

2099¹

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 2/07/2013 10:56 a.m.
Subject: [RELEASED FROM QUARANTINE] [SUSPECT SPAM]
http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/form_submission

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

Full Names: Dirk Hudig Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission:
It is essential that New Zealand has a constitution enshrining basic rights to place a limit on
politicians. Currently there are unwritten conventions. That is not enough - these should be enshrined
in law.

This constitution must not be the Treaty of Waitangi. It is too vague in many areas and the two
versions - Maori and English - are in some areas contradictory. The Treaty is therefore not a
document which should be enshrined in law.

Any constitution MUST have equality as a basic right without any ethnic favour.

Sent on the 1 July 2013 at 17:34

1243

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 10/06/2013 12:09 a.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: John Hudson Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB:
Postal City: Auckland Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code: Postal Country:
New Zealand Submission: There should not be a written constitution. Constitutional matters are dynamic and must be subject to change to reflect the views and aspirations of future generations.

Hard and fast rules together with attitudes and historical values of present and past generations as may be laid down in a written constitution will surely penalise and impede those of future New Zealanders irrespective of geographical and cultural background.

The American Model with its 'Right to carry arms' typifies the destructive nature of laid down antiquated constitutional rights that are not acceptable to present day thinking. Once set in the written constitution difficult to change.

New Zealand operates on a model that is fluid and open to change and proven over many generations to safeguard the rights and views of the individual.

No one group of people should enjoy preferential representation in the government of the country irrespective of background or creed.

Historical grievances have been and continue to be addressed but at some point must be laid to rest. Ask yourselves do modern Britains with DNA going back to before the Roman or Norman invasions have a claim to the land or do we accept the integration of the many peoples that make up that modern day land and indeed New Zealand as one and get on with it.

I see no representation within the committee members who might represent the views and heritage of the many New Zealanders born in Europe but who have lived and paid taxes for many years in the country. Finally, I view the panel as not being representative of the majority.

Sent on the 10 June 2013 at 00:08

Submission to the New Zealand Constitutional Advisory Panel 2013

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I therefore submit the following recommendations:

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

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

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

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

Rosemary Hudson
Dunedin
New Zealand

3958

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 28/07/2013 4:16 p.m.

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

Full Names: Sioux Hudson Organisation Name: Email: c Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal Region: Horowhenua Postal
Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: NZ to be a leader on how we
treat each other. Respect for all peoples. The "golden rule" covers everything.

The country being run be people who really care about others. Remembering that the government is like a servant to the people and should work for the good of all.

Submitted on the 28 July 2013 at 16:15

3784¹¹

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 24/07/2013 12:11 a.m.
Attachments: aspirations.odt

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

Full Names: Sean Huggins Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region:
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: What are your aspirations for
Aotearoa New Zealand?

Looking at the global state of affairs, it is hard to deny we are in a privileged position here in New Zealand. Across the seas, many populations live in fear of starvation, terrorism and abuse by their own governments. Those that are better off still grapple with intense competition for resources, corruption in politics and abuse of power by their institutions.

Here in Aotearoa New Zealand we are geographically isolated yet connected to other countries by technology and culture and therefore still actively partake in shaping our world. We communicate globally and act locally. We observe from a distance how other societies work to maintain and enhance both their standards of living and democratic ideals, and we improve and implement the ideas and methods we see are effective.

This we do without fear of being overrun by sectarian violence or malevolent ideals. They are not present here because our standard of living is high, our population level is low and the majority of us are reasonably well educated and accepting of others. Our privileged position allows us to enjoy a multiculturalism that is dynamic yet laid-back. Ours is a society worth maintaining and improving.

But these positive traits of our society do come with a flipside: we lack the honed awareness of danger that many other societies have. Our size and "she'll be right" attitude encourage apathy and make us vulnerable to insidious exploitation by both foreign interests eager to secure resources and expand their hegemony, and the few unsavoury characters here who have no respect for this land or their fellow citizens. In this aspect, naturalized New Zealanders mirror our iconic wildlife - we are valuable to those with moral integrity and vulnerable to the predators who lack integrity.

