay at 3 years or increase to 4 years?

Three years, unless there are binding plebiscites.

Should the election date stay flexible or be fixed?

Fixed

Should the number of electorate stay the same?

Indifferent

Should the method of calculating the size of electorates be changed?

Yes. To proportional representation

Should electoral integrity legislation be re-introduced?

Yes

(5.a) Should the Maori electoral option (separate Maori roll) be retained or abolished?

The Maori Electoral option should be abolished. I want equality before the law.

Should the parliamentary Maori seats be retained or abolished?

The parliamentary Maori seats should be abolished. I want equality before the law.

Should local government Maori seats be retained or abolished?

The local government Maori seats should be abolished. I want equality before the law.

Should the Treaty of Waitangi have a more central role in our constitutional arrangements?

The Treaty should have no role in our future constitutional arrangements. I want equality before the law.

Should the protection of property rights be included in Bill of Rights?

Yes

Should New Zealand retain our present flexible constitutional arrangements with the ultimate law-making power held by elected Members of Parliament, or should a new written constitution, which gives the ultimate law-making power to judges, be introduced?

We should most definitely retain the present arrangement.

Should the DECLARATION OF EQUALITY be enacted by Parliament?

Yes

Should constitutional change be dictated by MPs or subjected to a public referendum?

Subject to a binding public referendum.

Richard Archer

Papakura

5041

From: Richard Archer <
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.gov...
Date: 26/07/2013 4:13 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I am absolutely against any kind of "RACIST-BASED" legislation; any group or political party that promotes it are despicable.
Richard.

4541

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 1/08/2013 9:10 a.m.

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Alan George Armstrong Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Rotorua Postal Region:
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: NZ needs a written constitution
to put an end to political re-interpretation and spin that is often applied to legislation affecting human
rights.

Race relations needs particular focus, and for that reason the Treaty of Waitangi must be included as
a founding document and everything in the Constitution must be consistent with it. In addition
citizenship must give everyone equal rights regardless of race,
ethnicity, political opinions, religious beliefs or sexual orientation.

It is unsatisfactory that lawmakers can currently over-ride human rights whenever it suits their
purposes, and there should be a better way for citizens to challenge bad law than street protests or
voting those responsible out of office at 3-yearly elections.

For instance binding referenda or an Act giving the Supreme Court the power to review and annul
laws that contravene the Constitution would be effective remedies.

Submitted on the 1 August 2013 at 09:08

2918

From: "Bob Armstrong"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/07/2013 3:18 p.m.
Subject: CAP submission

Constitutional Review

I am Robert Brian Armstrong, Hamilton

I make the following submission on the Constitutional Review:-

A We do not need 120 members of Parliament. Return back to 80 elected and no list

B We do not need MMP. If we must have it, reduce the number of list members by at least 75%.

C Introduce Party-hopping laws - if a list MP hops, then that MP leaves Parliament as well as leaving the party.

D Eliminate all Maori seats and also the Maori roll

E Strip from all legislation all references to the Treaty of Waitangi and its recently invented "principles".

F Abolish all race based seats and raced based positions in Central and Local government

G Abolish the Waitangi Tribunal by 01 January 2015

H Ensure that no individual or group has preference in legislation or funding on the basis of ethnicity

I End the official Central and Local government promotion and enforcement of divisive bi-culturalism

J All New Zealanders to be treated equally at law, regardless of race.

4780

From: Keith Armstrong
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 3:39 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I make the below comments on the issues detailed in the Constitutional Review

1a Should the number of MPs stay the same increase or decrease
I am strongly supportive for a decrease in the number of MPs to a total of 99

2a Should the Parliamentary term stay at 3 years or increase to 4 years
I support a 4 year Parliamentary term

4a Electoral Integrity Legislation
I support the reintroduction of Electoral Integrity Legislation.

5a Should the Maori electoral option (separate Maori roll) be retained or abolished.
I strongly support the abolishment of this option.

5b Should the parliamentary Maori seats be retained or abolished
I strongly support the abolishment of these seats

5c Should local Maori seats be retained or abolished
These seats should be abolished. We need to become more unified as a nation.

6a Should the Treaty of Waitangi have a more central role in our constitutional arrangements.
Absolutely not

7a Should the protection of property rights be included in the Bill of Rights
For individuals Yes.

7b Should the Bill of Rights be entrenched
Yes

8a Should New Zealand retain our present flexible constitutional arrangements with the ultimate law making power held by elected Members of Parliament or should a new written constitution which gives the ultimate law making powers to judges be introduced?
Retain our present constitutional arrangements

9a Should the Declaration of Equality be enacted by Parliament?
Yes absolutely.

9b Should Constitutional change be dictated by MPs or subject to a public referendum
Public referendum is the only democratic method for constitutional changes.

The above is the submission of
Keith Armstrong

New Plymouth

2628¹

From: .
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 4/07/2013 9:42 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

We believe that the Maori seats in parliament should be abolished.

There are so many different races here now and we should all be simply New Zealanders. There are Maori in other political parties - chosen on their

merit as should always be the case.

It should be made illegal to have a party and choose people solely on racial grounds. It would be outrageous to have a Pakeha party and if we have a Maori Party then we are opening doors to other race based parties.eg. Filipino Party, Australian Party, Cook Islands Party etc.

Please ensure that Maori seats are abolished.

PL & KB Armstrong

Rotorua

3 603

From: "Robert Armstrong" ·
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 15/07/2013 5:11 p.m.
Subject: Maori Seats-Submission

NZ Constitutional Review.

Dear Reviewers,

I wish to state my opposition to continuing the race-based practice of separate seats for one of New Zealand's many racial groups. The facts show that Maori are already slightly over-represented in Parliament at this time and that separate seats are no longer required to provide Maori with representation.

If you add to this the fact that the overwhelming majority of 'Maori' are predominantly European racially the case for separate seats is even less valid.

I also fully support the submission made by Mr Michael Littlewood from the Research Section of Auckland University. I believe he is an expert in the area of superannuation issues and racial demographics, and his submission should be acceptable to you As Reviewers.

Let's recognise New Zealanders as one people, regardless of their race.

Sincerely,

Robert Armstrong,

Wellington
New Zealand

Phone:
Mobile:

2905

From: "Selwyn Armstrong"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 7/07/2013 9:10 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Sir, my views on the Maori Seats are that they should be abolished.
Race-based representation has no place in a modern society, our democratic rights should be based on citizenship not race, otherwise New Zealand will become a Racist and Separatist Society which does not bode well for the future.

Mr.S.N.Armstrong

Invercargill

4871

From: Ben Arnold
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 5:00 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission
Attachments: Constitution submission.odt

See attached

Ben Arnold

Wellington

Submission to the New Zealand Constitution Advisory Panel 2013

About this submission

This is my submission to the Constitution Advisory Panel as part of its public consultation phase.

I am making this submission on my own behalf. I have an undergraduate background in Political Science and a long-standing interest in constitutional law.

I also have a long career in software development and have been in recent years both a system architect and software development team leader. I have 20 years of experience understanding how formal systems work, how people interact with them and how to protect systems against failure or abuse.

Developing effective computer software requires many of the same skills as writing a legal document like a constitution.

why we need a constitution

Constitution as a defence against abuse of political power

Democracy is a form of periodic peaceful revolution. Constitutions provide both the authority that gives a government its power and the authority that removes that power when the time comes.

For this reason, a functioning constitution is what distinguishes a military junta, where might is right, from countries such as ours where leaders win the right to govern using a less violent form of influence.

In essence then, a constitution has a single overarching purpose: to constrain the power of government.

Everything in my submission relates to this purpose. When Government is behaving well and has the support of the electorate we have no need for a constitutional framework. This conversation is about the constitution which means it's a conversation about how to constrain Government power, during elections and between elections.

Whenever we discuss our constitution we must keep this in the back of our minds. What constraints do we need on Government power? What does abuse of power look like? How will we know it's happening? How can we protect ourselves when power is misused?

How a constitution constrains the power of government

A constitution must provide at least the following constraints:

- A process for replacement of governments through democratic elections
- Defence against capture of the government by powerful interests
- Transparency so that abuses of government power can be detected and resisted

The freedom to dissent and peacefully organise against the government without threat of retribution

- Regulation of the use of government power so that the force of law is applied impartially and humanely

The myth of constitutional convention

A lot is said in Westminster-style democracies about "convention". The Governor-General holds reserve powers that are not exercised by convention. The cabinet manual is full of standard practices and conventions.

In Britain it is fair to say that conventions are taken very seriously. The media is much more educated about the rules that govern political behaviour and the public has a reverence for convention and tradition. Any politician that breaks convention would be sure to suffer politically and if the breach were very serious or antidemocratic the Queen could plausibly intervene.

In New Zealand by contrast, the media has a very weak understanding of constitutional issues and typically takes its lead from the government of the day. When Helen Clark resigned her leadership of the Labour Party and stayed on as Prime Minister nobody questioned whether this had any constitutional ramifications. It went without comment. When a former head of the military and GCSB was appointed as Governor-General, no one questioned whether this was an appropriate appointment for an office that we expect to stand against the abuse of Government power should the need arise.

We need a formal written constitution in part because our constitutional conventions are so weakly defended.

The myth of the reserve powers of the Governor-General

We are told that the Governor-General holds reserve powers that can be used to protect our

democracy against threats. On paper this is true; our Governor-General maintains the legal right to exercise these powers. A bill to cancel elections could possibly be stopped through this mechanism.

In practice however the reserve powers are never used. They were used in Australia in 1975 and this was described as a constitutional crisis and led to the early departure of the Governor-General.

For the reserve powers to be an effective constraint we need to know that they will be employed when it's necessary to employ them. What Prime Minister would advise the appointment of a Governor-General who might consider using the reserve powers against them?

Consider the analogy of a fire drill in an office building. Because fires are rare we don't know what will happen in the event of a fire. Will people do the right things? Will the fire alarms sound? We solve this problem by creating imaginary fires to test that everything goes smoothly when a fire happens.

Without a regular test of an emergency system we can't have confidence that it will work when we need it.

