

4027

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 29/07/2013 11:09 a.m.

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

Full Names: Beverly Mary & Kenneth Albert Buchly Organisation Name: Private Individuals
Email: Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal
AddressB: Postal City: Cambridge Postal Region: Waikato Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: We don't require a written constitution as we are
happy with the present situation

Maori seats should be phased out as we are a multicultural society and grievances of the past have been or are being addressed by the current Treaty Settlements. We must move on so that we have a standard of living that is acceptable to all but it has to be achieved in a world that has now become global. The Maori people must realise that they can retain their culture but it has to exist in a global world. There is no sense in looking back and living in the past as the only way is forward.

We are in favour of a four year term as this would enable a new incoming government to draft new policies and have time to implement them and for the general public to make a decision as to how effective these policies are. A "new" incoming government always finds a situation that varies greatly from that indicated by the outgoing party irrespective of whoever is in power.

The number of M P's should be reduced to maybe 100.

This should be brought about by reducing the number of List members as they are not directly answerable to any specific group of constituents.

If an M P resigns from a Party mid-term they should be

replaced by another party representative. Parties should make a greater effort when selecting candidates. It is very noticeable that when Parties list their candidates the standard of those at the bottom is not that great. They appear to be a group of wantables.

Submitted on the 29 July 2013 at 11:08

222

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 11/04/2013 10:13 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: David Buck Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Upper Hutt Postal Region: Postal Post
Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I do not believe New Zealand needs a
single written constitution, the current arrangement is satisfactory. The constitution need not have a
higher status than other laws - to do so only invites challenge after challenge to the laws of the land.
Parliament
must be the final arbiter of which laws are constitutional. We cannot have judges, who are unelected
and unanswerable to the people making decisions of such magnitude.

Although not specifically asked - the Sovereign must remain head of state.

Sent on the 11 April 2013 at 22:13

222a

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 11/04/2013 10:19 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: David Buck Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Upper Hutt Postal Region: Postal Post
Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: NO, I do not support the inclusion of the
Treaty of Waitangi as a formal part of the constitution. It is an anachronistic document that has lead to
more divisiveness than inclusiveness. It's only place should be in the ongoing settlement of historic
grievances.
Once those have been dealt with it should be consigned to history, in the same way the British North
America Act 1867 has been in Canada.

Sent on the 11 April 2013 at 22:18

1689

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 28/06/2013 12:27 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission
Attachments: Submission Constitutional Review x 1.docx

Attached please find my submission on the Constitutional Review.

Thank you for the opportunity to be involved in the conversation.

Regards

Noelene Buckland

Managing Director

Auckland

Submission On: New Zealand's Constitutional Arrangements

Submission To: Constitutional Review Panel

Submission From: Noelene Buckland

Submission Date: 28 June 2013

.....

What are your aspirations for Aotearoa New Zealand?

My aspirations for Aotearoa are that it will be an independent multi cultural, peaceful nation where citizens enjoy a high standard of living, protect a high quality environment and aspire to the highest level of health and education in the world.

How do you want our country to be run in the future?

As a republic, through a parliamentary democracy.

Do you think our constitution should be written in one document?

Yes I do, but only if we are prepared to become an independent republic.

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

Once we have a formal written constitution, in one document, and are a republic then, yes, I think that it should be the supreme law. Prior to that it is my view that the constitutional arrangements we have will suffice as I don't see any point in having a single constitutional document while we remain a realm.

Who should decide whether legislation is consistent with the constitution – Parliament or the Courts? I think we should re-introduce the legislative chamber, or upper house, once we are a Republic. In the meantime, Parliament should decide.

Does the Bill of Rights protect your rights enough?

I think it does as it covers the essential freedoms that one expects to see in a modern democracy.

What other things could be done to protect rights?

In my view the world is awash with 'rights' – I would like to see more work done on what individual responsibilities are so, if more is to be done it should be in that area.

Do you think this Act should have higher legal status than other laws (supreme law?)

Not at this point in time as the Act already incorporates a consistency requirement and compulsory reporting by the Attorney General if there is any suggestion of inconsistency.

Once we have a formal constitution to support a republic the principles contained in the Bill of Rights should be incorporated into that document.

Thinking of the future – what role do you think the Treaty of Waitangi could have in our constitution?

It needs to be recognized as being an essential constitutional element that forms a part of Aotearoa's history along with the 1835 Declaration of Independence, the Constitution Act 1852 the universal suffrage in 1893, the Statute of Westminster 1947, the Constitution Act 1986, and other key documents.

I do not see it as the nation's founding document as it was only signed by some of the parties that inhabited Aotearoa at the time and a number of iwi do not acknowledge it.

Do you think that the Treaty should be made a formal part of the constitution?

No, but it should be acknowledged to the extent identified above.

How should Maori views be represented in Parliament?

I have no problem with the current arrangement other than it should not be permitted to be politically aligned. The purpose of the Maori seats is to provide a voice for Maori not to automatically add to the number of seats of any of the other parties.

How could Maori electoral participation be improved?

The same way that we would improve electoral participation for all voters – and there is work to be done in that area! However I am not as hung up about electoral participation as many seem to be as it is usually the case that voters will turn out in force if they do NOT like what government/local government is doing. In many ways the level of electoral participation is also a vote of confidence or otherwise in the elected body.

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

I think this is an impossible question to ask and to answer. What views and perspectives are alluded to here? Maori, like all other nations, have different views and perspectives on a myriad of things and it is nonsense to imagine that local government should somehow expect to accommodate them. Maori today will all hold different views about security - personal, internet, national or international - sports of every kind, fashion, travel, film/TV, motor cars, holidays and every other thing on the planet – and that is as it should be.

What maybe in the interests of both Maori and local government is a sharing of knowledge about decisions affecting the management of natural resources – matters critical to the Treaty of Waitangi principles that were signed up to all those years ago. However, I do not think that it is in anyone's interest to have apartheid like programmes across the entire spectrum of society. There are Toanga that we must all preserve – the language and culture in particular – but I do not see Treaty obligations extending beyond these boundaries into a permanent apartheid process.

How many members of Parliament should we have?

I don't have any problem with the number we have now and there is every reason to believe that the work that went into establishing that number was both diligent and rational.

How long should the term of Parliament be?

Five years. Three years is far too short and four years will not make enough difference. What happens in New Zealand now is that almost all governments get two terms i.e. six years, because it is only after this time that the nation begins to either tire of, or be encouraged by, the direction the government is taking the nation.

How should the election date be decided?

It should be established in law as a particular time.

My suggestions is that, assuming a five year term, then the election date might be the second week of October in the fifth year of the government. This wording provides for occasions when governments do not last the full term because of a vote of no confidence or similar event.

What factors should be taken into account when the size and number of electorates is decided?

What is being used now is fine by me as it provides for regular review.

What should happen if a member of parliament parts ways with the party from which he or she was elected?

I am strongly of the view that they should resign and allow voters, for electorate seats and the party, for list seats, to choose another candidate and for list seats it must be the next name on the party list as those names are a factor in how people exercised their original vote.

.....ends

132

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/04/2013 10:13 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Graeme Buckler Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal
Region: Hawkes Bay Postal Post Code Postal Country: New Zealand Submission:
As a non-Maori born in this country almost 60 years ago I feel more and more as though I am not
welcome here. My presence is tolerated as if I had stayed too long at the "Inlaws".
Growing up as a child here in New Zealand we could go any where, beaches
were available to all etc

I think we must all start to look ahead and stop looking back, I am a 5th generation kiwi, I do not have
another country to call home, this is my land, I do not claim any right greater than that of any other
person that lives in this country but I don't believe
I have less rights either.

I am sure that the Treaty of Waitangi has been a great document, but since there were two versions,
(English, Maori) they have been interpreted differently and the arguments continue, surely it is time to
leave this document where it belongs in history and move
on harmoniously and away from separatism.

Sent on the 8 April 2013 at 21:11

470

From: [redacted]
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 16/04/2013 8:26 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Matthew Buckler Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal
Region: Hastings Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: Hi,

I am 6th generation New Zealander. I am and have always been in full time employment. I have always paid my taxes. I am a lower middle class person who does have a mortgage.

This however seems to be irrelevant in this country as this country is held to ransom more and more by a minority group of people hailing the treaty of waitangi as their way of getting what they think they are owed. The government seems to want to hold this obsolete document as the be all and end all of what our country stands for.

What a crock! 30 odd years ago New Zealand shunned South Africa for the apartite. What is the government and some Maori pushing for in this country...pretty much the same thing....seperate rules for Maori and non-Maori. There are already schools that are Maori only....Lake waikaremoana and Te Urewera national park is now Moari Governed, Lake taupo is maori owed and we pay to swim in it etc ... there are probably more things that I don't know of....whats next? drinking fountains with signs above saying Maori only?

In my opinion the Treaty of Waitangi has now driven a wedge through this country and is the cancer that could bring this country to its knees both socially and economically.....if not further and worse, to the brink of or to civil war.

If it were up to me, there would be one set of rules, with no special clauses conditions or any 'small type' that favours any individual, race, company etc

It is time for this country to stand up and start fighting the cancer.....

ONE LAW TO RULE THEM ALL.

Sent on the 16 April 2013 at 20:25

3851

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 24/07/2013 10:40 p.m.

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

Full Names: Jake Buckthought Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Hamilton
Postal Region: Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission:
I think that the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi should be entrenched so that it can not be changed
so easily and so that it becomes a formal part of our constitution. Upon becoming entrenched, both
Maori and Pakeha could come to an agreement on the
principles, to promote equality in New Zealand.