We are also in continuous danger of being unduly or negatively influenced on the world stage. Although friendships with foreign powers is very important, too much acquiescence undermines the integrity of our society. Although investment is very important, too much foreign investment could do the same, moving power offshore and leaving our workers without influence on their own soil.

Some may advocate increasing isolation in order to protect us from the competitiveness and comparative harshness of overseas influences, but I consider this a non-policy. The continued exchange of people, goods and ideas with other countries is not only inevitable but to be desired. Although our small size and laid-back culture makes us vulnerable in many such exchanges, we can protect ourselves by making sure we are civil, educated, vigilant and unwilling to

be pushed around. I would like to see these values promoted more vigorously in our government and institutions, as an example to all of us.

I would like to address in more detail, as an example, one way our culture is being influenced by exchanges with the rest of the world. New Zealand is a land of immigrants with a young and multicultural history. While immigration and multiculturalism are undoubtedly positive overall, they do increase the threat of unsavoury behaviour within our society. Overpopulation and intense competition in some overseas societies occasionally brings out negative traits in an individual, such as a tendency to cheat, lie and backstab. Although immigration law stipulates a requirement of good character, these psychopathic traits are usually not picked up when an applicant goes through the immigration process. Once admitted into the country, the individual then continues to operate as they are accustomed, and takes advantage of the benign nature of naturalized kiwis. This causes increased conflict and social problems in the workplace and on the street.

Some immigrants are allowed in almost solely on the merit of their wealth. This also has some unfortunate consequences, for example these people are easily able to afford housing, which contributes towards increased house prices. People who have lived here for many years and have strong ties to the community and land are finding they are not able to buy a house. Of course, a certain level of wealth for any immigrant is important to ensure their success, and it is especially important in the investor categories. But too much emphasis is put on wealth at the expense of character.

Of course, determining quality of character is not an easy task and I don't have a framework to suggest how it might be improved, but it is apparent that a police check is not sufficient. This issue should be intensely brainstormed, so a fair and enforceable way is found to make character the primary consideration factor for new immigrants.

While some might consider the issue of character to be subjective, it is safe to say not all societies are equal and not all societies are as successful as ours, hence the desire for people to move here. The ideas and behaviours immigrants bring, although largely beneficial, are sometimes negative and we need to acknowledge this more deeply with improved vetting of character in our immigration policy.

My subsequent aspirations follow naturally from these observations above and are concerned with how we develop our society and how we position ourselves on the world stage. I aspire we be a cultural force and example to the world of a superior way of functioning. I envision a socialist society where everyone is involved and everyone is covered regarding the basic needs of food, water, clothing and shelter.

I believe a policy that would aid these aspirations is to strengthen ties with countries that have similar values and are in a similar position to us. I especially suggest the Scandinavian countries of Norway, Sweden, Finland and Iceland. Like us, their societies are largely egalitarian and fair. To use them as a comparison, we could be the multicultural Scandinavia of the south. Better ties with these countries would complement our increasing ties with Asia.

Being a cultural force is made much easier by a strong economy. Obviously, our small size means we are not suited to mass production or large-scale manufacturing. Our character and image are our strengths, and these can be the basis of a strong entrepreneurial economy. Perception of the uniqueness and quality of our exports is our niche, and we can expand that into the knowledge economy as well.

With regards to quality, one area we have strong demand for our products is farming. In an effort to increase output in this sector we should resist turning New Zealand any further into a farm for the world by intensifying farming using traditional methods.

That would only undermine the quality of our land and products, and affect other sectors such as tourism. But we can innovate in this sector, for example by using bioscience to enhance output and quality in an ethical way.