Present threats to our democracy

Political party “donations”

We generally choose not to use the term “bribery” to describe political party donations, but we should. Even an altruistic donor is giving to a political party because they support the party's agenda. More often than not this is because the political party's agenda aligns with their interests. The upshot is that political parties with policies that benefit the wealthy are more likely to receive funding, and funding in greater amounts, than those with policies that benefit the poor.

If you doubt that donations are bribes here's a thought experiment. Imagine that the judiciary was funded by donations. Would you have any doubt that this would lead to corruption? Do we think our politicians are less subject to corruption than our judges?

Political parties have vastly more power than individual judges. The stakes are higher yet we don't have the same aversion to allowing political parties to receive bribes.

To some extent we do believe that political parties are corrupt. It's not unusual to hear people allege that the National Party is influenced by the farming lobby or that the Labour Party is influenced by unions. Even if this is merely perception and not reality, why do we tolerate the appearance of corruption in our political process?

Abuse of Parliamentary urgency

In recent years the number of bills passed under urgency has increased dramatically. It's true that something like urgency is a feature of many parliaments, but it's particularly dangerous in the New Zealand context.

New Zealand has very few checks and balances compared to other parliamentary democracies. We don't have an independent executive. We don't have an upper house. We don't have supreme law; courts don't have the ability to strike down legislation.

Our only effective constraint on government power is our select committee process. I understand that our select committee process is unusually rigorous, but if we bypass the process then we are circumventing the only real check we have on political power.

Oligarchic MMP

Under First Past the Post party dissent was commonplace and tolerated. MPs would cross the floor and debates within caucuses were vigorous and passionate. These are healthy features of a democracy and features that we have now lost.

Under MMP dissident MPs are more likely to be ejected from Parliament than be heard. Party leadership wields a large amount of control of the party lists and uses it effectively to keep MPs in line.

It's true that MMP now brings more voices into Parliament and it's true that compromises have to be made to secure a government, but once coalition agreements are made very little further discussion is had. The result is that minor parties get key policy concessions they can advertise at the next election and the Prime Minister is generally free to pursue whatever agenda they wish without the risk of losing a vote in Parliament, certainly not through defections.

Communications spying

Earlier in my submission I enumerated the ways in which an effective constitution constrains the power of government, in particular I pointed out that a constitution must provide:

- Transparency so that abuses of government power can be detected and resisted

The freedom to dissent and peacefully organise against the government without threat of retribution

Transparency

Secrecy is the antonym of transparency. Clandestine agencies are a cloak that can be used to conceal government abuses of power. Governments argue that they need the secrecy to effectively guard our security but if we don't have the information to judge the effectiveness of their programmes how can we make an informed decision at the voting booth?

For this reason, Government secrecy must be restricted to specific operations that are limited in scope and duration. Secrecy should never extend to the scale of entire programmes or agencies, because the electorate has an interest in these programmes and must be allowed to judge political performance with reference to these programmes.

It's possible that some programmes may be more effective if they were kept secret, but the risk of misuse of Government power far exceeds the benefits of any secret Government programme.

Very little is public about the programmes of the GCSB and SIS. Much of what they do probably has public support, but there is significant public concern about their involvement in the PRISM programme. The secrecy around the activities of these organisations keeps the public from the information they need to to effectively exercise their democratic power.

Freedom of dissent without threat of retribution

Over the last decade and a half the Internet has become ubiquitous in our lives. This has made it possible for Governments to spy on people in unprecedented scales. The United States Government, at least has admitted to doing this.

There are long-standing protection against search and surveillance. Historically warrants were required to tap phone lines or search people's property. These same protections are not always applied to the Internet.

The mere threat of Government surveillance has a hugely suppressive effect on democracy. People who feel that the Government is watching are likely to be less vocal about their dissent.

In 2009, Paula Bennett used privileged access to personal information to target two beneficiaries who had been criticising Government policy. She released beneficiary information that was embarrassing to the women and deflected attention away from the concerns they were raising.

Previously it had been the convention that ministers refrain from releasing private information and pass comment in the abstract or invite people to consent to having their information made public.

Paula Bennett's actions were not illegal and did not cause her to be removed from Cabinet or even disciplined. Her actions may seem minor but the message was clear: "if you speak against the Government we will use the power of the state to fight back".

New Zealand democracy suffered that day.

Recommendations

Anti-corruption

Donations to political parties should be illegal. As explained earlier in the submission, donations are bribes by another name and corrupt the political process. The United States shows how bad this corruption can get.

Political parties should be funded by the crown. They should be funded in proportion to their registered membership. This would encourage grass-roots political involvement and strengthen our democracy.

MPs financial assets should go in a blind trust. MPs shouldn't have a financial stake in their decision making.

Surveillance, secrecy and privacy

Search and surveillance operations should be limited in scope and duration. This applies to all forms of surveillance including Internet and telephone. It means that Government should not be able to gather private data for harvesting later.

Secret operations should be subject to Parliamentary and judicial oversight. Every party with, say, more than 20 MPs should have a member with security clearance who is briefed on the secret activities of government. All search and surveillance investigations should require a judicial warrant to proceed.

Use of private data to target political opponents should be a criminal offence. Paula Bennett would not have released the beneficiaries' private data if it was against the law. Instead she would have had to ask their permission or speak in the abstract.

Whistleblowing

There should be a formal mechanism for whistleblowing. People should be able to submit confidential or secret information to an MP where they believe that information may be in the public interest. This adds to the public discourse and strengthens our democracy.

A judge should vet the information before it is passed to an MP. The question of whether the information meets the formal criteria for public interest should be determined by a member of the judiciary. If the information meets this criteria the information is passed on to the specified MP who chooses what action they wish to take. The judge provides a check that this channel isn't used to distribute purely salacious material for use as political ammunition.

The identity of the source and security of the communications channels should be protected by law. People should feel that they can blow the whistle on their employers or the Government without threat of retribution.

Other safeguards

MPs and Ministers should be paid a fixed multiple of the lower quartile of personal income.

As high income earners, Members of Parliament personally stand to benefit from policies that increase the incomes of high income earners at the expense of the poor. This would be a simple way to align the interests of MPs with the interests of the less fortunate. I propose the lower quartile to avoid a conflict of interest involving unemployment benefits.

The Speaker should be selected by Parliament from members of the Opposition. This ensures that neutrality of the debating chamber. Since Government controls Parliament, they still get to select the speaker but they only get to choose from opposition MPs.

Prisoners should be entitled to vote. The reason for this is to avoid the Government being able to get even a political advantage through large-scale incarceration. At present Māori make up half the prison population, so this is only slightly theoretical.

A straightforward replacement for the party list system

I explain early in my submission the problems with the oligarchic nature of our current MMP system. This nature arises from the party list system, which denies roughly half of MPs a mandate for membership of parliament outside of their position on the party list. Party leadership has a great deal of control over this list and general election voters have little input into which list MPs get in.

I propose a much simpler system, which would eliminate much of these issues.

Supplementary MPs should be taken from high-polling unsuccessful candidates, not from a party list. Once the winning candidates have been decided and the number of unfilled seats has been determined, the highest-polling unsuccessful candidates get to fill these missing seats.

There would be a number of beneficial effects to this approach:

In close races, both candidates are likely to get in, better representing the split nature of the electorate.

Each MP has an independent mandate from a specific electorate, whether or not they are the winning candidate.

There would be no need to create, prepare and advertise party lists.

Since there would be no list MPs, the autocratic power of party leaders would be sufficiently diminished, allowing for greater internal debate within parties.

Upper house

Overseas experiences with upper houses tends to be less than satisfactory. In the United States, half the time the houses are controlled by different parties and nothing gets done. The other half of the time the Senate acts a nothing more than a rubber stamp on the House of Representatives.

New Zealand needs some kind of check on its House of Representatives for reasons I've outlined earlier in this submission. There are plenty of times where it would be useful to appeal to some higher body. It would be nice if honours lists and official appointments were apolitical. Essentially it would be useful to have a stand-in for the electorate that operates between elections.

The problem is that any elected council would be subject to political forces, either to make waves for the purpose of attracting attention and getting re-elected, or to align with allies in the other house. An appointed council is nothing more than a rubber stamp.

An unusual idea: a Council of Citizens

I suggest a third option, a randomly selected Council of Citizens: something like a jury.

Like a jury, this council wouldn't be expected to draft or amend legislation. They would function like a standing jury, responding to petitions from groups of MPs or even citizens. Their powers would be clearly spelled out and their decisions would be from a limited set of options.

Powers of a Council of Citizens

The powers of the Council could be many and varied:

Accepting amendments to the constitution to be put for referendum

Agreeing to a request from a certain fraction of MPs to expel an MP or remove a ministerial warrant

Agreeing to Parliamentary enquiries initiated by the opposition

Selecting royal commissioners and other important independent officials from a short list selected by MPs from across Parliament

Selecting people for New Years and Queens birthday honours lists

Refusing assent, dismissing the Prime Minister or dissolving Parliament (with a significant super-majority of councillors)

Some other powers currently vested in ministers of the crown, the speaker or the Governor-General

Composition of a Council of Citizens

I envisage that council consisting of about 20 citizens who would sit for a year, but each three months five citizens would be replaced, so that three-quarters of the council would have three-months experience.

I envisage the Council of Citizens could be chaired by a member of the judiciary with no vote on the council, who would effectively replace the Governor-General.

I realise that this idea is quite out-of-the-box and needs to be explored further but I think it's a much better solution than other upper house systems I know about and warrants genuine consideration.

Terms of reference

The terms of reference are very narrow and most of the issues I've mentioned above aren't covered except as part of the "catch all". I've focused on the issues I think are most important to our constitution, but I will make a few comments on the issues in the terms of reference:

Size of Parliament

120 MPs is the smallest that Parliament can be without excessive dominance of Cabinet over other MPs in the governing parties. More MPs mean there is a greater potential to discover new talent and grow our party leaders of tomorrow.

Term of Parliament

As I mentioned earlier in my submission, New Zealand has very few checks and balances when compared to other Parliamentary systems. Our two saving graces are our rigorous select committee process and our small Parliamentary term. It may make be safe to expand the term of Parliament once we have a formal Constitution with the Bill of Rights as supreme law and an Upper House or other similar check on Parliament.

Even if we put all these things in place, we should defer increasing the Parliamentary term until the effectiveness of these constraints has been proven.