Submitted on the 24 July 2013 at 22:39

5003

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 27/07/2013 2:21 p.m.
Attachments: consitutional document.pdf

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

Full Names: Christiaan Buijsers Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region:
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: Submission Upload:
consitutional document.pdf

Submitted on the 27 July 2013 at 14:20

Constitutional Submission by

Christiaan Buijers

Auckland

How do you want our country to be run in the future?

I believe the position of Governor General and Speaker of the house should be merged into one position. The speaker of the house should be appointed by a 75% majority of parliament (or better) for a term of 4 years, renewable for another 4 years.

The office would sign laws in affect (royal assent) as well as police and set parliamentary rules. In the future should New Zealand ever become Republic, at that time the Governor General would be renamed President.

A new position of Deputy Governor General should be created. This position would again be decided upon by a 75% majority of parliament (or better) for a term of 4 years, renewable for another 4 years. Normally the Deputy Governor General would replace the Governor General as the new Governor General after his or her term has finished (or in case of resignation or death), and function as the deputy speaker of the house does right now.

Parliament should function similar to how it does now, except the behaviour of MPs needs to improve. One method of doing this is matters which are done under "Urgency" should require a 67% majority to pass. This will ensure a better relationship between the Prime Minister and Leader of the Opposition, and will encourage better law-making by being more inclusive.

Thinking of the future, what role do you think the Treaty of Waitangi could have in our constitution? Do you think that the Treaty should be made a formal part of the constitution? Why?

I believe the Treaty of Waitangi is an important document, however I do not believe it should be part of a written constitution. Unfortunately instead of celebrating the Treaty of Waitangi as a founding document it has been tainted by the ambiguity of the text of the treaty, and the apparent differences between the Maori version and English version. A new constitution should encapsulate the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi but it does not need to have the actual Treaty of Waitangi as part of it. To me the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi is not in the words of the actual treaty. It is in the spirit of Maori and Pakeha equality, shared responsibility for the preservation of Maori language and culture and protection of Maori treasures and assets.

Those things are basic human rights by today's standards.

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

I think it would be useful to have a written constitution. Presently many aspects of a constitution are scattered over several acts and conventions. I do not however feel that a written constitution like the United States is the way to go.

I believe the Constitution should be a simple document which states our sovereignty and independence, confirms our electoral processes, protects the independence of the judiciary and fair treatment of all by the judiciary, specifies basic human rights and separates the state from all

religion (separation of church and state).

It must also provide an Amendment process within the document. This needs to be entrenched so that governments of the day should need a very high level mandate to enact Amendments. I would say at least 75% of parliament after a successful National Referendum.

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

Yes. Where a law contradicts the Constitution, the Constitution should be above that other law. As such we require a high standard to provide amendments.

There should however be times when parts of the Constitution can be temporarily suspended. These are limited to

- War and Invasion
- States of Emergency (potentially such as a Major natural disaster)
- National Security

The obligation must however exist that at the conclusion of these temporary suspension, the Government be obligated to correct any such injustices caused by suspension.

For example: During a state of emergency an alleged looter may be caught by police or security personnel and may have to be imprisoned in a substandard facility, they at that time not be able to receive a quick trial or access to all the ordinary processes due to the priority of dealing with the National disaster. Once the disaster is under control then the judiciary would need to take that into consideration if this person was found guilty alternatively if they were found not guilty then compensation would need to be provided by the government, and an apology made.

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

Why?

As my submission has stated above. I proposed the merger of the Governor General and Speaker. In any future Republic this position would be the president.

Deciding whether a law was "constitutional" would be a responsibility of this office in the first instance. So no laws were passed which would be unconstitutional in the first place.

If however it was passed incorrectly then the independent Judiciary would be able to suspend that law or a part of that law for a period of upto 28 days, requiring Parliament to pass to appropriate measures in that time frame to make it consistent under urgency.

How should Māori views be represented in Parliament?

Maori should continue to be able to choose whether or not they wish to be in a Maori electorate or a General electorate.

How could Māori electoral participation be improved?

I don't think it needs to change. Maori are able to participate fully in elections

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

I don't think it needs to change. Maori are able to participate fully in local government.

Bill of Rights

I believe a written constitution would replace the Bill of Rights. I believe that the following rights need to be added beyond what is provided right now

- The right to privacy
- The right to your image, as in people may not take or publish photos (or similar) of you without your consent.
- The right to reasonable government support if your human rights are threatened outside of our National borders
- The right to Death with Dignity (Voluntary Euthanasia)

How many members of Parliament should we have? Why?

We should have 70 Electorate MPs including an appropriate number of Maori seats based on the General to Maori electoral roll. The number of Party MPs should be a minimum of 30, if proportionality cannot be achieved at 30, then up to 5 additional seats could be added to bring parliament up to an ordinary size of 100, or a maximum size of 105.

Why – at present we have a whole bunch of Party MPs who are basically invisible, and unnecessary. See my suggestion of proxy voting below.

How long should the term of Parliament be? Why?

The electoral term should be 5 years, however if the government is unable to retain confidence and supply then a temporary election should be held. At that time an election would be held to redistribute the Party MPs only, electorate seats would not be contested. This redistribution would remain until the completion of that 5 year term.

The Governor General/Speaker as per my proposal would be able to dissolve parliament however under the constitution and reset the 5 year term after another election. At the end of that reset he or she would automatically not be Governor General/Speaker anymore and the deputy Governor General/Speaker would temporarily be in charge until the new Parliament appoints a new Governor General/Speaker. The previous office holder would be ineligible to continue in that role.

How should the election date be decided? Why?

Unless it is reset above, every 5 years the first Saturday and Sunday of November should be election days. Polling booths should be open from 7am – 7pm on both days.

What factors should be taken into account when the size and number of electorates are decided Why?

The size of population that lives in it and the traditional provincial areas most New Zealanders identify with.

What should happen if a member of Parliament parts ways with the party from which he or she was elected? Why?

They should become an independent MP. If they choose to resign then they should be replaced with a by-election for an Electorate MP or their seat should be left vacant if they are a Party MP. When you are elected an MP your responsibility is first to the people of New Zealand, and second to the party you were elected on.

Other parliamentary matters.

- The office of Prime Minister should be limited to a maximum of 10 years service.
- Ordinary passing of laws (not under urgency) should require a Majority in parliament.
- Under urgency votes should require 67% Majority in parliament to pass, to encourage greater cooperation between the Government and Opposition, and reduce abuse.
- Proxy voting under Urgency should be abolished. If it is important enough law that requires Urgency then MPs should be there to vote on it in person. The government and opposition will work together to remove peers from voting if a particular MP is on official business outside of New Zealand and unable to attend. Eg. If the Foreign Minister is on official business overseas the Leader of the Opposition will ask one of his or her Opposition MPs to not vote to even up the numbers.

1485

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 20/06/2013 2:18 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Colin W. Bull Organisation Name: C.W. and G.J. Bull Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA:
Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal Region: Auckland
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: Constitution Review

The purpose of a Constitution is to put a brake on an oppressive government. There is no foreseeable likelihood of New Zealand having an oppressive government, so we have no need for a constitution

In my view the present system where Judges of the High Court can do a judicial review of government legislation is working well.

Treaty of Waitangi.

The present system where legislators must consider of the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi when drawing up legislation, is working. The conflict of different versions and their translation problems mean that the treaty document is too ambiguous to become a basis or part of an enforceable written constitution.

Other Constitution Negatives:

Under a constitution it would be very difficult to see how we could continue having Maori Constituencies especially as we have a Maori Party in Parliament. Yes we must eventually remove those Maori seats but they were pragmatically legislated for, to help Maori.
Maori have not yet obtained equality with other races in New Zealand so it is not yet time to remove these seats.

Pragmatic is the word. New Zealanders are very good at it. We can continue to pragmatically use guidelines from the Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights the Treaty of Waitangi and other useful commandments without the complication of a Constitution.

In the United States Constitution the Second Amendment allows American citizens to bear arms and because it is part of their Constitution they are finding it impossible to change or modify that Act and all Americans are in danger from the indiscriminate use of firearms.

We are be better off without a constitution.

Issues that a Constitution or Bill of Rights would be unlikely to remedy.

Under MMP minority groups with singular issues have too much influence on New Zealand Society but a constitution is unlikely to resolve that.

There should be a minimum age limit on Members of Parliament as we have too many MPs too young, immature and naive. A constitution is unlikely to resolve that.

There have been times in the past where I believe the New Zealand Government got it wrong however I do not believe in those instances a documented constitution would have been able to rectify it. I point out the Muldoon Government's price freeze in 1970-71; their disastrous 20% sales tax hikes on boats and caravans in 1979 which ruined many businesses. Then their wage, rent, price freeze and interest rates controls of 1982-84. I point out the Governments 20% devaluation of the New Zealand currency after the 1984 election that effectively knocked 20% off people's savings. The Labour Governments re-nationalizing of the accident insurance industry in 2002.

I say a definite NO to a formal written Constitution.

Other issues

Size of parliament

In the election of 1999 the electorate voted overwhelmingly (by over 80%) to reduce the number of seats in parliament from 120 to 99. The government said it was only an indicative vote. An 80% vote from an 80% turnout is more than indicative and the reduction in seats should have happened at the following election.

The suggestion then was that reducing the number of MPs would reduce the cost of government. It would also reduce the cost of bureaucracy.

The high cost of government is of serious concern. It consumes too large a portion of New Zealands gross domestic product thereby helping keeping our standard of living low.

MMP List Members.

I suggest that list members other than party leaders and Cabinet Ministers should be required to have a constituency office preferably in an electorate held by another party. This could be achieved by negotiation and no electorate should have more than two electorate offices. Presently list MPs have a very sweet job and a light workload compared with constituency members.