Bioscience could even be used to create uniqueness. One way we might do this in the future is to use DNA science to 'bring back' extinct species, such as the moa. Not only would this unique icon be a tourist attraction, but the stout legged moa could potentially be farmed for meat. No other country in the world could offer such a delicacy, it would certainly beat the turkeys Americans consume at Thanksgiving. This idea this is an example of the type of outside-the-square thinking that will be required if we aspire to greatness and is not as far-fetched as it may initially seem. However, it will take a while for the technology to develop to a point where it is feasible. When that time comes, we should be ready.

As previously mentioned, we need to maintain the quality of our landscape for tourism, for our own enjoyment and for the integrity of our ecosystem. This may seem obvious, but it is the sort of thing that can slip without constant attention. Many countries have a beautiful wilderness, but few have quite what we do. In New Zealand we have big landscapes in a relatively small area. We have uniqueness in flora and fauna. We have variety, and a balance between the splendour of nature and the culture and convenience urban areas bring. This is all worth protecting and enhancing.

I am confident these aspirations are not naive or idealistic, although their realization might be impeded by a level of apathy in society that is higher than anticipated, or by those without a developed sense of altruism. For example, I have no illusions our business leaders and politicians will invariably choose to do "what is right for all" rather than serve their own narrow interests. Success for a specific institution, be it government, an NGO or corporation does not necessarily have flow-on benefits for the rest of society, although it sometimes does. In the subsequent sections my answers to the given questions keep this in mind as I describe how issues surrounding the constitution, Treaty and government could progress.

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

In the future, New Zealand should be run as a hybrid direct democracy that lets all citizens discuss

and respond to important issues quickly. This could start by having online referendums on important issues, the results of which would advise government.

A further step would be to have online forums where the issues in question that get picked for referendum are first upvoted by citizens until a hierarchy of issues is established to deal with.

Eventually, the public could be given more influence on the specifics for legislation until the parliamentary debating chamber effectively incorporates the whole country. This is some way off, but is what we should aim for.

We have the technology and almost everyone has access to computers. Library and community centre facilities could be extended to make access even easier for the disadvantaged.

To mitigate any possible negative effects of an emotional herd mentality, discussion and resolution would be checked and modulated by expert opinion and a modified form of central government. Government would have three main roles:

1. Guide the populace and administer the process of direct democracy
2. Balance the power of the people, especially by applying a method to verify the integrity of the people's will. A body of legal and ethical experts would ensure there could not be tyranny by the majority, for example by making sure the rights of minorities are not impinged.
3. Carry out the decisions of the people through appropriate action.

Of course, most people would have no idea about certain specialist issues and many people wouldn't be interested in certain issues. Therefore the debates would be optional, and certain qualifications or experience might be needed for an individual to have an influence on a debate surrounding a certain area of policy or lawmaking.

Direct democracy is a worthy ideal with several practical caveats; most notably it needs an educated and engaged populace to be successful. I believe a country like New Zealand is the world's best chance at making it work, and we could introduce initiatives in this direction slowly. It is not clear exactly how power in such a system would be balanced to make it effective.

As a starting point, we should study how other countries such as Switzerland are implementing these ideas. I don't see the type of system I describe here ever existing in pure form - rather our current system should start adapting and changing to form a hybrid system. Submission Upload: aspirations.odt

Submitted on the 24 July 2013 at 00:11

What are your aspirations for Aotearoa New Zealand?

Looking at the global state of affairs, it is hard to deny we are in a privileged position here in New Zealand. Across the seas, many populations live in fear of starvation, terrorism and abuse by their own governments. Those that are better off still grapple with intense competition for resources, corruption in politics and abuse of power by their institutions.

Here in Aotearoa New Zealand we are geographically isolated yet connected to other countries by technology and culture and therefore still actively partake in shaping our world. We communicate globally and act locally. We observe from a distance how other societies work to maintain and enhance both their standards of living and democratic ideals, and we improve and implement the ideas and methods we see are effective.