Size and number of electorates

I suspect other submitters will comment on this adequately. I draw your attention to my comments about a replacement for the list system. If we had something like this in place then larger electorates may be viable.

Electoral integrity legislation

This is a power grab by party leaders and exactly the opposite of what we should be pushing for in our debating chamber. We should encourage dissent and vigorous debate. Instead of removing MPs because they have little mandate, we should structure the system to give every MP an independent mandate other than the mandate of their party. Again, I draw your attention to my comments about a replacement for the list system.

Removing someone from Parliament is an affront to democracy and out to be treated with the

highest suspicion.

The reality is that all list MPs have little mandate. Party leaders only draw attention to those list MPs who have little mandate and disagree with them.

My replacement for the list system is easy, simpler than a list system, less convoluted and much more consistent with democratic principles.

Crown–Māori matters

The only comment I feel qualified to make on this is that the we need to distinguish between Treaty issues and issues of social justice. This parallels a difference between iwi and Māoridom in general.

Māori seats arguably make sense as a positive discrimination measure to make sure that Māori are adequately represented in Parliament. However, one day we may reach a time when this social justice need for Māori seats no longer exists. At that time we should do away with them and progress as a nation voting together, not keep them as some misguided way to honour the Treaty.

Written constitution

New Zealand needs a formal written constitution. The reasons are explained early in my submission, particularly the risks of relying on constitutional conventions and reserve powers.

Bill of Rights

New Zealand's Bill of Rights should be supreme law. Laws inconsistent with the Bill of Rights should be struck down by the courts. My reasons are explained earlier in the submission, particularly the need to constrain the powers of Government and regulate the use of Government power.

I have also recommended various additional rights that ought to be added to the Bill of Rights (see the section titled Recommendations above).

1317

Constitutional Advisory Panel.
% Ministry of Justice,
Wellington

Dear Members,

My submission regarding the N.Z.
Constitutional Review is that we
want no change of N.Z.'s unwritten
Constitution it has served us well
since 1852. when the N.Z. Constitutional
act was passed as a founding
document. It may require some changes
but not a race based constitution.
We are meant to be One People
One Nation with equality for all.
New Zealand belongs to all
New Zealanders.

Thank you D + D Arnold.

Katiki

B.O.P.

5215

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/08/2013 12:01 p.m.

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Edwin Paterson Arnold Email: Phone:
Postal Address: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Christchurch Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: In order to
achieve a better way to run the country in the future, we could review the way in which decisions are
made.

The party political system could be much better as witnessed by the puerile standard of debate in the Chamber, the point scoring in the adversarial model we have, and by a code of conduct, respect and dignity both within and outside the House. The same postures

affect the media and the whole population in a "name, blame and shame" mentality, from which we as NZ'ers suffer badly.

The Swiss model may not be perfect, but places more emphasis on the issues at hand rather than on point scoring. It does involve more referenda, and needs people able to design the questions correctly.

No one party has a monopoly on wisdom, and opponents must always have agreement with some of the things a government wants to do. Debates which are issue-driven rather than party policy-directed would be a major step forward in improving the ways in which we

govern ourselves.

Submitted on the 10 June 2013 at 13:49

1256

From: Ted Arnold
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 10/06/2013 2:02 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have just had my on-line submission rejected so will include it in this email:

In order to achieve a better way to run the country in the future, we could review the way in which decisions are made.

The party political system could be much better as witnessed by the puerile standard of debate in the Chamber, the point scoring in the adversarial model we have, and by a code of conduct, respect and dignity both within and outside the House. The same postures affect the media and the whole population in a "name, blame and shame" mentality. The Select Committee process goes part way to this end, but party politics is still pervasive.

The Swiss model may not be perfect, but places more emphasis on the issues at hand rather than on point scoring. It does involve more referenda, and needs people able to design the questions correctly.

No one party has a monopoly on wisdom, and opponents must always have agreement with some of the things a government wants to do. Debates which are issue-driven rather than party policy-directed would be a major step forward in improving the ways in which we govern ourselves.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Yours sincerely,
Ted Arnold

Edwin Paterson Arnold

Christchurch

1312

Submission to the New Zealand Constitution Review

Thank you for the opportunity to submit to the review of New Zealand's Constitution.

- I believe in one law for all, with no special treatment based on race.
- I ask that our society be developed in equality, fairness and comradeship.
- I oppose any laws that establish or promote racial distinction or division.
- I reject references to the Treaty of Waitangi or its principles in any constitutional documents and that such references be removed from all existing legislation.
- I ask that race-based Parliament seats and representation on local bodies be abolished.
- I ask that the Waitangi Tribunal be abolished.

LORRAINE M ARNOLD

16th MAY 2013

D.M. & L.M. Arnold

Te Aroha

570

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 20/04/2013 2:30 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission
Attachments: 20April13ConstitReview.doc

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Edith Jean Paton Arnott Organisation Name: Email:
 Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal
 City: Palmerston North Postal Region: Manawatu Postal Post Code: Postal Country:
 New Zealand Submission: Constitutional Review Submission

I am concerned that our Bill of Rights allows people "rights" that impinge upon the safety of others. Also of concern is the granting of licenses with little thought to the conditions under which these licenses can and indeed should be revoked.

I have arrived at this conclusion as a result of the circumstances surrounding the death of my father in a road accident. The car versus logging truck accident on the 29th March 2010 that took his life was not father's first. On 19th March 2007 he turned into the path of an oncoming vehicle at the junction in Oamaru (Police file . For this he was fined \$150-00. There was no prosecution, no surrender of his license nor any retesting of his driving skills.

In the period between these two events the family was unable to persuade any of the stakeholders to stop him from driving. The Optician did retest his eyes and supplied him with a new pair of glasses. The family doctor assented to reissue his license even though family concerns were noted on his file. Police declined to get involved when approached. I personally confronted father and we agreed on a strategy to implement when he did give up driving. However to him the time to give up was still somewhere out in the future. It has been proven by research that older drivers are not good judges of their own ability hence they will be unaware of the dangers they present. Also well proven is the fact that one's faculties decline with advancing age. This fact is increasingly recognised by rental vehicle companies around the world who refuse to rent to older people at varying age limits. Alarming the current NZ standards for eyesight means drivers do not have to see the dashboard of their car – only very large lettering some 6 metres ahead.

The family exhausted every avenue and yet frustratingly nothing could be done to avoid this catastrophe. Equally exasperating is the period since the accident. The Coroner took a very narrow view of the tragedy blaming the wearing of incorrect glasses on the accident and ignored our submissions about being unable to get any stakeholder to act. Even the coroner's recommendation to LTSA about eyesight standards is not to be implemented. I have raised these matters with my previous Member of Parliament Simon Power and current Member of Parliament Ian McKelvie. I have corresponded with the previous Minister of Transport, The Honourable Stephen Joyce and had responses from the Honourable Nathan Guy and Simon Bridges (Associate Ministers of Transport in consecutive years) both in support of the current system. However Statistics show a different picture. Those over 75 have the highest risk of dying while driving of all age groups. As a society we keenly debate the age at which our youth qualify to obtain their license whilst

ignoring the riskiest age group.

Lives are being lost whilst officialdom prevaricates. Front-page article from the Oamaru Mail on 24 December 2012 supports this contention. From this you will see police are very concerned about the spike in road deaths amongst the elderly in the same region
my father died only one year earlier. All appear loath to act because of an irrevocable so called right aged drivers have to drive that beurocracy is equally loath to confront. Why are we so quick to protect the young when they are vulnerable yet leave the elderly, their families and other road users to shoulder the burden of risk alone?

Thank you for your time & consideration of the issues I raised.

From: Jean Arnott

Palmerston North

Phone

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2011/05/26/3227476.htm>

<http://www.crag.uab.edu/safemobility/hfw138/Wood.pdf>

<http://www.seniormoneymemos.com/2010/03/29/forever-young-but-too-old-to-rent-a-car/>

<http://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/medical-aspects/6.html>

Coroners reference CSU 2010 – DUN 000114

Personal communication from Mark Pugin, Team Leader, Medical Reviews, NZTA. Palmerston North

AA Directions magazine, Winter 2010, page 23.

<http://www.oamarumail.co.nz/news/older-drivers-a-concern-for-police/1696486/>

Submission Upload: 20April13ConstitReview.doc

Sent on the 20 April 2013 at 14:29

Constitutional Review Submission

I am concerned that our Bill of Rights allows people "rights" that impinge upon the safety of others. Also of concern is the granting of licenses with little thought to the conditions under which these licenses can and indeed should be revoked.

I have arrived at this conclusion as a result of the circumstances surrounding the death of my father Hugh Paton in a road accident. The car versus logging truck accident on the 29th March 2010 that took his life was not father's first. On 19th March 2007 he turned into the path of an oncoming vehicle at the junction in Oamaru (Police file 070322/3042). For this he was fined \$150-00. There was no prosecution, no surrender of his license nor any retesting of his driving skills.

In the period between these two events the family was unable to persuade any of the stakeholders to stop him from driving. The Optician did retest his eyes and supplied him with a new pair of glasses. The family doctor assented to reissue his license even though family concerns were noted on his file. Police declined to get involved when approached. I personally confronted father and we agreed on a strategy to implement when he did give up driving. However to him the time to give up was still somewhere out in the future. It has been proven by research¹ that older drivers are not good judges of their own ability hence they will be unaware of the dangers they present. Also well proven² is the fact that one's faculties decline with advancing age. This fact is increasingly recognised by rental vehicle companies around the world who refuse to rent to older people³ at varying age limits. Alarming the current NZ standards for eyesight⁴ means drivers do not have to see the dashboard of their car – only very large lettering some 6 metres ahead.