In reducing the size of parliament we should also reduce the ratio of list MPs; reducing the number of list MPs from 41% (51 seats in a 122 seat parliament) in the present parliament to 35.35% (35 seats in a 99 seat parliament).

Size of electorate and frequent boundary changes.

We need to amend the size of electorates so we have boundary changes less frequently. It is not the electorate vote that decides which party/parties will govern but the party vote; so a wider variance of a plus or minus say 20% on electorate constituent numbers would be acceptable and would not effect the balance in parliament. This would also allow a size reduction in large sparsely populated rural electorates, and allow those MPs to better serve their constituents.

Three year parliamentary term

A nationwide referendum in 1990 with an 85% turnout; had 70% supporting a three year term and 30% a four year term. We should continue with the three year term, supporting the two thirds majority who supported that.

Bi-elections

The Constitutional Review Panel should consider the issue of a constituent Member of Parliament dying or resigning and the possibility that the party of which he was the MP being be able to install their next candidate off their list to take up that seat, rather than have the cost and inconvenience of a bi-election.

Sent on the 20 June 2013 at 14:17

1136

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 6/06/2013 4:31 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: FREDERICK BULL & ; CAROLYNE JONES Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA:
Postal AddressB: Postal City: WADDINGTON Postal Region: CANTERBURY Postal Post
Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: We wish to state that a 4 year term of
parliamentary office would be a more suitable length of term & hope the Government will
implement this.

Sent on the 6 June 2013 at 16:30

4531

From: Frank Bull
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
CC: Frank
Date: 31/07/2013 11:47 p.m.
Subject: CAP submission

SUBMISSION

On The Constitution Conversation

Submitter: Frank A L Bull
Email Address:
Street Address: Auckland
Contact Phone:

My Submission is as follows:

It address two parts only: Part 1 is concerned with the Panel and lack of Balance

(1) Apart from the desire of the National Party to retain power, there is little justification for this 'conversation' to take place now. Successive governments - at least since the Bolger administration - and Treaty Settlement payments aside, have shown an excessive determination to appease Maori, expressed by grant to Maori of both money and privilege. Almost all of which has been without a mandate from the Electorate, from ordinary New Zealanders.

(2) From its inception, the make up of the Advisory Panel has been controversial, being weighted greatly favouring Maori or Maori sympathisers, which is absurd when Maori comprise only about 15% of the NZ population.

(3) The Maori panellists present an easily-identifiable Maori radical or activist influence. These Maori are strongly - some even fanatically - biased in favour of Maori sovereignty, and are mainly advocates for Maori grievances. On past form they argue largely from a bias. The non- Maori representatives are a political mishmash whose individual or collective political views are largely unknown to the majority of New Zealanders. Who or what they favour or support is largely unknown, but mostly they are not recognised for being in favour of the status quo.

(4) The whole concept of an open and unbiased Panel is a nonsense; the workings and deliberations of the collective Panel is so far unknown. It is unlikely most NZ ers have confidence in them individually or collectively. To date the workings of the Panel/Panellists seems to have occurred mainly below the radar of the majority of NZ ers; whether this has been accidental or deliberate is a matter of some conjecture.

(5) I witnessed the co chairman of each 'side' outlining the 'conversation' from his side's perspective [i.e. Sir Stephen O'Regan and Professor John Burrows] and from the point of view of a fair or balanced debate I was horrified. Professor Burrows strove to be eminently fair; he was clear, erudite, balanced, but simply lacked volume or projection of voice. By contrast, Tipene O'Regan was the natural orator, short on identifiable facts and balance, but loud with a natural volume and wonderful ability to project his voice. In effect the 'street fighter' O'Regan easily won on points and against a mild-mannered gentleman, Burrows. Was this mis-matched approached either then, or going forward be replicated in marae or other forums where this 'conversation' takes place?

(6) It appears O'Regan and his team have already canvassed Maori widely through many marae visits. Conversely, non-Maori and Pakeha have been almost overlooked.. The debate, or 'conversation' has been little advertised, or non-Maori views canvassed until very recently. Thus the Maori voice has been widely heard while the other side has not had the 'marae' advantage. There has been little coverage by the media. The balance in dissemination of information has to date been decidedly lop-sided in favour of Maori.

(7) The whole so called 'conversation' has been extremely divisive among New Zealand people. The whole issue, once it emerges clearly to the whole country, will almost certainly exacerbate this division. It is untimely, unwarranted and unnecessary and as such it should be either deferred or tested in a public referendum. This could conveniently be held at the time of the next General Election.

Part two is concerned with 'Partnership' and embedding the Treaty into our Constitution:

(1) The term Partnership does not appear anywhere in the Treaty; it is a latter-day term applied by politicians (including an NZ born Law Lord), seized on delightedly by Maori Radicals, and has gained some credence which was never implied or intended originally. This is largely by constant repetition also by politicians and Maori Radicals. It is thus a devious and totally wrong consideration.

(2) Academic and political Constitution experts mainly regard our NZ Constitutions as both good and workable, and there has been no condemnation of it because it is unwritten, therefore we should apply common sense. The old adage should be recognised, i.e. "If it isn't broke, don't fix it!" In short we should leave it alone!

(3) It is an absurdity that a document which by its genesis of time and place and, being reasonably well designed, should be given a some contemporary and revisionist significance beyond its original scope or determination. The fact this has already occurred in no way makes it right going forward.

(4) The whole exercise now being undertaken, in idiomatic language, is so full of fish hooks it is a disaster waiting to happen. One can only conclude with the phrase from our National Anthem: God Defend New Zealand !!

Frank A L Bull
Dated 31 July 2013

1010

From: Richard Bull
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 1/06/2013 8:06 p.m.
Subject: CAP submission

Hi,

I guess it is fair to ask if we need a constitution but I am troubled as to what it is, precisley, that is wrong with the status quo.

A constitution wont solve unemployment or family violence. If anything it has the potential to create probelms, as we have seen in USA with their gun problem. A constitution freezes contemporary thinking into some sort of list that may or may not be what the bulk of people want. It is probably also going to result in the latest maori gravy train that will cost the country another fortune.

We dont need a constitution just because other countries do. I hardly think the UK is a retarded third world country, in fact its justice system is hugely civilised and respected.

Plus a constitution is just going to cost taxpayers a whole bunch of money. Legal fees dont come cheap and there will be a whole industry created around interpreting a constitution. I suspect this is a folly of the legal profession.

Thanks.

101

From:

To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>

Date: 8/04/2013 9:00 p.m.

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

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

Full Names: Bullen Organisation Name: Email: Phone: Postal
AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region: Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I dont like that our government is giving everything to
the Maori's

Sent on the 8 April 2013 at 19:58

2114.

From: "Jim Bullock" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 3/07/2013 8:30 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I believe we need Maori seats abolished altogether and people get voted in on their own merits like all politicians not by being a Maori.

1912'

"Tauranga

Dear Sir

I wish to state my
objection to having any reference
to the Treaty of Waitangi in our
constitution

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

Regards B.M. Zumbach

4928

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 25/07/2013 9:41 p.m.

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

Full Names: Katrina Bungard Organisation Name: NZNP Pakuranga Electorate. Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA:
Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region: Auckland
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I believe that our
parliamentary term should be four years in length, rather than the three year term currently imposed. I
believe that this needs to occur in order to establish greater consistency for the government in being
able to fulfil electoral promises,
as four years is a much more reasonable time in order to implement new policies. Under the current
term, government tends to be constantly in campaign mode, with only a little over one year
in-between where policies can be implemented, before the next election
campaign begins. And barely any time at all before the next election to actually establish whether the
government, and any new policies which they did manage to implement, had a positive impact on our
country. Most other countries under an MMP environment
practice a four year term successfully, and I believe that this is in the best interest of our country.

Submitted on the 25 July 2013 at 21:40

2920.

From: "Sue Bunn" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/07/2013 4:42 p.m.
Subject: Review

The Chairman,
Constitutional Panel.

Dear Sir,

I believe that race-based representation has no place in modern society,
so I feel very strongly that it is time to abolish Maori seats.
Our democratic rights should be based on citizenship, not race,
so the Maori seats should be abolished, in the best interests of all citizens.

Yours faithfully,

Susan R Bunn

Wanqanui

789

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 17/04/2013 2:47 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Terence Joseph Bunn Organisation Name: N/A Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB:
Postal City: Postal Region: Far North Postal Post Code: Postal Country:
New Zealand Submission: Ditch any concept of a Constitution and stick with the status quo. A
Constitution could further Maori independence ideas re the Treaty of Waitangi which would further
divide our country.

Sent on the 17 April 2013 at 14:46

To

THE SECRETARY,
ADVISORY PANEL
WELLINGTON

24th JUNE 2013

DEAR SIR,

NEW ZEALAND DOES NOT NEED
A WRITE CONSTITUTION, AND
I STRONGLY OPPOSE ANY
LEGISLATION TO THE TREATY
OF WAITANGI OR REFERENCE TO

SAME

WE ARE ONE PEOPLE NO
MATTER WHAT, CREED, COLOUR
OR RELIGION WE MIGHT BE.

IN GOD'S EYES WE ARE
ONE PEOPLE.

Yours faithfully
HRE E. BUNTING

1848

1987

From: "Graeme Burberry" <
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 30/06/2013 7:12 p.m.
Subject: Review Conversation

Hello Team.

I attended the recent meeting in Hamilton with Lindsay Tisch and Deborah Coddington and much appreciated the opportunity to raise some questions.

Having given the matter some further consideration I offer some thoughts.