This we do without fear of being overrun by sectarian violence or malevolent ideals. They are not present here because our standard of living is high, our population level is low and the majority of us are reasonably well educated and accepting of others. Our privileged position allows us to enjoy a multiculturalism that is dynamic yet laid-back. Ours is a society worth maintaining and improving.

But these positive traits of our society do come with a flipside: we lack the honed awareness of danger that many other societies have. Our size and "she'll be right" attitude encourage apathy and make us vulnerable to insidious exploitation by both foreign interests eager to secure resources and expand their hegemony, and the few unsavoury characters here who have no respect for this land or their fellow citizens. In this aspect, naturalized New Zealanders mirror our iconic wildlife - we are valuable to those with moral integrity and vulnerable to the predators who lack integrity.

We are also in continuous danger of being unduly or negatively influenced on the world stage. Although friendships with foreign powers is very important, too much acquiescence undermines the integrity of our society. Although investment is very important, too much foreign investment could do the same, moving power offshore and leaving our workers without influence on their own soil.

Some may advocate increasing isolation in order to protect us from the competitiveness and comparative harshness of overseas influences, but I consider this a non-policy. The continued exchange of people, goods and ideas with other countries is not only inevitable but to be desired. Although our small size and laid-back culture makes us vulnerable in many such exchanges, we can protect ourselves by making sure we are civil, educated, vigilant and unwilling to be pushed around. I would like to see these values promoted more vigorously in our government and institutions, as an example to all of us.

I would like to address in more detail, as an example, one way our culture is being influenced by exchanges with the rest of the world. New Zealand is a land of immigrants

with a young and multicultural history. While immigration and multiculturalism are undoubtedly positive overall, they do increase the threat of unsavoury behaviour within our society. Overpopulation and intense competition in some overseas societies occasionally brings out negative traits in an individual, such as a tendency to cheat, lie and backstab. Although immigration law stipulates a requirement of good character, these psychopathic traits are usually not picked up when an applicant goes through the immigration process. Once admitted into the country, the individual then continues to operate as they are accustomed, and takes advantage of the benign nature of naturalized kiwis. This causes increased conflict and social problems in the workplace and on the street.

Some immigrants are allowed in almost solely on the merit of their wealth. This also has some unfortunate consequences, for example these people are easily able to afford housing, which contributes towards increased house prices. People who have lived here for many years and have strong ties to the community and land are finding they are not able to buy a house. Of course, a certain level of wealth for any immigrant is important to ensure their success, and it is especially important in the investor categories. But too much emphasis is put on wealth at the expense of character.

Of course, determining quality of character is not an easy task and I don't have a framework to suggest how it might be improved, but it is apparent that a police check is not sufficient. This issue should be intensely brainstormed, so a fair and enforceable way is found to make character the primary consideration factor for new immigrants.

While some might consider the issue of character to be subjective, it is safe to say not all societies are equal and not all societies are as successful as ours, hence the desire for people to move here. The ideas and behaviours immigrants bring, although largely beneficial, are sometimes negative and we need to acknowledge this more deeply with improved vetting of character in our immigration policy.

My subsequent aspirations follow naturally from these observations above and are concerned with how we develop our society and how we position ourselves on the world stage. I aspire we be a cultural force and example to the world of a superior way of functioning. I envision a socialist society where everyone is involved and everyone is covered regarding the basic needs of food, water, clothing and shelter.

I believe a policy that would aid these aspirations is to strengthen ties with countries that have similar values and are in a similar position to us. I especially suggest the Scandinavian countries of Norway, Sweden, Finland and Iceland. Like us, their societies are largely egalitarian and fair. To use them as a comparison, we could be the multicultural Scandinavia of the south. Better ties with these countries would complement our increasing ties with Asia.

Being a cultural force is made much easier by a strong economy. Obviously, our small size

means we are not suited to mass production or large-scale manufacturing. Our character and image are our strengths, and these can be the basis of a strong entrepreneurial economy. Perception of the uniqueness and quality of our exports is our niche, and we can expand that into the knowledge economy as well.