The family exhausted every avenue and yet frustratingly nothing could be done to avoid this catastrophe. Equally exasperating is the period since the accident. The Coroner took a very narrow view of the tragedy blaming the wearing of incorrect glasses on the accident and ignored our submissions about being unable to get any stakeholder to act. Even the coroner's recommendation to LTSA about eyesight standards⁵ is not to be implemented⁶. I have raised these matters with my previous Member of Parliament Simon Power and current Member of Parliament Ian McKelvie. I have corresponded with the previous Minister of Transport, The Honourable Stephen Joyce and had responses from the Honourable Nathan Guy and Simon Bridges (Associate Ministers of Transport in consecutive years) both in support of the current system. However Statistics

¹ <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2011/05/26/3227476.htm>

² <http://www.crag.uab.edu/safemobility/hfw138/Wood.pdf>

³ <http://www.seniormoneymemos.com/2010/03/29/forever-young-but-too-old-to-rent-a-car/>

⁴ <http://www.nzta.govt.nz/resources/medical-aspects/6.html>

⁵ Coroners reference CSU 2010 – DUN 000114

⁶ Personal communication from Mark Pugin, Team Leader, Medical Reviews, NZTA. Palmerston North

show a different picture. Those over 75 have the highest risk of dying while driving of all age groups⁷. As a society we keenly debate the age at which our youth qualify to obtain their license whilst ignoring the riskiest age group.

Lives are being lost whilst officialdom prevaricates. Front-page article from the Oamaru Mail on 24 December 2012⁸ supports this contention. From this you will see police are very concerned about the spike in road deaths amongst the elderly in the same region my father died only one year earlier. All appear loath to act because of an irrevocable so called **right** aged drivers have to drive that beurocracy is equally loath to confront. Why are we so quick to protect the young when they are vulnerable yet leave the elderly, their families and other road users to shoulder the burden of risk alone?

Thank you for your time & consideration of the issues I raised.

From:

Palmerston North
Phone

⁷ AA Directions magazine, Winter 2010, page 23.

⁸ <http://www.oamarumail.co.nz/news/older-drivers-a-concern-for-police/1696486/>

Submission to the New Zealand Constitutional Advisory Panel 2013

As a supporter of Amnesty International, I write to add my voice in support of its submission to the current constitutional conversation.

I am concerned that all our human rights are not adequately protected in New Zealand law.

For example, our Bill of Rights Act 1990 only incorporates civil and political rights. Yet, it is widely recognised that human rights are interrelated, interdependent and indivisible; this means that one set of rights cannot be enjoyed in a meaningful way if the other set of rights is not also adequately protected and respected too.

I believe civil and political rights, such as the right to life, cannot truly be achieved without the equal right to work, accessible health care, adequate housing and education, which are enshrined in the concepts of economic, social and cultural rights.

Despite having ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights in 1978, successive New Zealand Governments have failed to fulfill their obligations to respect, promote and fulfil these human rights.

While the Government says economic, social and cultural rights are currently protected by subject specific statutes, current issues involving these rights, such as child poverty, show that the current system is not working to adequately protect our rights. The maze of laws and policies around economic, social and cultural rights make it difficult for New Zealanders to understand and access their rights.

Without a clear framework to guide legislation and policy it also makes it difficult to see if laws policies are actually working to recognise New Zealanders rights. In addition many human rights in New Zealand lack avenues to remedies if they are breached, which limit New Zealanders' access to justice - an essential right of victims of all human rights violations.

I therefore submit the following recommendations:

- The incorporation of economic, social and cultural rights into the Bill of Rights Act 1990;
- The entrenchment of the Bill of Rights Act 1990 so that the weight and importance of these rights is adequately recognised;
- The explicit inclusion of the power for judges to provide remedies when the Bill of Rights Act is violated;
- That New Zealand ratify the Optional Protocol for International Covenant of Economic Social and Cultural Rights, including opting in to its inquiry and inter-state mechanisms, so that New Zealanders have access to an international remedy;
- The establishment of a Human Rights Select Committee to ensure that the impact of legislation on human rights is sufficiently considered;
- The requirement of all levels of Government to take a human rights approach to addressing human rights issues; and
- Increased human rights education initiatives to increase awareness of economic, social and cultural rights.

I believe these recommendations will provide for stronger protections within our constitutional framework for economic, social and cultural rights.

Taking these measures will ensure a strong legal framework in which all rights are equally protected. It will ensure that the Government can take a rights-based approach to addressing rights issues in New Zealand such as child poverty.

New Zealand has an obligation to take steps to progressively realise such rights as the rights to health, education, and adequate housing. Ensuring they are explicitly protected in New Zealand law is a significant step in ensuring that New Zealand is a place where human rights are protected, respected and fulfilled.

Rosemary Arnoux
Auckland
New Zealand

64
ConstitutionalReview - <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 26/03/2013 9:49 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation.

Full Names: Thomas Edward Brian ARRANDALE

Organisation

Name:

Email:

Phone:

Post:

AddressA:

**Postal
AddressB:**

Postal City:

Postal Region: Waikato

Postal Pos

Code:

Postal New Zealand

Country:

Submission: Before the Government adopts the Treaty of Waitangi as the Constitution of New Zealand a universal vote must be held; as this is a monumental change to the Constitution of this country.

Failure by Parliament to allow a universal vote on a written Constitution is contrary to our democratic rights, and furthermore would open this country to a dictatorship of an ethnic unelected minority.

Furthermore if Parliament refuses the right to a vote on this issue, I would consider it an act of dictatorship, and would therefore not be bound by this law.

Sent on the 26 March 2013 at 09:48

64^(a)

ConstitutionalReview - <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

From:

To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>

Date: 28/03/2013 11:41 a.m.

Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation.

Full Names: Thpmas Edward BRIAN

Organisation

Name:

Email

Phone:

Postal

AddressA:

Postal

AddressB:

Postal City:

Postal Region: Waikato

Postal Post

Code:

Postal New Zealand

Country:

Submission: Addition to my recent submission.

In view of the composition of the Panel how did the Government arrive at the decision to have 5 Maori Members when Maori are approx only 15% of the population?

Why is the Panel not represented on the population basis of our nation?, The inclusion of 5 Maori members represents an over representation on ethnic grounds at the expense of the majority.

On this basis, this is NOT A FAIR REPRESENTATIVE PANEL OF NEW ZEALANDERS and therefore any conclusion or decision on a Constitution that this Panel may recommend to Parliament is totally undemocratic, having no relevance or constitutional authority in our democracy.

Sent on the 28 March 2013 at 11:40

64b

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 28/03/2013 11:41 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names:	Thpmas Edward BRIAN	Organisation Name:	Email:	
	Phone:		Postal AddressA	Postal AddressB:
Postal City:	Postal Region:	Waikato	Postal Post Code:	Postal Country:
New Zealand	Submission:	Addition to my recent submission.		

In view of the composition of the Panel how did the Government arrive at the decision to have 5 Maori Members when Maori are approx only 15% of the population?

Why is the Panel not represented on the population basis of our nation?, The inclusion of 5 Maori members represents an over representation on ethnic grounds at the expense of the majority.

On this basis, this is NOT A FAIR REPRESENTATIVE PANEL OF NEW ZEALANDERS and therefore any conclusion or decision on a Constitution that this Panel may recommend to Parliament is totally undemocratic, having no relevance or constitutional authority in our democracy.

Sent on the 28 March 2013 at 11:40

64c

From: "Brian"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 3/07/2013 2:10 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Constitutional Advisory Panel

I hereby place this submission.

I vote for the removal of the Maori seats for the under-mentioned reasons.

1. I do not believe that it is in the interests of any Democracy that any one Group ethnic or otherwise, should be granted special seats in our Houses of Representatives (ie Parliament.)
2. In any Western Democracy the basis of parliamentary representation is that all have the same rights, with no special privileges accorded to either ethnic, religion or colour of the people.
3. That these Maori seats endanger New Zealand democracy, and open this country to the option or right, for other groups that may demand consideration for special Parliamentary seats.
4. That the Maori Roll be abolished as since this country became a Dominion all its citizens are equal under the law and therefore need only one electoral roll.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

Thomas Edward Brian ARRANDALE.

dated at 1408 hours 3rd July 2013.

1189

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 9/06/2013 8:27 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Christine Arnott Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Auckland Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: I don't think there should be the need for a Maori Party, or separate Maori Boards. If
Maori want to be represented they are very capable of being elected naturally. They are a very
intelligent people. We do not need separatism. They will have received
all their justified claims through the Treaty Settlements and that should be an end to it. You can not
have your cake and eat it too as they say.

The dole age should be raised to 18 thus encouraging kids to work rather than start life off on a
benefit, thus removing the need to raise the retirement age.

It's time we started working together for the good of each other and make this country the great and
fare place it should be. Promote growth by allowing mining, oil exploration and Maori using their land
for useful endeavours (not growing dope) Crops can be
grown and exported and their life will be more fulfilling. There are so many things the youth can be
doing instead of sitting around on the dole. You don't need a University Degree to learn to paint
houses and do gardening and it is very rewarding.

I don't think my wishes for New Zealand are that out of reach and sure wouldn't cost the earth.

Sent on the 9 June 2013 at 08:26

4848

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 4:53 p.m.

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Tim Arthur Organisation Name: self Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: Sth Auckland . Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: New Zealand is getting torn apart by self righteous religious ,and or tribal individuals
having apparently too much influence on the powers that be . New Zealanders by nature owing to our
Gods own fortunate birth & existence will be a forgotten society
if this trend is allowed to go forward unchallenged .We need to front up ,put a stop to the abuse of
this country by a handful of disruptive selfish driven persons whose agenda is to breed contempt , evil
civil un-rest , & disrespect through our society .As
also on our very own doorstep ,NZ Maori folk fought along side us for a common cause , now having
jointly benefitted , they are continually asking to bite the hand that has been offered them . Its got out
of hand I personally believe any attempt to rectify
will be too late . As is the prime example of the extended

points of reference being conveniently conceived for their disruptive self benefiting purpose by the
Waitangi tribunal

advocates . The gravy train has to crash . Other groups of religious fractions need to respect our ways
, live accordingly , peacefully , and respectively . Those that can- not , their problem , go home !
UNITED WE STAND LEAST UNITED WE FALL .

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 16:52

1467

From: Jane Asbury <...>
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 19/06/2013 2:25 p.m.
Subject: NZ Constitution

Dear Secretariat, Constitutional Advisory Panel

NZ does not need a written constitution. The British system based on Westminster law has served us well and there is no need to change.

A written constitution by definition is the result of the conscious and deliberate efforts of the people. Little attempt has been made to ensure any proposed written constitution has the overwhelming support of the NZ people. There has been little public debate and in general the population of NZ are unaware of what a written constitution means to them and their future.