I really question the need for Maori seats in this day and age and believe it's time for their demise. Apart from the fact that they (Maori) are already well represented in Parliament across all the political parties they are otherwise too splintered as a race to qualify for separate representation. The recent offer to have them choose between the General Roll or Maori Roll seemed to highlight this, as I understand the numbers switching between each roll virtually cancelled each other out. A complete waste of time do you not think?

The size of parliament should certainly be reviewed. I'd like to emphasise at this point that I did not endorse MMP at any stage, and I think it's a sop to good governance. I seem to recall that when the first referendum was held only about 35% of those eligible voted, and then the final margin of yeas to nays was about 50+% to 49+%. In other words, there was no real mandate for MMP and yet it was still introduced, and look at the kerfuffle there's been since. It should be dumped!

A parliamentary term of four years would seem a fair change to that in existence. More stability would be provided with any proposed changes better researched and considered.

I'll be very interested to see what recommendations the Panel eventually suggest.

Yours encouragingly.

Graeme Burberry

HAMILTON

Phon
Fa:
Emai

4473

From: Aidan Burch ·
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 7:21 p.m.
Subject: CAP submission

Dear Sir/Madam,

I have three points on which I would like to submit:

- (1) The term of each government should be extended to four years
- (2) Economic, social and cultural rights should be placed on an equal footing with civil and political rights in the NZ Bill of Rights Act
- (3) The NZ Bill of Rights Act should have the status of supreme law

Yours sincerely,
Aidan Burch

Wellington

1340

From: "Burch Family"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 14/06/2013 8:59 p.m.
Subject: A submission regarding democracy.

To Whom It May Concern

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

Yours faithfully,

Robert and Valerie Burch.

Tauranga ,

New Zealand.

2173

From: Burchett
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 3/07/2013 11:12 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

It is way past time too abolish the maori seats

JA Burchett

1171

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/06/2013 12:16 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Grant Burden Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Havelock North
Postal Region: Hawke's Bay Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: Question 1

The treaty should have no role what so ever in any future constitution.

Question 2

No it should not because if this happens non Maori will be beholden to Maori interests only.

Sent on the 8 June 2013 at 12:16

117/a

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/06/2013 12:20 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Grant Burden Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Havelock North
Postal Region: Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: Maori
seats should be abolished they are racist, if they want to become an MP do it like everybody else.

Sent on the 8 June 2013 at 12:19

11716

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/06/2013 12:31 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Grant Burden Organisation Name: Email: ☐
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Havelock North
Postal Region: Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission:
Question 1

100 MP's. We are small country and we don't need that many people to run the country.

Question 2

4 - 5 years. Short terms means short term thinking if the terms were longer governments would be more prepared to tackle long term problems. The cost is also an issue if we had elections less often it would save the country a lot of money. This should only be for central government at this stage and not for local body government.

Question 3

As long as the election is held by the time the 3/4/5 year period is up any time.

Question 4

Population size.

Question 5

They should leave parliament and/or the party leader should have the power to fire him/her.

Sent on the 8 June 2013 at 12:30

1171c

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/06/2013 12:42 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Grant Burden Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Havelock North
Postal Region: Hawkes's Bay Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: Question 1

No it should not. We are living and have lived fine with out a single document so if it is not broken don't fix it.

Question 2

No because it restricts the governments power to make changes. All you have to do is look at the American constitution and gun issues to see what kind of a problem these systems can cause.

Question 3

Parliament because if the judge has the power it becomes restrictive and limits the parliament power to make changes. It depends on each judge views the document 1 might view it as anti-constitutional while another will view it as constitutional. Again all you have to do is look at the American constitution to see the problem you often have 5/4 rulings how can 4 judges see it as anti-constitutional while 5 judges can or vice versa. Judges will end up voting via political affiliations which is why this doesn't work well.

Sent on the 8 June 2013 at 12:41

117/1

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/06/2013 1:44 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Grant Burden Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: | Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: Hawke's Bay Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: Question 1

No because it does not protect my economic and property rights. Privacy is an issue but due to the internet putting it in the bill or rights will make little or no difference. Social and cultural rights should not be protected under the bill of rights as it depends on your views about what is important culturally or socially. The bill of rights should only protect things that affect everyone or a large majority of the population.

Question 2

Better laws could be made to address these issues however the problem is that the next Government could just change the law.

Question 3

As long as the rights affect everybody then it should have a higher legal standing. However if other rights are added like something specific to Maori or another group it should not have that higher standing.

Question 4

The courts because they should be unbiased however this is probably unlikely.

Question 5

The rights to economic and property protection, by property I mean property, shares, bonds, cash and any other asset owned. This should protect their property so that governments or councils can't ever seize it or make unfair laws that will diminish its value.

Sent on the 8 June 2013 at 13:44

1171e

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 8/06/2013 1:58 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Grant Burden Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: Hawke's Bay Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: Question 1

My aspirations for New Zealand can be broken down into 3 areas economic, social and cultural. My economic aspirations are for more businesses to thrive and many new small businesses to open. I would also like to see many current smaller businesses grow into more medium size businesses and then into large businesses. I would also like New Zealand to be a place that attracts overseas business and new overseas business. Having unattractive tax systems such as the proposed Capital Gains Tax by the left will not achieve this. I would like tax breaks given to companies who are prepared to move away from Auckland to places like Hamilton and Tauranga which would help the housing issue in Auckland. I would also like New Zealanders to value innovation and business as many people just see them as cash cows for the government. Socially I would like to see people not always hide behind political correctness and say what they think. I would also like people to be more responsible in everything they do from buying a house to having children and not always think the Taxpayer will always help them out. Culturally I would like there to be less Maorification shoved down our throats New Zealand is now a multi-cultural country whether people like it or not. No more special treatment for Maori there should be 1 law for all.

Sent on the 8 June 2013 at 13:58

2846

From: John Burford
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 5/07/2013 9:12 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Abolish the maori seats

It's a form of apartheid - no matter how this is dressed up!

John Burford

Whangaparaoa

3605

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 15/07/2013 6:22 p.m.
Subject: http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/ form submission

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

Full Names:	Timothy Burge	Organisation Name:		Email:		Phone:	
	Postal AddressA:			Postal AddressB:			
	Postal City:	Coromandel	Postal Region:	vaukato	Postal Post Code:		Postal
Country:	New Zealand	Submission:	Who should have the power to decide whether legislation is consistent with the constitution: Parliament or the Courts?				

Why?

I would like to see the Courts hold this power.

I have more faith in the Courts than I do in Parliament. Parliament where oppositions disagree with each other just because they're on opposing sides. Because MPs are influenced more by their own personal agendas.

Thank you for reading my submission.

Tim

Sent on the 15 July 2013 at 18:21

1856

20 June 2013

WANGANUI

To: The Secretariat
Constitutional Advisory Panel
C/- Ministry of Justice
DX SX 10088
WELLINGTON

SUBMISSION TO THE CONSTITUTIONAL ADVISORY PANEL

Constitution

There is no need for New Zealand to have a Constitution as the present laws, statutes and conventions serve this country well. We currently have one of the most flexible, robust unwritten constitutions in the world.

There is no place for The Treaty of Waitangi in any proposed constitution. I strongly oppose any legislation or reference to the Treaty of Waitangi in any current or future legislation.

If in the future a written constitution is drafted I am strongly opposed to any race based legislation.

Number of MP's

The number of MP's should be decreased and the list system be done away with as being totally undemocratic. List MP's are not voted into Parliament.

Parliamentary Term

The Parliamentary Term must remain at 3 years. This puts the power into the hands of electors to oust a rogue government.

Electoral Integrity Legislation

Democracy needs to be brought back with electorate elected MP's only with no List MP's. If an elected MP does not fulfil the 3 year contract then they must resign and a by-election will need to be held.

Size and Number of Electorates

The number of Electorates in both the North Island and South Island should remain the same.

Maori Representation in Parliament and Local Government

Abolish the Maori seats in Parliament. Separate racial representation is totally unacceptable in a Democracy and this includes local government. There is no place for a separate Maori roll and resultant Maori MP in New Zealand.

The Bill Of Rights

It works perfectly as it is so leave it alone.

In conclusion

The foundation of democracy is that all citizens must be equal with no regard to race, religion or gender and all citizens must be treated exactly the same under the law.

Democracy must be based on citizenship and not ethnicity.

If the treaty is enshrined in law the governance of our country will be drastically changed. It is a recipe for apartheid.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jenny Burgess', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Jenny Burgess

31/5

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.

Chas Burgess
Auckland
New Zealand

423

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 16/04/2013 9:22 a.m.
Subject: http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/form_submission

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

Full Names: Jade Burgess Organisation Name: Te Hānu one one Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB:
Postal City: Tokoroa Postal Region: Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: Considering the Constitution was written in 1835, acknowledged by the King of England at that time, the Tangata Whenua need to understand that, we already have one, and it does not support the acting Government of New Zealand, that's why the Government want a new one, you know how they like to change the rules and regulations that they are bound by, not a LAW, hence the reason why previous Primeminister Jeffrey Palmer stood down and shut Parliment doors, but would we sell our Tupuna wants for our future.

Dont Stand for something that is wrong, as the Government in play now stays we are loosing everything, if our tupuna where here today, they would tell us how they fought and died to not let what is happening today....

Tangata Whenua we have a constitution already that is reccognised in England by the Crown, learn it, uphold it, then you will see the illegalities running this country through a Government that makes us think they are legal when they are not, if Jeffrey Palmer shut Parliment, why was it opened? and they should shut again for good.