With regards to quality, one area we have strong demand for our products is farming. In an effort to increase output in this sector we should resist turning New Zealand any further into a farm for the world by intensifying farming using traditional methods. That would only undermine the quality of our land and products, and affect other sectors such as tourism. But we can innovate in this sector, for example by using bioscience to enhance output and quality in an ethical way.

Bioscience could even be used to create uniqueness. One way we might do this in the future is to use DNA science to 'bring back' extinct species, such as the moa. Not only would this unique icon be a tourist attraction, but the stout legged moa could potentially be farmed for meat. No other country in the world could offer such a delicacy, it would certainly beat the turkeys Americans consume at Thanksgiving. This idea this is an example of the type of outside-the-square thinking that will be required if we aspire to greatness and is not as far-fetched as it may initially seem. However, it will take a while for the technology to develop to a point where it is feasible. When that time comes, we should be ready.

As previously mentioned, we need to maintain the quality of our landscape for tourism, for our own enjoyment and for the integrity of our ecosystem. This may seem obvious, but it is the sort of thing that can slip without constant attention. Many countries have a beautiful wilderness, but few have quite what we do. In New Zealand we have big landscapes in a relatively small area. We have uniqueness in flora and fauna. We have variety, and a balance between the splendour of nature and the culture and convenience urban areas bring. This is all worth protecting and enhancing.

I am confident these aspirations are not naive or idealistic, although their realization might be impeded by a level of apathy in society that is higher than anticipated, or by those without a developed sense of altruism. For example, I have no illusions our business leaders and politicians will invariably choose to do "what is right for all" rather than serve their own narrow interests. Success for a specific institution, be it government, an NGO or corporation does not necessarily have flow-on benefits for the rest of society, although it sometimes does. In the subsequent sections my answers to the given questions keep this in mind as I describe how issues surrounding the constitution, Treaty and government could progress.

Please continue to next page

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

In the future, New Zealand should be run as a hybrid direct democracy that lets all citizens discuss and respond to important issues quickly. This could start by having online referendums on important issues, the results of which would advise government.

A further step would be to have online forums where the issues in question that get picked for referendum are first upvoted by citizens until a hierarchy of issues is established to deal with.

Eventually, the public could be given more influence on the specifics for legislation until the parliamentary debating chamber effectively incorporates the whole country. This is some way off, but is what we should aim for.

We have the technology and almost everyone has access to computers. Library and community centre facilities could be extended to make access even easier for the disadvantaged.

To mitigate any possible negative effects of an emotional herd mentality, discussion and resolution would be checked and modulated by expert opinion and a modified form of central government. Government would have three main roles:

Guide the populace and administer the process of direct democracy
Balance the power of the people, especially by applying a method to verify the integrity of the people's will. A body of legal and ethical experts would ensure there could not be tyranny by the majority, for example by making sure the rights of minorities are not impinged.
Carry out the decisions of the people through appropriate action.

Of course, most people would have no idea about certain specialist issues and many people wouldn't be interested in certain issues. Therefore the debates would be optional, and certain qualifications or experience might be needed for an individual to have an influence on a debate surrounding a certain area of policy or lawmaking.

Direct democracy is a worthy ideal with several practical caveats; most notably it needs an educated and engaged populace to be successful. I believe a country like New Zealand is the world's best chance at making it work, and we could introduce initiatives in this direction slowly. It is not clear exactly how power in such a system would be balanced to make it effective.

As a starting point, we should study how other countries such as Switzerland are implementing these ideas. I don't see the type of system I describe here ever existing in pure form - rather our current system should start adapting and changing to form a hybrid

system.

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 25/07/2013 6:25 a.m.
Attachments: constitution.odt

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

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

Yes, a constitution simplified into a single document is more 'marketable' as a symbol of shared rights and values that the average citizen, untrained in law, can hold in their minds. It is also a document that citizens can easily reference.

The raised public awareness brought about by a constitution written in a single document would help check executive and legislative power: government would hesitate to pass laws that go against the spirit of a clearly defined and publicly recognisable constitution.