Constitutional law takes precedence over ordinary law (as demonstrated in the USA) and any written constitution that is not as a result of the conscious and deliberate efforts of the people is a recipe for strife.

I strongly oppose any legislation or reference to the Treaty of Waitangi should one be drafted now or in the future. There is strong debate over which version of the Treaty truly represents the intentions of the parties who signed it. There is also strong debate over meanings of words in the various versions of the Treaty, what they meant at the time of signing and what they have now been construed to mean. Without a verification and NZ wide agreement on the correct version of the Treaty and the true intent of the wording of the original Treaty any document or legislation referring to the Treaty is flawed.

Sincerely Jane Asbury

1200

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 9/06/2013 11:06 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Douglas R,H, Ashby Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: PAEROA Postal Region: Postal
Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: There should be one law for all
New Zealanders. Any privilege or distinction based on race or ethnicity is totally unacceptable.
Therefore I support the Declaration Of Equality

Doug Ashby

PAEROA

Sent on the 9 June 2013 at 11:05

1483

From: Jan Asher
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 20/06/2013 12:05 p.m.
Subject: I STRONGLY OPPOSE CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

New Zealand does not need a written constitution and I strongly oppose any legislation or reference to the Treaty of Waitangi should one be drafted now or in the future.

Please STOP this foolishness and do not impose separatism and bi-culturalism on New Zealand.

Yours sincerely

JAN ASHER
Tauranga

95

ConstitutionalReview - The form on your contact page has just been submitted

From:

To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>

Date: 7/04/2013 4:18 p.m.

Subject: The form on your contact page has just been submitted

Sent from Constitutional Advisory Panel.

Contact Joan Hayes Ashford

Name:

Phone:

Email:

Comment: My submission with regard the NZ Constitutional Review is that I want NO CHANGE TO NZ's unwritten constitution it has served us well since the 1852 NZ Constitutional Act was passed. STOP trying to make us into two peoples, we are ONE let's go back to before the so called Treaty rubbish was started by Maori that are too lazy and want only to be looked after by us hard working people OF ALL NATIONALITIES WE ARE ONE PEOPLE AND ALWAYS WILL BE.

Sign Up For Yes

Updates:

Sent on the 7 April 2013 at 16:17

1978

From: Brian & Mary Ashmore
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 30/06/2013 11:43 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I wish to record my concern at the possibility of a new constitution that will give preference to any particular ethnic group.

New Zealanders are generally an apathetic bunch and as a result many unpopular policies are adopted that are contrary to the wishes of the majority.

This current review of a Constitution appears to have been introduced "under the radar" with the intention of pushing through a document that will give further priority to Maori.

Much consultation has been held with Maori making them aware of what benefit they will achieve with a Constitution that will give them benefits. No such consultation has been widely been made with other New Zealanders.

Even the web site advising of possible changes is Maori slanted using the term Aotearoa and whanau prominently displayed.

It is absolutely abhorrent that legislation giving preference to one ethnic group should even be considered. I know of no other democratic country that has such legislation, South Africa had one called apartheid.

We have had years of treaty settlements (many multiple claims being revisited) and they show no sign of stopping. Most New Zealanders have had enough but the new proposals will only accentuate the problem.

We hear a lot about child poverty but nothing about how the billions of dollars given in settlements have been used to help. The money seems to stop at the elite Maori level.

Several elections ago John Key promised to abolish Maori seats in Parliament. This has now been forgotten and there is talk of extra Maori seats. In addition, Maori representation on Local Bodies is costing ratepayers further millions.

I understand Maori represent 15% of our population. I would expect that a large proportion of that would be part Maori who register as such for benefits.

The percentage of New Zealanders with some Maori ancestry is huge but many of these people don't regard themselves as Maori or claim special treatment, they regard themselves as New Zealanders.

In my own family, I had a Maori mother in law who was quarter Maori. Three generations of her descendants has resulted in 37 descendants. None of these descendants regard themselves as Maori but they should have as much right to claim benefits from their ancestry.

Given that my mother in law had 12 siblings you could make a good guess at the number of part Maori have resulted from that family.

A democracy should give equal rights to all regardless of ethnicity. We continue to head down the track of special rights for Maori and the

suggestion that Maori will have special treatment is going to continue to drive division in this country.

I strongly oppose any racist preference in any Constitution, Parliament, Local Body, etc. We are all New Zealanders and should be treated equally.

Leonard Edward Brian Ashmore

Auckland

1078a

From: Brian Ashmore
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 4/07/2013 9:48 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I wish to record my objection to the retaining of Maori seats.

Such preference together with our ridiculous MMP system gives a disproportionate position to Maori.

I also object to the right that Maori have special representation on local bodies and similar organisations.

It is about time that we adopt the democratic system of equal rights for all regardless of race.

Leonard Edward Brian Ashmore

Auckland

1978b.

From: Brian Ashmore <
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.gov...
Date: 4/07/2013 10:00 a.m.
Subject: Maori Seats

I wish to record my support of any move to abolish Maori seats in our Parliament.

The present system together with our MMP system give Maori a disproportionate ability to influence Parliament.

I also support the abolition of special representation for Maori on local body and similar organisations.

It is about time we stopped the PC nonsense and adopt the democratic system of one vote for all regardless of race.

Leonard Edward Brian Ashmore

Auckland

1978c

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 6/07/2013 10:09 a.m.
Subject: Constitutional Review

Several days ago I e mailed my opinions on the current review process.

One matter I did not cover in my e mail was the most important one.

I consider that any review should be undertaken by a Referendum held at the same time as a General Election and that Referendum should be binding.

Changes should not be able to be made by Parliament or any legal bodies (Supreme Court, Law Society) as they all have vested interests that may override the wishes of the people.

The contentious areas that appear to be under consideration relate to Maori special rights which I am sure would not gain majority support.

I dont believe there is any reason to make any changes but a referendum would be a good idea to get a true reflection of public opinion.

I think any referendum should ask for a yes/no vote on a number of issues:

1. Should Maori seats in Parliament be abolished.
2. Should the Treaty of Waitangi be scrapped.
3. Should the treaty be enshrined in a constitution to give Maori preferential treatment.
4. Should the present system of giving Maori special treatment on local bodies and similar be scrapped.
5. Do you think there should be special rights for any racial group.

Unless we adopt a democratic system of equal rights for all we will see a growing continuation of claims for special treatment and payments for perceived grievances.

Leonard Edward Brian Ashmore

Auckland

Phone

--

/Visit our new-look website at

Free Phone:

Phone:

Fax:

Mobile: 01223 316100

844

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 14/05/2013 8:31 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Phillip & Isabel Ashmore Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal
AddressB: Postal City: Postal Region: Bay of Plenty Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: Our submission regarding the NZ
Constitutional Review is that we do NOT want to see ANY changes that are race based. We do not
want to go down the same road that South Africa failed on. New Zealand's unwritten constitution has
served us well since the
1852 NZ Constitutional Act was passed and do not believe it requires any amendments at present.

Sent on the 14 May 2013 at 20:30

5111

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 7/08/2013 3:54 p.m.

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Wayne Philip Ashton Email: Postal AddressA:
Postal City: Paraparaumu Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: Any NZ constitution
must be based on the principle of equality for all. There must be no rights or privileges given to any
group based on race.

We are all immigrants. No rights or privileges should be granted to groups based on the order or
arrival to NZ.

Any constitution must encourage the development of a meritocracy. People advance through their
efforts rather than through a status based on race.

Submitted on the 16 June 2013 at 12:44

2872

From: "Frank Edward Ashworth"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 6/07/2013 1:48 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

There is no justification in our country for legislation based on race or ethnicity. We should all have the same rights and be bound by the same obligations. If you refer to your history books you will find all attempts at social engineering by legislation have failed. Why should we be so arrogant to think we can succeed. The creation of Maori Seats was a short term measure and their continuance is an insult to the Maori race. They must be abolished. Two of my grandsons identify themselves as Maori and I can assure you they do not need the crutch of racist legislation to succeed. Whilst you are at it you should also get rid of the ridiculous Waitangi Tribunal which only benefits lawyers and gravy train Maori. Talk to the average Maori in the street and ask him . Frank Ashworth.

2541

From: Ron Atkin
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.gov...
Date: 4/07/2013 12:13 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I am of the opinion that Maori seats in Government and/or local authorities should be abolished, for the sole reason that they are race based.

I want one law for all and no particular race or sect or religion or gender to get any preference over any other group, or the populace, as far as deciding on the outflows of our taxes or decision making for and on behalf of the rest of us.

We have enough hideous examples around the world now of what happens when undue preference is given to these groupings. We are not immune to such repercussions here, even when the granting of additional rights on basis or race are taken with the best of intentions.

Maori will not be prejudiced by our voting entitlement, if there is no Maori seats - any more than any other race.

And we are not in partnership with Maori. That is an opinion of a single member of the Waitangi Tribunal. We are all equal citizens in New Zealand or we are heading for serious trouble.

Ron Atkin

Napier.

3013

newzealand.govt.nz

Our constitution is the set of rules that determines how this country is governed and how we all live together.



Tell us your aspirations for our country and let us know what's important to you about how this country is run:

More love, tolerance, listening,
involved democratic processes
(participative democracy.)
Less apathy, manipulation,
self-serving politicians and
businesses. More looking out for one
another and Papatuanuku.

You can find out more about the Constitution Conversation and make a fuller submission online at www.ourconstitution.org.nz

Secretariat
Constitutional Advisory Panel
C/o Ministry of Justice
DX SX 10088
Wellington

Name(s):

ROSALIND ATKINSON

Email or postal Address:

☐

Tick box to receive regular updates by email

6088.1

1751 Quick Submission

Your name:

Peter Atwood

Name of the organisation you represent (if applicable):

Postal address or email address:

Dunedin

While dubious about the authenticity of this 'conversation', I, nevertheless, submit.

In any constitutional review my key aspiration is that the constitution reflects the unity in diversity of this country where all races / cultures are treated equally and no one group is given primacy over another.

Treaty of Waitangi. I would like to see the status quo kept where the Treaty is a founding document alongside other laws / statutes. For me it has no primacy overall.