Sent on the 16 April 2013 at 09:21

1005

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 1/06/2013 2:36 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Pamela Rosemary Yvonne Durham Organisation Name: N/a Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal
AddressB: Postal City: Waipukurau Postal Region: Hawkes Bay Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I do not want a written constitution where proposed
laws would be interpreted by the judiciary. I want to see the current Westminster system maintained
where proposed new laws are debated and decided upon by an elected Government. Our current
system has
a long tradition dating back to the Magna Carta of 1215 and has served democracies well over the
centuries.

Sent on the 1 June 2013 at 14:35

31/16

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.

Anne Burke
Whanganui
New Zealand

4360

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 9:45 a.m.
Attachments: Submission to CAP.docx

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

Full Names: Johanna Burns Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Bay of Plenty Postal Region:
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: As a pakeha woman, I agree with this document.

We need to have a robust constitution around tangata whenua and tangata tiriti. Submission
Upload: Submission to CAP.docx

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 09:45

Submission to the Constitutional Advisory Panel

Name:

Organisation (if applicable):

Postal or Email Address:

Date:

Overview

I/We believe that the Consideration of Constitutional Issues has been constrained by its overly narrow terms of reference and the inherently political nature of its origin.

I/We recommend that the public be engaged in a more wide-ranging constitutional discussion that addresses fundamental issues such as the values that ought to underpin our constitution.

I/We also recommend that, in any case, the Treaty of Waitangi be recognized as a central component of our constitution and that, until better mechanisms are established for Māori representation, the Māori seats in Parliament are retained and entrenched, and the establishment of Māori wards continues to be encouraged at the local government level.

Narrow Terms of Reference

There is a pressing need for constitutional reform in Aotearoa. However, the terms of reference for the Consideration of Constitutional Issues are too narrow to allow for any issues to be addressed that could lead to effective constitutional reform. The terms of reference focus on specific mechanical issues relating to our existing constitutional institutions. This assumes that the basic structures of our current constitution work well, provide for effective accountability and participation in the exercise of public power, and reflect values that are appropriate for Aotearoa in the 21st century and beyond.

A more effective process for constitutional reform should be undertaken. This should begin with a discussion about the core values that ought to underpin the exercise of public power in Aotearoa. Those values could then drive the development of appropriate institutions and mechanisms. The approach and work of Aotearoa Matike Mai: The Independent Constitutional Working Group might be instructive to consider.

Politicization of the Process

The Consideration of Constitutional Issues is also constrained because it has been established as an inherently political process. The entire process originated from the confidence and supply agreement between the Māori Party and the National Party. The terms of reference are coloured by the political imperatives that drive each of those parties. Those parties have a vested interest in portraying this process as a success. Other political parties have an incentive to paint the process as a failure. These issues are simply too important to be politicized in this way or to be controlled by politicians and political processes.

A non-politicized process of constitutional reform should be undertaken.

Maintenance of Basic Constitutional Protections for Māori

While the Consideration of Constitutional Issues is too constrained to lead to effective constitutional change, it is vital that basic constitutional protections for Māori are not eroded as a result of this process. The Treaty of Waitangi ought to be recognized as a central part of our constitutional arrangements that speaks to the exercise of public power in Aotearoa. The Māori seats in Parliament may be only a minimal form of Māori representation but they must be retained and entrenched until better mechanisms are established. Similarly, Māori wards should continue to be encouraged at the local government level.

3117

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.

Lorna Burns
Auckland
New Zealand

2371

From: "The Burrs" ·
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 3/07/2013 9:57 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Re: Maori seats in Parliament.

I wish to add my name to the number of New Zealanders opposed to any race based seats in Parliament.

I'm a fourth generation European Kiwi and I believe there is no benefit to any country to define who can, or cannot govern, based on age, sex or ethnic origins.

New Zealand has become a racist society out of guilt over past transgressions (real or perceived) and a naive belief that the indigenous people (Maori) of our country have been oppressed and disadvantaged. The reality is that they have had the same opportunity to progress themselves as anyone - in some cases even more opportunity than other ethnic groups. They are not an oppressed or disadvantaged people today.

If you take a good look around New Zealand now, you will find many ethnic groups (European included) who are struggling and disadvantaged because that is what the real world is like now - it's hard out there!

So unless we change the constitution to include specific ethnic based seats for Europeans, Asians, Pacific Islanders etc - why should we retain parliamentary seats just for Maori? Isn't that just another racist policy?

Carey Burr

Nelson

228

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 12/04/2013 9:14 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Peter John Burrell Organisation Name: Fmail: _____
Phone: _____ Postal AddressA: _____ Postal AddressB: _____ Postal City: _____
Postal Region: Waikato Postal Post Code: _____ Postal Country: New Zealand

Submission: I would like to see all NZ'ers as being equal and no one race held above any other.
Maoris may well have beaten Europeans to this land but it is a widely held view that they were not the
first inhabitants, and as such should not enjoy a special place in
a revised constitution. It is ridiculous for anyone who has less than 50% Maori blood to be able to
claim to be Maori and as such have privileges not accorded other inhabitants. All Maori claims should
be finalized before any review and then the Treaty of
Waitangi deleted from all documents and retired to history. Until this happens there will always be
them and us.

Sent on the 12 April 2013 at 09:13

2996¹

From: "Peter C Burridge" <
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 10/07/2013 3:15 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission/ FROM PETER BURRIDGE,

Wednesday 10th Julv 2013,
, Auckland

Good afternoon,
The review of aspects of the current constitution (of which formal type we do not have in New Zealand as we follow the British model), currently includes a General Roll and a Maori Roll for elections and representation in Parliament. I am a 5th generation Kiwi and firmly of the opinion that it is time for the abolishment of the separate Maori Roll. This would mean that all candidates for election stand on the one Roll and all vote for their particular electorate on the General Roll. . Please note my interest in this matter. Thank you.
Yours faithfully,
Peter C Burridge.

4938

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 26/07/2013 8:01 a.m.

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

Full Names: Dorothy Burrill-Gray Organisation Name: Email: - - - - -
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission:
We must retain our original constitution as we are part of the commonwealth and as such still under
the realm of the British Queen. As a country all our people should be equal citizens under the laws of
the land. No group of people should have any special
privileges over the others. We must retain our democratic process where the majority has power.
Freedom of speech, movement and religion

must be retained. Immigrants coming to NZ must adopt our laws and standard of conduct.

Submitted on the 26 July 2013 at 08:00

4938a

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 26/07/2013 8:27 a.m.

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

Full Names: Dorothy Burrill-Gray Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission:
The Treaty of Waitangi should have no part in anything to do with the constitution, Laws or
Government. All our people are equal. All races are equal.

Submitted on the 26 July 2013 at 08:26

49386

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 26/07/2013 8:40 a.m.

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

Full Names: Dorothy Burrill-Gray Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code: - Postal Country: New Zealand Submission:
Maori representation is no longer relevant, the Maori seats should be abolished. Everybody has the
right to vote and be educated, we are all equal in the eyes of the law. All special rights for Maori in
Local and Federal Government should be abolished.
All races are equal.

Submitted on the 26 July 2013 at 08:39

3646

From: "John Burrows"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 16/07/2013 5:46 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Separate Maori Seats should be ABOLISHED.

It is simply pure racism (apartheid) to have two separate voters rolls.

John Burrows

Auckland

2323

From: Melva Burton
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.gov...
Date: 3/07/2013 6:01 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Dear Sir , I think all Maori seats should be earned by election where all parties are voting for the one
seat

We should have no Maori seats at all
Have no mmp but previous election
Melva & John Buron

Melva

2323a.

From: Melva Burton
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 3/07/2013 6:01 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Abolish Maori seats

Melva

2834

From: Richard Burton <
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.gov...
Date: 5/07/2013 5:35 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I would like to make the following submission
I think the we are one country and thus we should abolish the Maori seats
Richard Douglas Burton

Auckland

Sent from my iPad

Quick Submission

Your name:

Rae Burton x

Name of the organisation you represent (if applicable):

A.A.W.
Holy Trinity Fitzroy NP.

Postal address or email address:

Need a fair and
equitable society.

Privacy should be
ensured

All Constitution Laws
Should ^{not} be Superseded.
But enshrined in law

A balance with English
Law ie magna carta.
50/50 maori treaty.

Cut back list members.
delete SI List members.
Cut back members
to 80.

No one man parties in Govt

Already have maori
seats, etc so have a
representation.

make the vote compulsory

make it 4 years.

up to the Govt.

Leave the House
By Election.

No voter as another
Party.

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

Quick Submission

2681

Your name:

CASSANDRA BURTON-WOOD

Name of the organisation you represent (if applicable):

Postal address or email address:

Wellington

I am very concerned that the current bill of rights that protect us as a New Zealander do not currently include economic, cultural and social rights.

I support the movement to amend our bill of rights to include the right to adequate housing, judicial fair play and the universal right to health

to bring New Zealand in line with the rest of the developed world.

Thank you very much

Cassandra Burton-Wood
(19 yrs old)

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**

4011"

From: Ralph Butcher
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 29/07/2013 9:31 a.m.
Subject: Submission to the Constitutional Advisory Panel
Attachments: Constitutional Review.docx

To Professor John Burrows and the Constitutional Advisory Panel

Please find attached my submission for the constitutional review
Thank you
Ralph Butcher

Submission to the Constitutional Advisory Panel

New Zealand's Constitution

I believe the constitution should be written down clearly in one document to make it more accessible to all New Zealander's without confusion. The Bill of Rights therefore should be incorporated in to the main body of the constitution. Parliament should continue to have the final say over the status of any legislation, and this should never be put in the hands of the government with final control. If Nzer's decide issues are of sufficient importance to the nation that they warrant a referendum, this referendum should be binding and should only be overturned with a majority vote exceeding 85%.