A newly written constitution is also an opportunity for a 'fresh start', where the best parts of our legal tradition can be melded with our common aspirations. Such a document would have positive social effect by furthering integration of our national identity and promoting unity through the common values enshrined within.

However, the constitution would not be-all and end-all. Separation of power and an informed and educated populace are the best tools to allow democracy to flourish. A new constitution would only support that.

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

Court judges are expert at interpreting the law. They are also a bit less vulnerable to political bias and lobbying. Parliament should always aim to make new laws consistent with the constitution. The courts should have power to strike down a law if it is not consistent.

Such oversight through separation of power is very important. It is fundamental to the US system, where it works with varying effectiveness. I would suggest a fourth node in the separation of power: the public through referenda could block a piece of legislation from becoming law, if there is enough of a majority. (Please see my answer to the question 'How do you want your country to be run in the future?' for more about my thoughts on how this might work.)

Submission Upload: constitution.odt

Submitted on the 25 July 2013 at 06:24

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

Yes, a constitution simplified into a single document is more 'marketable' as a symbol of shared rights and values that the average citizen, untrained in law, can hold in their minds. It is also a document that citizens can easily reference.

The raised public awareness brought about by a constitution written in a single document would help check executive and legislative power: government would hesitate to pass laws that go against the spirit of a clearly defined and publicly recognisable constitution.

A newly written constitution is also an opportunity for a 'fresh start', where the best parts of our legal tradition can be melded with our common aspirations. Such a document would have positive social effect by furthering integration of our national identity and promoting unity through the common values enshrined within.

However, the constitution would not be-all and end-all. Separation of power and an informed and educated populace are the best tools to allow democracy to flourish. A new constitution would only support that.

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

Court judges are expert at interpreting the law. They are also a bit less vulnerable to political bias and lobbying. Parliament should always aim to make new laws consistent with the constitution. The courts should have power to strike down a law if it is not consistent.

Such oversight through separation of power is very important. It is fundamental to the US system, where it works with varying effectiveness. I would suggest a fourth node in the separation of power: the public through referenda could block a piece of legislation from becoming law, if there is enough of a majority. (Please see my answer to the question 'How do you want your country to be run in the future?' for more about my thoughts on how this might work.)

3784a

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 28/07/2013 1:04 p.m.
Attachments: constitution.odt

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

Full Names: Sean Huggins Organisation Name: Ema. Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region:
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: This is an update to my
previous submission on these questions.

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

Yes, a constitution simplified into a single document would be a symbol of shared rights and values that the average citizen, untrained in law, can hold in their minds. It would also be a document that citizens could easily reference. This is certainly not the case at the moment. Many New Zealanders probably aren't even aware we have a constitution at all, and what our basic laws and rights actually are; they just have an impression of what is legal or not, and that we are generally free and egalitarian. That impression could be clarified by a newly written constitution.

The raised public awareness brought about by a constitution written in a single document would help check executive and legislative power: government would hesitate to pass laws that go against the spirit of a clearly defined and publicly recognisable constitution.

A newly written constitution is also an opportunity for a 'fresh start', where the best parts of our legal tradition can be melded with our common aspirations. Such a document would have positive social effect by furthering integration of our national identity and promoting unity through the common values enshrined within.

However, the constitution would not be-all and end-all. Separation of power and an informed and educated populace are the best tools to allow democracy to flourish. A new constitution would only support that.

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

Parliament should always aim to make new laws consistent with the constitution. The courts should have power to strike down a law if it is not consistent. Court judges are expert at interpreting the law. They are also a bit less vulnerable to political bias and lobbying. District courts could nullify by-laws that go against the constitution. The Supreme Court

could perform the same role on a national level.