Electoral Matters

- Keep the present size of parliament. This allows for diversity of backgrounds & skills.

- Keep the three year term. Accountability is more important than sinecure.
- Have a set election date. No snap election that may favour the governing party.
- If any member resigns from the party they were elected for, he/she should resign from Parliament in order to keep true representation valid.

Maori Representation. Abolish Maori seats. They are a colonial overhang - are paternalistic to Maori. Maori are now well represented within most parties. They have to be! Maori are well versed in speaking up for themselves whether nationally or locally.

Bill of Rights: This should be given utmost prominence in any formal constitution. This bill is a powerful statement of ^{our} democratic rights & responsibilities. In my mind its importance has superseded the Treaty of Waitangi at this point in the C21st. The Courts should ^{ultimately} decide whether these rights have been breached. This prevents a government from abusing these rights to suit its own purposes (eg like banning protests at sea.)

Privacy and Confidentiality
Your personal information will be held in accordance with the Privacy Act 1993. This Act outlines the requirements for transparent collection, ethical use and secure storage of personal information.

The personal information you provide in this submission form will be used for the purposes of the Consideration of Constitutional Issues only.

You can also make a submission online at www.ourconstitution.org.nz

TE PUKE

26 APRIL 2013.

To Whom it may concern.

My submission regarding the New Zealand Constitutional Review is that I want no change to New Zealand's unwritten constitution, it has served us well since the 1852 New Zealand Constitutional Act was passed, our founding document.

It may require some alterations in the future, but not a race based Constitution. Any race based Constitution would greatly undermine the New Zealand Democratic system (even more so than MMP) & possibly bring an end to the true meaning of democracy, it would also introduce a system of 'blatant' Apartheid in New Zealand, which there is no place for in this country.

Yours faithfully

(PAUL AUDLEY)

4806

From: Sonia August
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 4:11 p.m.
Subject: Submission
Attachments: Constitution Submission July 2013.docx

Thank you,

Sonia August / Administration/Data Entry

A world strong with children

GISBORNE

stand
for
children.
org.nz<<http://www.standforchildren.org.nz>>
Twitter<<https://twitter.com/TuMaiaWhanau>> /
Facebook<<http://www.facebook.com/pages/Te-Puna-Whaiora-Childrens-Health-Camps/215375385152127>> /
LinkedIn<<http://www.linkedin.com/company/te-puna-whaiora-children%27s-health-camps-new-zealand>>

The Conversation so Far – NZ Constitution

Submissions to; constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz

S August, June 2013

Ensuring Maori World view is fairly represented in government including the right to have their spiritual, cultural, religious values and beliefs treated with care and the highest of respects and considered in all decision making processes which affect the people in NZ and all its resources.

- Honour the Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi – Participation, Partnership, Protection
- The New Zealand government and the crown will work in partnership with Maori as Tangata Whenua of NZ,
- Kaitiakitanga – Guardianship and protection of NZ, its assets and its resources, natural and otherwise
- Mauri Ora – Hollistic wellbeing for all people of NZ
- Ahurutanga – A safe space for all people of NZ
- The constitution should be written and interpreted in plain English and Maori to ensure all the people of NZ understand it
- Supporting a bi-cultural work force
- Quality, accessible health care
- Violence free Aotearoa
- Care, welfare, safety and security for all children of New Zealand
- Fair representation for Maori in the New Zealand Government
- Mana Whenua, Mana Moana – Protection, Guardianship of our Whenua/Moana
- The obligation of protection of our natural environment and all its resources
- Quality, free education including compulsory learning of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and ancient Aotearoa history, prior to the treaty signing in 1840.
- Empowerment of families through increased supportive networks

I would like to see Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the history of NZ prior to the 1840's become a compulsory part of the NZ secondary education curriculum. I believe a successful future for NZ lies in the need for our people to be empowered by first learning "who they are and where they came from in order to know where they're going". For many Maori and Non Maori, it is not unless you take the opportunity for a second chance education that you open yourself up to really understanding your own histories; your predecessors whose shoes you fill, and future generations who follow in your footsteps. Many of my peers alike have little knowledge about who they are and where they came from, no idea about the Treaty of Waitangi or the unique history of Aotearoa culture, so many are lead to believe that they come from generations of low achievers and are pre-destined for a life of adversity. Subsequently, in the modern day context, when it comes to decision making processes where they are invited to make submissions or attend meetings or contribute opinions on a range of issues and concerns that affect Maori; their values, traditions and beliefs, they are not equipped with

the tools, skills and knowledge to do so.

I would like to see Aotearoa take more responsibility of guardianship, protection and restoration of our environment and its natural resources. This should also be included as a compulsory part of education systems. It is most important for us to remember that this land does not belong to us, but to our future generations, and therefore this needs to be made a priority in our constitution.

Another priority is our children. Ensuring protection, care, welfare, safety and security of our children. Ensuring parent caregivers are equipped with quality tools, skills and knowledge to provide for and raise their families to the best of their abilities rather than degrading and oppressing – strength based, solution focussed opportunities.

Submissions to The Constitutional Advisory Panel

Introduction

New Zealand does not have a written constitution in the form of a single source or as the governing document. What we currently have is scattered all over in various Acts, statutes, conventions, customs and practices.

It is time that we have clearly defined principles in one governing document, the constitution. Inclusion of Treaty of Waitangi and the debate surrounding it cannot be ignored while considering the composition of this document.

Equally important as part of this discussion is the representation of Other Ethnic Minorities along with the Maori representation in the national and local government, and employment.

The preservance of fundamental rights of the common man and the principles of the rule of law should be achieved through entrenchment.

Monarchy/Republic

No doubt that the current symbolic head of the state is the Queen, but perhaps it's time that moving forward we have a democratic republic form of government that is independent. The decisions will then be of the people, by the people, and for the people rather than for the queen.

However, in saying this, it will be very imperative to give the Treaty of Waitangi a more effective prominence in this new set up, given that it forms the basis of the whole settlement. But again, it remains to be seen as to which version of Treaty (the English or the Maori) is given this prominence.

Perhaps the disagreement on this issue will be a topic of debate for ever, as no one can change history.

Written Constitution in a single document

A written constitution will provide more clarity and consistency.

It should have core principles of division of powers and duties of the Legislature and the Executive, and the independence of the Judiciary, clearly and comprehensively enshrined in this document.

The salient provisions, like the rule of law, Bill of Rights, The Human Rights, Electoral Act, the Privacy Act, and the Official Information Act should be further thrashed out and incorporated

as part of this written constitution. The appointments and removal to these three branches, namely the Legislature, Executive & Judiciary need to and should be spelled out in detail.

This document should then be entrenched so that any deviation from these core principles be treated as violation of the constitution. This will give the Courts the clear authority and basis to decide any such violations of the constitution by way of treating them as Public Interest litigation.

It will not only make the working of the government and public bodies more transparent and accessible but also bring in more accountability.

The role of Treaty of Waitangi in our Constitution.

Inclusion of the Treaty of Waitangi in this document, the Constitution, is a subject of debate at the moment. However, as mentioned in earlier paragraphs, it should in fact be included in the constitution to give it a real meaning rather than it being just a best practice without any tooth and nail.

Keeping it out of this written constitution will mean adding salt to the wounds rather than redressing the wrongs in good faith.

Entrenchment

I have had the privilege of going through Hon Dr Wayne Map, Member Law Commission's, draft New Zealand Constitution Bill, and although it proposes to bring all the important constitutional principles in a single statute, yet it states that it will not be the supreme law and that it will not be entrenched.

I differ with some of his views.

We have seen the encroachment of private rights of the public by passing of laws with razor thin majority in parliament.

We also see legislation being passed by one government and overturned by the next, making us a mockery in the World as a nation of hit and trial when it comes to law making. Prime examples of it are the legislation, on Knighthood and Queen's Counsel, being abolished by one government and re introduced by another and perhaps to be abolished again in the future by another.

Although the Bill of Rights has gained the status of high importance and the perception is that no government or judicial body can afford to ignore it, yet we see it being ignored now and then.

Recently the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Amendment Bill [No 2] that limits the right to judicial review and is inconsistent with and not justified under the New Zealand Bill

Similarly, a certain percentage of all employment in public and private sector should be reserved for Maori and ethnic minorities to walk the talk of inclusion and diversity. This will help in uplifting the nation as a whole and reduce economic burden on the state and welfare.

This above mentioned reservation policy could be given a fixed timeframe of revisit, review and amendment in another 15 to 20 years, by providing for such a provision within the Constitution.

Conclusion

A comprehensive written constitution is the need of the hour to give robust guidance, consistency, and for the preservation of the fundamental rights and the rule of law. Inclusion of a reservation policy for the minorities along with the Treaty of Waitangi in this entrenched document will help in redressing a lot of historical and current social wrongs while making New Zealand economically better and the best multicultural place to live in.

Submitted by ^

Gurbrinder Aulakh

Barrister & Solicitor

The writer is also the Deputy-Chair of Auckland Regional Migrant Services, and on the National Board of English Language Partners New Zealand (working with Refugees & Migrants), however, the views expressed in these submissions are writer's individual views and may not be the collective views of any of these organisations or of any other person other than the writer.

Submissions
Secretariat, constitutional Advisory Panel
c/o Ministry of Justice
DX SX 10088
Wellington

1745a

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 2/07/2013 10:54 a.m.
Subject: [
<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission
Attachments: Constitution.docx

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: Gurbrinder Aulakh Organisation Name: Barrister & Solicitor Email:
Phone Postal AddressA: i Postal
AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: Submission Upload: Constitution.docx

Sent on the 1 July 2013 at 15:58

Submissions to The Constitutional Advisory Panel

Introduction

New Zealand does not have a written constitution in the form of a single source or as the governing document. What we currently have is scattered all over in various Acts, statutes, conventions, customs and practices.

It is time that we have clearly defined principles in one governing document, the constitution. Inclusion of Treaty of Waitangi and the debate surrounding it cannot be ignored while considering the composition of this document.

Equally important as part of this discussion is the representation of Other Ethnic Minorities along with the Maori representation in the national and local government, and employment.

The preservance of fundamental rights of the common man and the principles of the rule of law should be achieved through entrenchment.