As the time for settling treaty grievances between the crown and Maaori is drawing to a close, so should the seats in parliament allocated specifically for Maaori be brought to an end also. After all the settlements, Maaori who will have the resources and ample opportunity to work with both local and central government, will also have the opportunity to care for their people. If these Maaori require specific additional government support for any programme or venture for their people, then it is wise to see an account of how the resources have been utilised for their people up to that point and the positive outcomes that have been achieved before any further assistance is granted.

I do not have any strong views on the parliamentary term or number of seats etc, except to say that power should be removed from central government as much as possible and decentralised as much as possible, giving local communities more control over their own affairs as much as possible.

Treaty of Waitangi and the NZ Constitution

The treaty of Waitangi was an important historical attempt for two different cultures to be able to live together in peace that should always be respected in that context. While there are difficulties to interpret English documents at times, I don't believe these difficulties are not nearly to the same extent as the difficulties that have come out in translating a document written in Te Reo Maaori in order to obtain a precise interpretation that all New Zealanders can accept and agree on. As it stands, The Treaty of Waitangi remains a divisive document, and will always be a source of dispute and contention.

It is for this reason that I do not consider it wise to include the Treaty of Waitangi in a NZ constitution. Indeed I don't believe it appropriate to include any document in a NZ Constitution, and the Constitution should be confined to a series of overriding principles.

Through the years there have been numerous attempts to settle grievances through the Treaty of Waitangi, the last significant one coming from Sir Geoffrey Palmer in the form of introducing the

"principles of the Treaty", which unfortunately has only muddied the waters even more. There will never be general agreement amongst New Zealanders about the Treaty and its significance in NZ affairs, and so as a specific document, the Treaty of Waitangi should be kept out of all discussions about building nationhood. To me, the basis of an appropriate and vital discussion should be concerning the things we all have in common, not only between the white races and Maaori, but with every representation of other cultures in NZ, and not focusing on our differences. There are many valuable aspects of each culture embodying wisdom in NZ that can be used to enhance the health and well being of every NZer to build a nation together that every NZer can be proud of. One particularly important aspect of Maaori culture as well as with other indigenous cultures is the sense of community which represents a vital part in building a peaceful and responsible nation together.

All who live in New Zealand are New Zealander's. All the white skinned races in NZ are not "pakeha" or "foreigners", but kiwis. All the non white races in NZ are not sub races or sub cultures either. They are equally kiwis as well. We all have to look to the future and not dwell on the wrongs of the past.

He pai te tirohanga ki nga mahara mo nga raa pahemo engari ka puta te maaramatanga i runga i te titiro whakamua

Ralph Butcher

29 July 2013

2190

From: Butland"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 3/07/2013 11:49 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Maori Seats should be abolished for what I would have thought were very obvious reasons

J R Butland

International Mobile

Auckland

NEW ZEALAND

CONTACT

SITE:

820

From: Don Butler
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 11/05/2013 5:03 p.m.
Subject: CAP submission
Attachments: CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW.odt

Constitutional Advisory Panel
c/o Ministry of Justice
DX SX 10088 WELLINGTON

11/5/2013

Re: the New Zealand Constitutional Review and my submission,

I want no change to New Zealand's unwritten constitution as it has served us well since the 1852 NZ Constitution Act was passed as our founding document.

It may require some alterations in the future, but not a race based constitution.
"EQUALITY FOR ALL, ONE PEOPLE ONE NATION"!

Don Butler

Don Butler

139

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 9/04/2013 9:23 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: David Fenton Butler Organisation Name: Private Individual Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB:
Postal City: Postal Region: Bay of Plenty Postal Post Code: Postal Country:
New Zealand Submission: My submission has one underlying principle:

Look back and fail...orLook forward and prosper. We have the choice.

Our country is divided and backward looking while our competitors (eg Australia) are united and forward looking. We need a constitution that points us forward again and keeps us looking that way.

The first step in this process must be to create a written constitution that starts from a clean piece of paper - greenfields. "What do we need to succeed"

The Treaty of Waitangi was written to reflect conditions approaching 200 years ago. The world has changed. To use this document as a plan for the future is fatally flawed.

It must be written that:

All New Zealanders must now receive equal recognition under law

Subsidies for Maori must be removed

Maori seats in parliament must be removed

Compulsory Maori culture must be removed and replaced with learning the culture of possible trading partners

Natural resources must be legally defined as equally belonging to all citizens of New Zealand

Additionally:

The welfare system must remain to protect those proven unable to protect themselves, but:

It must not be enshrined as a way of life, a lifestyle for those who choose to be lazy as at present.

New Zealanders, regardless of race or creed must be encouraged to contribute to the productivity of this country by fairly rewarding individuals who work hard.

Justice:

Justice shall be equally dispensed.

Courts shall not undermine the good work of Police

Education:

Free education for all to end of Secondary level

Free tertiary education to those who undertake a course that contributes directly to our economy - medicine, engineering, science, commerce, but not arts or cultural courses (eg not commercial pilots courses, diving courses, dancing or painting or acting).

Summary:

If any future constitution is based on feely-touchy do-good fuzzy PC concepts instead of crystal clear direction for the future we are doomed.

Margaret Thatcher just died. She brought Great Britain from an era of low productivity, labour disputes, Irish War, Falklands war into an era of national unity, prosperity and was instrumental in defeating communism with clear direction.

Our constitution has an opportunity to do the same for New Zealand

Sent on the 9 April 2013 at 09:22

1954

To Whom it May Concern.

Secretariat,
Constitutional Advisory Panel
c/- Ministry of Justice
DX SX 10055
Wellington

There are seven adults in this family, all of us are strongly against any legislation or reference of the Treaty of Waitangi or any current or future legislation in our constitution written or otherwise of any race based now or in the future constitution we are one people all New Zealanders for the good of our country.

Signed Elsie M Butler J Butler
E. M. Butler. J. Butler. and
five family members

1065

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 4/06/2013 7:15 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: John Edward Butler Organisation Name:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Email:
AddressB: Postal City: Motueka Postal AddressA: Postal
Postal Region: Nelson Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: ;If it ain't broke, don't fix it.

Sent on the 4 June 2013 at 19:14

821

From: Johanna Butler
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 11/05/2013 9:07 p.m.
Subject: Fw: CAP submission
Attachments: CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW.odt

This attachment is a copy of my husband Don Butler, please change name at the bottom of this attachment into my name: Johanna Butler.

Information from ESET NOD32 Antivirus, version of virus signature database 8320
(20130511)

The message was checked by ESET NOD32 Antivirus.

<http://www.eset.com>

Constitutional Advisory Panel
c/o Ministry of Justice
DX SX 10088 WELLINGTON

11/5/2013

Re: the New Zealand Constitutional Review and my submission,

I want no change to New Zealand's unwritten constitution as it has served us well since the 1852 NZ Constitution Act was passed as our founding document.

It may require some alterations in the future, but not a race based constitution.
"EQUALITY FOR ALL, ONE PEOPLE ONE NATION"!

Johanna Butler

Tauranga

Pf

2448.

From: Kevin Butler
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 4/07/2013 8:55 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

To Whom It May Concern,

My submission to the Constitutional Advisory Panel is that Maori seats should and must be ABOLISHED.

Thank you.

Kevin Butler

Hamilton

007
OK**ConstitutionalReview - Re: Constitutional Advisory Panel booklet error**

From: "mikebu"
To: "ConstitutionalReview" <ConstitutionalReview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 26/09/2012 10:15 a.m.
Subject: Re: Constitutional Advisory Panel booklet error

Dear secretariat,

Thank you for your reply.

However, you neglected to put a name at the bottom of the letter.

Is this an automated reply or did someone write it?

Regards

Mike Butler

----- Original Message -----

From: ConstitutionalReview

To:

Sent: Wednesday, September 26, 2012 10:05 AM

Subject: Constitutional Advisory Panel booklet error

Good morning Mr Butler

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister has referred your email to the Panel's secretariat for response.

The aim of the booklet is to inform and support conversations with summary information about the existing constitutional arrangements, the conversation so far, and the questions and perspectives that have been expressed along the way. In gathering the information and perspectives reflected in the booklet the Panel relied on existing resources including academic texts, previous ministerial inquiries, case law, Waitangi Tribunal reports and news media.

Public understanding and participation is needed for enduring constitutional arrangements that reflect the values and aspirations of New Zealanders. The Panel are committed to ensuring that the people of New Zealand have an opportunity to tell them what they think.

As your email deals with substantive issues, it will be treated as a submission by the Panel.

Regards

-----Original Message-----

From: mikebu

Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2012 10:51 AM

To: B English (MIN)

Subject: Re: Constitutional Advisory Panel booklet error

Open letter to Bill English

I am writing to you as one Minister in charge of the Constitutional Advisory Panel to let you know that "New Zealand's Constitution - the conversation so far", released last week, includes a fundamental error in the assertion on page 9 that: "The treaty records an agreement that enabled the British to establish a government in New Zealand and confirmed to Maori the right to continue to exercise rangatiratanga".

This is incorrect. All the treaty actually says is that the Queen is sovereign and Maori are her subjects, with the rights of subjects, including possession of property. That is all, in both English and Maori versions.

Since then, moreover, the Queen and her successors have exercised sovereignty for 172 years.

If you go back to the official English and Te Tiriti texts as posted on the Waitangi Tribunal website:

In Article 1, "the Chiefs of the Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand and the separate and independent Chiefs who have not become members of the Confederation cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of sovereignty" is phrased in Maori as "Ko nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa hoki ki hai i uru ki taua wakaminenga ka tuku rawa atu ki te Kuini o Ingarani ake tonu atu - te Kawanatanga katoa o o ratou wenua".

And, in Article 2 "Her Majesty the Queen of England confirms and guarantees to the Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand and to the respective families and individuals thereof the full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates Forests Fisheries . . ." is phrased in Maori as "Ko te Kuini o Ingarani ka wakarite ka wakaae ki nga Rangitira ki nga hapu - ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me o ratou taonga katoa".

These two texts show that "sovereignty" is translated into "kawanatanga" and "possession" into "rangatiratanga". The treaty's Article 1 refers to ceding sovereignty while Article 2 guarantees possession of their lands etc.

Nowhere in these two articles does the treaty "confirm to Maori the right to continue to exercise rangatiratanga". This is a distortion of the meaning of the treaty.

Could you please ask the Constitutional Advisory Panel to correct this error by replacing the phrase "The treaty records an agreement that enabled the British to establish a government in New Zealand and confirmed to Maori the right to continue to exercise rangatiratanga", with the phrase ""The treaty records an agreement in which the Queen is sovereign and Maori are her subjects, with the rights of subjects, including possession of property."

X Mike Butler
New Zealand Centre for Political Research

Secretariat, Constitutional Advisory Panel
| c/- Ministry of Justice | DX SX10088 | Wellington 6011 | 04 918 8800 |
www2.justice.govt.nz/cap-interim/
=====

Confidentiality notice: This email may contain information that is confidential or legally privileged. If you have received it by mistake, please:
(1) reply promptly to that effect, and remove this email and the reply from your system;
(2) do not act on this email in any other way.
Thank you.

=====

4289

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 30/07/2013 10:01 p.m.

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

Full Names: Richard Butler Organisation Name: not applicable Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA:
Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region: Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: New Zealand needs a far more robust process
of checks and balances to ensure that the laws that are passed reflect the best interests of the
majority of New Zealanders and are not passed for the benefit of the privileged few.

New Zealand is a small nation. While we have very low rates of corruption, it is very easy for political
decision making to get captured by special or vested interests. This results in legislation that reflects
the interests of interest groups at the expense
of the majority of New Zealanders.

We don't need a second house of parliament or a president. This would not solve the issue just create
more politics. What New Zealand needs is a panel of five to seven people whose role it is to scrutinize
proposed legislation to ensure that it benefits the
majority of people. If it does not meet this test the panel would reject the proposed legislation.

We also need to get rid of our constitutional monarchy. It is time we grew up as a nation and cut the
apron strings with England. The governor general plays no useful role in New Zealand society other
than a ceremonial one.

Submitted on the 30 July 2013 at 21:59

4739

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 2:34 p.m.

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

Full Names: Tiffany Butler Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal Region:
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: As a country we have to stop
looking backwards and we need to trade in an international market with many countries. Cementing
the Treaty of Waitangi into our constitution would be a huge backward step for future prosperity.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 14:34

4615

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 3:03 p.m.

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

Full Names: Gina Butson Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Wellington Postal Region: Postal Post
Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: If a List MP changes parties or becomes
independent during the Parliamentary term, they should be required to leave Parliament (or defend
their position in some form of by-election).

On your 3 questions:

1. While a written constitution has the advantage of being easier to find and read for the average citizen (which is very important), written constitutions generally do not seem to be better at dealing with complex situations. They tend to be ambiguous and require amending. I think the accessibility issue could be dealt with by beefing up public resources (e.g. a decent website). Introducing Civic Education into the school curriculum would also be a huge step in raising awareness and understanding of constitutional issues.

3. The Courts. This is consistent with the separation of powers and the principle of comity. Further, the courts have the training and expertise to decide such issues. Politicians are concerned with politics.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 15:02

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 8:33 p.m.

4489²

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

Full Names: paigan butterfield Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
christchurch Postal Region: canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: Does the Bill of Rights Act protect your rights enough? Why?

No make it supreme law.

What other things could be done to protect rights?

Making the Bill Of Rights supreme law.

Do you think the Act should have a higher legal status than other laws (supreme law)? Why?

Yes, because these are fundamental rights that all people living in a democratic society should enjoy and exercise. No law should have the power to encroach on them and if a law does then there is obviously something wrong with the encroaching law that needs to be altered. If a government wants to pass a law that affects the Bill of Rights Act then they should change the Act directly rather than passing a new law that effects it. I feel that by passing a law which affects the Act they are encroaching on human rights in a way that is underhand and sneaky, which makes it harder for the public to realise what is happening and to defend their Rights. If the Bill of Rights was supreme law then no law could supersede it without actually altering the Bill of Rights Act itself and alerting the public that changes to their rights were being made.

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

I feel like the Courts should have measures to supersede if they deem that Parliament has passed a law that is inconsistent with the Act. I feel that the courts would not have a personal interest to pass to a prohibitive law for political gain and that we could trust them to be more objective than we could parliament. Also I feel that evaluating law is the courts job, parliament makes the law but it is the Courts that apply it. If they feel that law passed is not consistent with the Bill of Rights Act then should have the power to send it back to Parliament to alter or justify it. Using the Courts to check to the power of Parliament seems a logical safe guard in a democratic society.

What additional rights, if any, could be added to the Act? Why?

Rights agreed to in International Law should be put up for discussion to be potentially included in the Bill of Rights Act, possibly by referendum or 70 percent consensus in Parliament.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 20:32

4489a

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 8:47 p.m.

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

Full Names: paigan butterfield Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Christchurch Postal Region: Canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: Do you think our constitution should be written in a single document? Why?

Yes, because it could be a clear, unambiguous, concise document. It would all be outlined in one Act which would make it more accessible to people wanting to study or investigate matters affecting it. Ordinary people would not find it so confusing and would be able to pin point the Constitution and what it involved with far greater ease. Also exactly what was included and what wasn't included in our Constitution would be agreed upon clearly and not up for debate like it is now.

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

Yes because it is fundamentally a higher law. The Bill of Rights and the Constitution are the backbone of law within a democratic country, every other law should align up with them. These two laws are agreed upon as being integral to our countries legal fabric, they should not be superseded by any laws that are passed willy nilly by Parliament.

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

Parliament should endeavour not to pass laws which are inconsistent with our Constitution and our Courts should have the power to alert us when legislation is passed that is inconsistent and send it back to Parliament to be reviewed and rewritten. The Courts should safeguard our Rights, both Human Rights and National Rights.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 20:46

44896

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 8:54 p.m.

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

Full Names: paigan butterfield Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Christchurch Postal Region: Canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: Thinking of the future, what role do you think the Treaty of Waitangi could
have in our constitution?

The principles of the Treaty need to be considered when creating the Constitution.

Do you think that the Treaty should be made a formal part of the constitution? Why?

Yes, because it was the founding document for our nation. The Constitution should align with Treaty Principles and if it doesn't serious debate and public consultation (Referendum) should be had before implementing it.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 20:53

4489c

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 9:20 p.m.

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

Full Names: paigan butterfield Organisation Name: Email: | Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
christchurch Postal Region: canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: How should Māori views be represented in Parliament?

I feel the way they are now works well. I don't feel that Maori are marginalised on a nation-wide scale any more. Personally I don't feel that we need Maori Seats in Parliament, there are plenty of Maori MP's in the general electorate seats and as list MP's.

However I do feel that the decision to abolish Maori seats needs to be a decision made by Maori and agreed to by a majority of Maori, otherwise it could be viewed by Maori as taking away a Right rather than being seen as a step of independence and mana. Maori

don't need the seats to be an integral part of New Zealand's electoral system, they need the confidence to decide that though and to say "hey we can put our own unique Maori world view across in a way that is accessible to everyone, we don't need special electorate

seats to do this." Having special electorate seats for Maori doesn't mean they have special rights or an unfair advantage as some argue, personally I feel Maori may get their political views across to greater reception if they refused to separate themselves

from the general electorate and stood up for their Rights in the General Electorate, which would bring their views and concerns to the attention of the general population more often and potentially be expressed by respected MP's which everyone else in the same electorate has voted into office.

How could Māori electoral participation be improved?

Getting more young Maori to vote. This a problem for all young people though. Awareness at Marae level of the importance of electoral participation and making it a social event as well.

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

Mandatory consultation with local Iwi. "The Local Electoral Act 2001 provides councils with an opportunity to create Māori wards; these wards can only be created with the support of the majority of voters in the region." To date no Maori wards have been created

by a council they have all been voted down when suggested. There needs to be a push on a regional level to involve Maori in local politics, it's hard enough to get anyone to participate! Local Iwi opinion should always be sought when issues arise which affect them.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 21:20

4489 d

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 9:26 p.m.

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

Full Names: paigan butterfield Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
christchurch Postal Region: canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: Adding on to my previous submission:

What additional rights, if any, could be added to the Act? Why?

Disabled New Zealanders need greater protection under the Act and under the law in general. They are the most discriminated and marginalised minority in New Zealand and have the least means to protect and advocate for themselves. The Bill of Rights Act needs to be a starting point for them to do so and the legislation referring to them within it needs to be wide ranging and forceful.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 21:26

4489e

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 9:45 p.m.

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

Full Names: paigan butterfield Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
christchurch Postal Region: canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: What are your aspirations for Aotearoa New Zealand?

To be more inclusive of all types of people. For gender roles and expectations to disappear and for people to be judged as people and by their character rather than by stereotypical expectations. For the rights of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender New Zealanders to be exactly the same as every other New Zealander, with special reference to gay adoption. For disabled New Zealanders to be included in our society generally, for their needs to met without fuss or reluctance so that they can enjoy all the freedoms (such as employment, accessibility, social interaction, education) that other New Zealanders take for granted. For New Zealand born citizens to be more welcoming and accommodating of migrants as well as being more generous - we have a country with a lot of space, a lot of resources and very few life threatening issues compared to many countries around the world. We need to appreciate our luck (because that is all it is - luck not ability - that has allowed us to be born in this country) and be generous with what we have and how many people we grant refugee status to.