Monarchy/Republic

No doubt that the current symbolic head of the state is the Queen, but perhaps it's time that moving forward we have a democratic republic form of government that is independent. The decisions will then be of the people, by the people, and for the people rather than for the queen.

However, in saying this, it will be very imperative to give the Treaty of Waitangi a more effective prominence in this new set up, given that it forms the basis of the whole settlement. But again, it remains to be seen as to which version of Treaty (the English or the Maori) is given this prominence.

Perhaps the disagreement on this issue will be a topic of debate for ever, as no one can change history.

Written Constitution in a single document

A written constitution will provide more clarity and consistency.

It should have core principles of division of powers and duties of the Legislature and the Executive, and the independence of the Judiciary, clearly and comprehensively enshrined in this document.

The salient provisions, like the rule of law, Bill of Rights, The Human Rights, Electoral Act, the Privacy Act, and the Official Information Act should be further thrashed out and

incorporated as part of this written constitution. The appointments and removal to these three branches, namely the Legislature, Executive & Judiciary need to and should be spelled out in detail.

This document should then be entrenched so that any deviation from these core principles be treated as violation of the constitution. This will give the Courts the clear authority and basis to decide any such violations of the constitution by way of treating them as Public Interest litigation.

It will not only make the working of the government and public bodies more transparent and accessible but also bring in more accountability.

The role of Treaty of Waitangi in our Constitution.

Inclusion of the Treaty of Waitangi in this document, the Constitution, is a subject of debate at the moment. However, as mentioned in earlier paragraphs, it should in fact be included in the constitution to give it a real meaning rather than it being just a best practice without any tooth and nail.

Keeping it out of this written constitution will mean adding salt to the wounds rather than redressing the wrongs in good faith.

Entrenchment

I have had the privilege of going through Hon Dr Wayne Map, Member Law Commission's, draft New Zealand Constitution Bill, and although it proposes to bring all the important constitutional principles in a single statute, yet it states that it will not be the supreme law and that it will not be entrenched.

I differ with some of his views.

We have seen the encroachment of private rights of the public by passing of laws with razor thin majority in parliament.

We also see legislation being passed by one government and overturned by the next, making us a mockery in the World as a nation of hit and trial when it comes to law making. Prime examples of it are the legislation, on Knighthood and Queen's Counsel, being abolished by one government and re introduced by another and perhaps to be abolished again in the future by another.

Although the Bill of Rights has gained the status of high importance and the perception is that no government or judicial body can afford to ignore it, yet we see it being ignored now and then.

Recently the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Amendment Bill [No 2] that limits the

right to judicial review and is inconsistent with and not justified under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1993, yet it was passed through urgency in Parliament by a simple majority. There are two more bills currently before parliament which if passed (and likely to be passed with thin majority) would curtail further the privacy rights of New Zealand citizens.

Entrenchment of all the basic acts, mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs, will not let any government, under the garb of national security or urgency, tramp upon the principles of the rule of law and the fundamental rights of common man without a 2/3 majority of the elected representatives in parliament.

Supremacy of Parliament

We have heard a lot of talk, in the recent past, that any move of entrenchment or a written constitution will erode the supremacy of the parliament. However, these fears and concerns are totally misplaced and unfounded, as the entrenched written constitution will be the defining and guiding force for the upkeep and preservance of fundamental core principles but at the same time 2/3 majority of parliament can always legislate and change any of its provisions thus maintaining its supremacy.

How Maori and other Ethnic views should be represented in national and local government.

The review and discussion on the representation should not only be limited to Maori but also include the other ethnic minorities.

With New Zealand having become more multicultural, we still see an imbalance in national and local government representation with the concentration of key law making and decision making positions with a particular class only. We have seen time and again in the surveys, voting, and experiences from public racial outbursts that there exists a silent culture of discrimination and deprivation against these ethnic minorities, especially when it comes to representation in national and local government, and in employment.

One may put in place any number of rights and safeguards in the Bill of Rights and Human Rights Act but it can never capture the silent discrimination and deprivation, which can only be experienced.

Reservation a key

A reservation policy of national and local government representation And employment, into this written constitution, will help eliminate a lot of socio-economic disparity. Creation of Maori and ethnic seats in parliament and the Maori and ethnic local wards will help alleviate some of these issues and will give the minorities a real and meaningful voice.

This can be achieved by introducing a Minority roll alongside the Maori and General roll.

Similarly, a certain percentage of all employment in public and private sector should be reserved for Maori and ethnic minorities to walk the talk of inclusion and diversity. This will help in uplifting the nation as a whole and reduce economic burden on the state and welfare.

This above mentioned reservation policy could be given a fixed timeframe of revisit, review and amendment in another 15 to 20 years, by providing for such a provision within the Constitution.

Conclusion

A comprehensive written constitution is the need of the hour to give robust guidance, consistency, and for the preservation of the fundamental rights and the rule of law. Inclusion of a reservation policy for the minorities along with the Treaty of Waitangi in this entrenched document will help in redressing a lot of historical and current social wrongs while making New Zealand economically better and the best multicultural place to live in.

Submitted by

Gurbrinder Aulakh

Barrister & Solicitor

The writer is also the Deputy-Chair of Auckland Regional Migrant Services, and on the National Board of English Language Partners New Zealand (working with Refugees & Migrants), however, the views expressed in these submissions are writer's individual views and may not be the collective views of any of these organisations or of any other person other than the writer.

1745b

From: Aulakh Gurbrinder <
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 2/08/2013 9:52 a.m.
Subject: Submissions made earlier
Attachments: Constitution.docx

Dear Sir

We understand that the submissions to the Constitutional Advisory Panel are now closed.

We have now come to know that the date for the submissions to the panel been extended till 31st July 2013 from the earlier date.

I had made submissions to the Constitutional Advisory Panel through post and online before the earlier closing date of 30th June 2013, but have had no acknowledgment of its receipt.

I attach the copy of that submission again.

I would like to re-iterate that the views expressed in the submission are my individual views and not of the Law Firm, or any other organisation.

An acknowledgment that it was duly received, within the stipulated timeframe, will be appreciated.

Regards
Gurbrinder Aulakh

Yours Truly

Gurbrinder Aulakh
Barrister & Solicitor

George Bogiatto
Barrister & Solicitor

Attention:

Confidentiality: This e-mail and its attachments are intended for the above named only and may be confidential. If they have come to you in error you must take no action based on them, nor must you copy or show them to anyone; please reply to this e-mail and highlight the error.

Security Warning: Please note that this e-mail has been created in the knowledge that Internet e-mail is not a 100% secure communications medium. We advise that you understand and observe this lack of security when e-mailing us.

Viruses: Although we have taken steps to ensure that this e-mail and attachments are free from any virus, we advise that in keeping with good computing practice the recipient should ensure they are actually virus free.

Submissions to The Constitutional Advisory Panel

Introduction

New Zealand does not have a written constitution in the form of a single source or as the governing document. What we currently have is scattered all over in various Acts, statutes, conventions, customs and practices.

It is time that we have clearly defined principles in one governing document, the constitution. Inclusion of Treaty of Waitangi and the debate surrounding it cannot be ignored while considering the composition of this document.

Equally important as part of this discussion is the representation of Other Ethnic Minorities along with the Maori representation in the national and local government, and employment.

The preservice of fundamental rights of the common man and the principles of the rule of law should be achieved through entrenchment.

Monarchy/Republic

No doubt that the current symbolic head of the state is the Queen, but perhaps it's time that moving forward we have a democratic republic form of government that is independent. The decisions will then be of the people, by the people, and for the people rather than for the queen.

However, in saying this, it will be very imperative to give the Treaty of Waitangi a more effective prominence in this new set up, given that it forms the basis of the whole settlement. But again, it remains to be seen as to which version of Treaty (the English or the Maori) is given this prominence.

Perhaps the disagreement on this issue will be a topic of debate for ever, as no one can change history.

Written Constitution in a single document

A written constitution will provide more clarity and consistency.

It should have core principles of division of powers and duties of the Legislature and the Executive, and the independence of the Judiciary, clearly and comprehensively enshrined in this document.

The salient provisions, like the rule of law, Bill of Rights, The Human Rights, Electoral Act, the Privacy Act, and the Official Information Act should be further thrashed out and

incorporated as part of this written constitution. The appointments and removal to these three branches, namely the Legislature, Executive & Judiciary need to and should be spelled out in detail.

This document should then be entrenched so that any deviation from these core principles be treated as violation of the constitution. This will give the Courts the clear authority and basis to decide any such violations of the constitution by way of treating them as Public Interest litigation.

It will not only make the working of the government and public bodies more transparent and accessible but also bring in more accountability.

The role of Treaty of Waitangi in our Constitution.

Inclusion of the Treaty of Waitangi in this document, the Constitution, is a subject of debate at the moment. However, as mentioned in earlier paragraphs, it should in fact be included in the constitution to give it a real meaning rather than it being just a best practice without any tooth and nail.

Keeping it out of this written constitution will mean adding salt to the wounds rather than redressing the wrongs in good faith.

Entrenchment

I have had the privilege of going through Hon Dr Wayne Map, Member Law Commission's, draft New Zealand Constitution Bill, and although it proposes to bring all the important constitutional principles in a single statute, yet it states that it will not be the supreme law and that it will not be entrenched.

I differ with some of his views.

We have seen the encroachment of private rights of the public by passing of laws with razor thin majority in parliament.

We also see legislation being passed by one government and overturned by the next, making us a mockery in the World as a nation of hit and trial when it comes to law making. Prime examples of it are the legislation, on Knighthood and Queen's Counsel, being abolished by one government and re introduced by another and perhaps to be abolished again in the future by another.

Although the Bill of Rights has gained the status of high importance and the perception is that no government or judicial body can afford to ignore it, yet we see it being ignored now and then.

Recently the New Zealand Public Health and Disability Amendment Bill [No 2] that limits the

right to judicial review and is inconsistent with and not justified under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1993, yet it was passed through urgency in Parliament by a simple majority. There are two more bills currently before parliament which if passed (and likely to be passed with thin majority) would curtail further the privacy rights of New Zealand citizens.

Entrenchment of all the basic acts, mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs, will not let any government, under the garb of national security or urgency, tramp upon the principles of the rule of law and the fundamental rights of common man without a 2/3 majority of the elected representatives in parliament.