How do you want our country to be run in the future?

With the retention of a MMP electoral system. FPP was an archaic and inept electoral system. I feel that MMP is prgressive, representative and democratic and that by evaluating and learning from other countries (such as Germany) who have implemented MMP we can fine tune our electoral system to get the most out of it.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 21:44

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 26/07/2013 7:50 p.m.

44 89 A)

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

Full Names: paigan butterfield Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: ; Postal AddressB: Postal City:
christchurch Postal Region: canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: How many members of Parliament should we have? Why?

-140 MP's: because that was initially the number recommended and I feel it was scaled back for financial reasons. I understand the need for restraint in the size of a countries bureaucracy but feel that investment in MP's is the best use of financial resources (rather than in public servants, support people for MP's etc) as they directly decide what direction our country heads. We need a diverse range of MP's to achieve a true representation of our population, representation shouldn't be by a small number of elite people. Also as our population increases so should the number of MP's, more people require more MP's to represent them.

How long should the term of Parliament be? Why?

-4years. More time to implement policy and see the effect of it. The disruption that elections bring will occur less often.

How should the election date be decided? Why?

-Fixed date, decided by a committee involving all parties in parliament currently. If the election date is fixed then the Prime Minister of the time can not call an election for a time that is advantageous to his political party. The fixed date would not necessarily be a date but could be a month - e.g. elections are always held in September, with the exact date to be voted in parliament. There would obviously need to be a lot of consideration of when the fixed date would be to make sure it was convenient and fair for everyone.

What factors should be taken into account when the size and number of electorates are decided? Why?

-The geography of a electorate should be taken in to account, not just the population. If a MP has a very large electorate then it is difficult for them to get to all of their constituents. Likewise constituents in a large electorate have a disadvantage compared to constituents in a small electorate as it is much harder for them to have a face to face meeting with their MP. Maybe an extra budget for travel and for technology such as skype etc to make it easier for bigger electorates to stay in contact with their MP.
The Maori electorate that covers all of the South Island and the bottom of the North Island is to big and is unfair to the constituents it covers.

What should happen if a member of Parliament parts ways with the party from which he or she was elected? Why?

- It doesn't matter if the make up of parliament doesn't reflect the general election vote (due to MP's leaving their party) as the electorate voted in their MP on the electoral vote not their party vote. Obviously this only applies to electoral MP's. List
MP's need to stick with their party or resign as they got into parliament on general support for their political party, not support of them personally.

Submitted on the 26 July 2013 at 19:50

408

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 15/04/2013 11:28 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: sarah buunk Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: christchurch Postal Region: Postal
Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: i think new zealand should actually get
a constitution and stop pretending that we actually have one when we do not but then again even if
we did i am sure john key would find a way to screw that up like hes screwed everything else up
maybe you should
wait until after the elections next year before trying to make and one and if you could please stop the
false advertising that would be appreciated as well

Sent on the 15 April 2013 at 23:28

Constitution Conversation

Submission by

Mervyn K. Buxton

Napier.

1. It is my opinion that the Constitutional Advisory Panel representation is skewed ethnically in favour of Maori. Consequently the panel's recommendations will be at risk of favouring Maori interests. I could not accept a rebuttal of my point based on the assurance that all members of the panel will take a balanced position. Sir Tipene O'Regan and Dr Walker have during my lifetime earned a reputation for being vociferous advocates of Maori interests.

2. It is my opinion that the invitation to 'Share Your Aspirations' has been deliberately under promoted and that the panel has promulgated this invitation in places where it has reached a small sector of the population. No-one in my Bowling Club attends hui! The predictable consequence of choosing such a path for a 'Conversation' is that the response will not be representative of all sectors of New Zealand's populace. There will be a poor level of response from the elderly. They do not go to meetings. Young parents who are likely to be fully engaged in the needs of a family, the underprivileged, the uneducated and people who are not socially equipped to write letters to government panels have all been excluded from this 'Conversation'.

3. It is my opinion that the discussion papers, 'Electoral Matters', 'The Bill of Rights', the 'Treaty of Waitangi' and 'Maori representation' distributed at meetings, workshops and hui were irrelevant in a Conversation on a Constitution. It appears the reason for promoting other issues alongside such an important matter as the Constitution of a nation is a cynical attempt to divert attention from the focal issue. It could be described as a smokescreen.

4. I have listened to Maori explaining that a Constitution for Aotearoa New Zealand must contain recognition of the spirituality of Maori culture. This was concerning. In the first place, I was born in New Zealand. My passport of forty years ago says so. My present passport says I now live in New Zealand Aotearoa. I can't remember when I moved to this other country.

The necessity to have a Constitution which recognizes the spirituality of a minority ethnic group is, I contend, unnecessary in a secular country. There is no disputing that New Zealand is a secular society. Members of the panel may recall New Zealand's Prime Minister, Helen Clark, dropping 'grace' at the start of a Commonwealth Heads of Government dinner and justifying the decision with the remark "We're increasingly secular...". In the twenty-first century all Western nations set religion aside from politics. It is of concern to many people of my acquaintance, a group I believe to be representative of the majority of New Zealanders, that Maori intend to have their ancient religious beliefs (tikanga) embedded in the nation's Constitution. The incorporation of ancient Maori

religious practices in present day non-Maori events is found by large numbers of non-Maori people both irritating and unnecessary. Examples are, public buildings are subjected to a Maori ritual before the Opening Ceremony can commence or a place where a death occurred may be declared tapu by a kaumatua who has no recognized authority. (New Plymouth Golf Course) Such customs bearing religion from hundreds of years ago do not fit postmodernity.

5. It is my opinion that this desire to incorporate tikanga in a Constitution is an insidious attempt to gain legal and political advantage over the majority of this country's populace. This has already happened in the separation of the Church of England into three divisions, Maori, Pacifica and European. Neither the Pacifica nor the European divisions can change administrative or pastoral practices without the consent of the Bishopric of the Maori Division.

I have seen, in my life time, Maori culture invented and reinvented and I am sure that the pre-pakeha practices of Maori have been subjected to forces that have removed much of the authentic qualities and I wonder about the quality of the residual spiritual beliefs.

6. My submission concludes by reminding the panel (if this paper ever reaches the eyes of a panel member) that an acquaintance of mine, from our Homewood Crescent Karori days, Sir Robin Cook, has ruled that 'the Treaty has to be seen as an embryo rather than a fully developed and integrated set of ideas'.

In the same sense I believe the panel should regard a Constitution of New Zealand as an embryonic concept rather than an embryo ready to fly.

249

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 12/04/2013 5:01 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: George Ean Byett Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal
City: Postal Region: Waikato Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: We do not need a constitution. If we have a constitution we have a ram put
judiciary governing the country. We will finish up like america were unelected judges hamstringing
governments ability to govern. e.g the right to bear arms. We are governed by a democratically
elected parliament, not an unelected high court judge. We have seen an example of this in the sale of
mighty river power. Parliament decreed that the state asset should be sold. what gives the high court
the right to interfere in in this decision. Since magna
carter we are governed by parliament not a high court judge. And do not come an independent
judiciary, it does not exist. Judges are APPOINTED by the government of the day.

Sent on the 12 April 2013 at 17:00

2542

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 4/07/2013 12:17 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

Constitutional Review Panel

I am of the opinion that the Maori seats should be abolished. It is a form of apartheid being entrenched in our society. We are all supposed to be equal citizens with equal rights so why the need for discrimination on race.

Regards

Laurence Bylsma

PS I am of Dutch descent, perhaps we need a Dutch roll too, as well as Indian Chinese etc

3693

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 18/07/2013 8:28 p.m.

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

Full Names: Marie Joan Byrne Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Wellington Postal Region: Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: Of recent years transport and communication developments have meant people &
goods move freely world wide making all of us dependent on others around the globe..

A constitution must be fair and just for all people who now live in NZ. I fully support the right of all racial groups to enjoy their own cultural identity but it must not violate the rights of others or be at the expense of others.

Western civilization settlers with their knowledge and hard work developed NZ's resources to make a world respected land.

We have great emphasis on what Maoris lost to these settlers but we never see a balance sheet showing what they gained in today's world. e.g. What price can be put on freedom from the violence of tribal warfare?

It is time all New Zealanders moved into today's world and cooperated for the benefit of all

Submitted on the 18 July 2013 at 20:27

271

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 13/04/2013 10:40 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Byron Organisation Name: Email: Phone: Postal
AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Wellington Postal Region: Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: For Maori People to have more rights in New Zealand
by writing a new treaty of waitangi that allows Maori people more rights in New Zealand and that they
are paid the same minimum wage as pakeha no less and same rights to our education,health and etc
in
New Zealand.

Sent on the 13 April 2013 at 10:40

1017

From:
To: :constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz
Date: 3/06/2013 6:16 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Alan Bywater Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Christchurch Postal Region: Canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: There is a need to clear articulate the relationship between central and local
government in the constitution. This issue was identified in the draft report by the Productivity
Commission, Towards Better Local Regulation, chapter 2. As someone who has
worked in local government in NZ for nearly 20 years the lack of a clear and consistent relationship
between local and central government is a source of ongoing frustration and inefficiency. Depending
on the prevailing view in the government of the day local
government is either considered as being accountable to its local constituency and a potential partner
for central government or gets treated as wholly subservient to the will of central government
regardless of the view of local people. It is time this fluctuating
relationship was clarified once and for all in the constitution.

Sent on the 3 June 2013 at 18:15