Supremacy of Parliament

We have heard a lot of talk, in the recent past, that any move of entrenchment or a written constitution will erode the supremacy of the parliament. However, these fears and concerns are totally misplaced and unfounded, as the entrenched written constitution will be the defining and guiding force for the upkeep and preservice of fundamental core principles but at the same time 2/3 majority of parliament can always legislate and change any of its provisions thus maintaining its supremacy.

How Maori and other Ethnic views should be represented in national and local government.

The review and discussion on the representation should not only be limited to Maori but also include the other ethnic minorities.

With New Zealand having become more multicultural, we still see an imbalance in national and local government representation with the concentration of key law making and decision making positions with a particular class only. We have seen time and again in the surveys, voting, and experiences from public racial outbursts that there exists a silent culture of discrimination and deprivation against these ethnic minorities, especially when it comes to representation in national and local government, and in employment.

One may put in place any number of rights and safeguards in the Bill of Rights and Human Rights Act but it can never capture the silent discrimination and deprivation, which can only be experienced.

Reservation a key

A reservation policy of national and local government representation And employment, into this written constitution, will help eliminate a lot of socio-economic disparity. Creation of Maori and ethnic seats in parliament and the Maori and ethnic local wards will help alleviate some of these issues and will give the minorities a real and meaningful voice.

This can be achieved by introducing a Minority roll alongside the Maori and General roll.

Similarly, a certain percentage of all employment in public and private sector should be reserved for Maori and ethnic minorities to walk the talk of inclusion and diversity. This will help in uplifting the nation as a whole and reduce economic burden on the state and welfare.

This above mentioned reservation policy could be given a fixed timeframe of revisit, review and amendment in another 15 to 20 years, by providing for such a provision within the Constitution.

Conclusion

A comprehensive written constitution is the need of the hour to give robust guidance, consistency, and for the preservation of the fundamental rights and the rule of law. Inclusion of a reservation policy for the minorities along with the Treaty of Waitangi in this entrenched document will help in redressing a lot of historical and current social wrongs while making New Zealand economically better and the best multicultural place to live in.

Submitted by

Gurbrinder Aulakh

Barrister & Solicitor

The writer is also the Deputy-Chair of Auckland Regional Migrant Services, and on the National Board of English Language Partners New Zealand (working with Refugees & Migrants), however, the views expressed in these submissions are writer's individual views and may not be the collective views of any of these organisations or of any other person other than the writer.

2888

From: "trevor auld"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 7/07/2013 10:26 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

In a multi cultural society why is there a need for Maori seats? Abolish them

2979

Submissions Secretariat
Constitution Advisory Panel
Ministry of Justice
DX SX 10088
WELLINGTON

SUBMISSION FROM
Warren Iver Austad

I note the three major headings under which your discussions are to take place but wish to confine my comments to the Treaty of Waitangi, as so much relates to this. There is nothing new in my observations, but the sequence of evidence presented may be of interest and gives some support to my conclusions.

The 19th century British Government was concerned with Empire, colonies, trade, indigenous peoples and the threat from other countries of annexations. So many territories were involved that treaties could not be easily enforced and consent rather than coercion became the underlying consideration. This Doctrine of Good Faith was meant to give both parties to a Treaty certain rights but with them also certain responsibilities or obligations.

New Zealand was furthest away from England of all colonies. The British Government changed twice in 1839 and there were also changes in the Colonial Office, no doubt part of the tension between that body and its political masters. It is thus difficult to believe that the full intellectual powers of lawmakers were employed when the Treaty was drafted. The Colonial Office had to address problems with the governing of frequently unruly European immigrants, the control of the New Zealand Company and pressure from the Church Missionary Society, among many others at a distance of 12,000 miles.

Hobson's changing interpretation of the Treaty swung from an initial belief, as intended by England that it applied only to immigrants, to a period when he was bribing local Maori for their signatures. He accented the protection they might expect from the Crown but his attitude to, and information about, what in return was ceded was less clear. Compounding this lack of clarity was the deliberate mistranslation of the Treaty by the already large landholder Henry Williams, a person fluent in Maori and relied on by many Chiefs for a translation and explanation of the document. In 1841 instructions to Hobson from London were that he was to promote the health, civilisation, education and spiritual care of the natives, and not directly rule them. However, the Governor had his own agenda with proclamations of sovereignty to include Maori. With a progressively disinterested and over-worked Colonial Office at a distance, a period of war between settlers and the indigenous peoples, and massive immigration the principle of British Sovereignty over New Zealand gradually became established.

Thus to regard the Treaty as a carefully considered instrument between two parties with agreement and understanding on both sides is about as far from the truth as is possible to be. One might ask why it has survived at all. Apart from popular and varied opinions as to what the Treaty means, its very legality is immediately in question. Is it a contract in domestic law? Is it an international treaty, or might it be construed as a basic constitutional document upon which, with good faith on both sides, a developing country like New Zealand could progress. Again, was the South Island to be included in these considerations?

2 (Austad)

In view of these numerous uncertainties, what is the point of discussing the meaning of an historic document written by persons who could not have even begun to imagine conditions to be found in this country today. Instead of the Treaty being the nucleus for New Zealand of progress and development in good faith for all citizens, a grievance industry has emerged which prolongs differences and inhibits growth. If grounds of appeal were clear cut surely a majority of claims should have been registered and settled by now. With the greatest goodwill, no administration can do justice to a succession of demands that continue to emerge from sources representing progressively smaller minority groups, on matters that are progressively more esoteric. There might be some point in these deliberations if a conclusion agreeable to all parties was likely, or even possible, but in my view we are no closer to consensus than was the case ten, fifty or one hundred years ago.

It is acknowledged by all that settlers and the Crown in the mid to late nineteenth century abused Maori and usurped land. For a number of decades there has been transfer of land and money to Maori, perhaps the only practical way towards some sort of retrospective justice as there can be no directly affronted individual still alive. As a measure of the significance of this programme I understand Mark Solomon, recently knighted, to have said that taxpayer-seeded Maori enterprise now accounts for more than 15% of gross domestic product. In such a case, with the perceived Maori population at about that proportion, it could be argued that further transfer of assets from the Crown should be coming to an end.

Europeans, who have seen hundreds of treaties come and go, must regard our prolonged and ongoing concerns with a 170 year old document as quaint.


By all means let us take pride in the Treaty as our founding document, rather than the focus of dissent that it has become. Let us progress together in good faith, as was originally intended by our antecedents in London, as opposed to attempting to find answers without establishing the real questions. In spite of past difficulties let us wind up the Waitangi Tribunal as an agency that has done its best but is now barely relevant in modern New Zealand. The removal of this divisive influence and a cessation of claims, all of which are merely requests for money based on increasingly tenuous grounds, would promote interest and pride in things Maori as opposed to the widespread sense of resignation among most New Zealanders that now exists. An increasing Asian cohort in this country, whose ancestors had nothing to do with our beginnings and therefore the Treaty, may regard future taxpayer funding based on race with increasing concern.

From this position it will come as no surprise that I believe any future legislation, even and including a constitution, should be based on the general population according to need, should not be based on race and should certainly not enshrine the Treaty of Waitangi in any way.

My final remarks pertain to yourselves, the appointed advisory group, and the reason they are last will become self-explanatory.

Austad (3)

I am unaware as to how the Panel came into being, whether by professed interest or appointment or representation from various parties. While wishing you well in your deliberations I note that seven out of twelve have present or past Maori affiliations. It may be difficult for New Zealanders to believe that your views, when they emerge, are truly objective and patriotic.



Warren Austad, June 7, 2013

Wellington

Ph/fx

282

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 13/04/2013 2:04 p.m.
Subject: http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/form_submission

Sent from The Constitution Conversation #link:<http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/>.

Full Names: DonnaMaree Austin Organisation Name: Email:
 Phone: Postal Address: Postal
 AddressB: Postal City: Whangarei Postal Region: Northland Postal Post Cod..
 Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I am a proud New Zealander. 8th generation born in
 this country. By ancient Roman law I would be considered an ethnic New Zealander or 'Kiwi' but every
 time I fill out a government form I have to grit my teeth in disgust as I tick the 'European New
 Zealander'
 box. WHY? Because I know that it will immediately disadvantage me.

I love our multi cultural society and growing up in Otangarei which is a Maori predominant
 neighbourhood in Whangarei. Both my parents came from Hokianga in Northland which is a strong
 Maori rural community in Northland. They moved into the city during the
 great urban migration of the 60's. My family background socio-economical story is no different from
 most Maori and many other 'uncounted' and 'unrecognized' Pakeha who walked the same road as our
 Maori brothers. Growing up I learned the reo, the waiata, the
 whakairo (weaving), the kai (my Pakeha father made a mean Hangi and taught me to eat kina, paua
 and eel alongside lamb and beef from the time I could eat solid food) and I embraced it all as part of
 MY heritage as a New Zealander; that was until I got to school
 and discovered as a Pakeha I was not equal.

Apparently I was an oppressor against a poorer Maori minority (they obviously didn't see the house I
 grew up in), and because of this the Maori people have fallen into the trappings of poverty, alcohol,
 drugs, domestic and child abuse and an overall defeatist
 belief that education is useless ... so we have a problem of low educated school leavers.

How to solve this cycle of poverty? Throw money at them. In the form of grants, scholarships,
 benefits, educational reforms and medical advantages based solely on the qualification of race. I feel
 that any grant, scholarship, or medical, educational, and social
 advantage be not based on RACE OR ETHNICITY but rather on socio-economic need assessed
 individually. So long as this racist practice continues I feel an unwelcome and unwanted member of
 society in a country that I love.

A person with 1/16th Maori blood who grew up in a mansion in Ponsonby can claim so many
 advantages to education, social reform, and health based solely on their claim to Maori ethnicity and
 we live in a society where this is not only accepted but is celebrated.
 I would ask this constitutional discussion to really look at the inequity of race/ethnicity based
 advantages and see it for the racist and separatist practice it really is.

I ask that constitutionally we stop grants, scholarships, and policy reforms being based on race/
 ethnicity and base them instead on individual need.

Thank you for your time.

Sent on the 13 April 2013 at 14:03