Such oversight through separation of power is very important. It is fundamental to the US system, where it works with varying effectiveness. I would suggest a fourth node in the separation of power: the public through referenda could block a piece of legislation from becoming law, if there is enough of a majority. (Please see my answer to the question 'How do you want your country to be run in the future?' for more about my thoughts on how this might work.)
Submission Upload: constitution.odt

Submitted on the 28 July 2013 at 13:03

This is an update to my previous submission on these questions.

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

Yes, a constitution simplified into a single document would be a symbol of shared rights and values that the average citizen, untrained in law, can hold in their minds. It would also be a document that citizens could easily reference. This is certainly not the case at the moment. Many New Zealanders probably aren't even aware we have a constitution at all, and what our basic laws and rights actually are; they just have an impression of what is legal or not, and that we are generally free and egalitarian. That impression could be clarified by a newly written constitution.

The raised public awareness brought about by a constitution written in a single document would help check executive and legislative power: government would hesitate to pass laws that go against the spirit of a clearly defined and publicly recognisable constitution.

A newly written constitution is also an opportunity for a 'fresh start', where the best parts of our legal tradition can be melded with our common aspirations. Such a document would have positive social effect by furthering integration of our national identity and promoting unity through the common values enshrined within.

However, the constitution would not be-all and end-all. Separation of power and an informed and educated populace are the best tools to allow democracy to flourish. A new constitution would only support that.

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

Parliament should always aim to make new laws consistent with the constitution. The courts should have power to strike down a law if it is not consistent. Court judges are expert at interpreting the law. They are also a bit less vulnerable to political bias and lobbying. District courts could nullify by-laws that go against the constitution. The Supreme Court could perform the same role on a national level.

Such oversight through separation of power is very important. It is fundamental to the US system, where it works with varying effectiveness. I would suggest a fourth node in the separation of power: the public through referenda could block a piece of legislation from becoming law, if there is enough of a majority. (Please see my answer to the question 'How do you want your country to be run in the future?' for more about my thoughts on how this might work.)

3784b

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 28/07/2013 1:37 p.m.
Attachments: bill-of-rights.odt

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

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

No, it doesn't go far enough in protecting individual rights. It does a reasonable job at protecting very basic rights but it doesn't address any of the more subtle yet destructive influences individuals face. Recent events have highlighted some of these, specifically the collection of communications information and metadata for analysis with the aim of fighting crime. This is a threat to the individual (and society as a whole) because this information confers a lot of power to those who have it, and without rigorous oversight or transparency, such information will be abused, used for personal gain and to advantage special interests at the expense of the public. This will undermine democracy and liberty.

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

The Act needs to protect us from manipulation by powerful special interests. From unagreed-upon surveillance, spying and analysis by any group, including collection of metadata, or the same without a court order.

Government, universities and marketers already analyze public information, which is not only fine, but important to understanding our society and enables better planning.

The right to communicate privately should be added to the Act. An alternative would be to completely open surveillance data and make all communication public, so that no interest is disadvantaged - but I don't think our society is ready for that.

What other things could be done to protect rights?

Transparency and oversight in all government departments and stricter standards of behaviour for all institutions, including corporations and NGOs. The more power an organisation (or individual) has, the

more transparent their processes should be. This simple principle helps balance power by conferring privacy to private citizens, and opening up large organisations (and powerful individuals) to scrutiny so they are less prone to corruption.

Ideally, there would be no concentrations of power in any sector, but reality has shown that government rarely relinquishes power willingly, and it is all too easy to form monopolies and duopolies in private sector industries. Transparency, oversight and separation of power are very important to protecting rights.

But perhaps the most important thing that could be done to protect rights is to increase the quality of education. In the Information Age, some of the older forms of education that require rote learning have lost value. Although we already have a reasonable education system, focusing more on analytical skills, logic, critical and creative thinking and the ability to absorb and integrate information would be invaluable. Teaching empathy and morality would guide the application of these skills. This is important, because an educated, informed and moral populace is less prone to manipulation by special interests and other unsavoury forces. Submission Upload: bill-of-rights.odt

Submitted on the 28 July 2013 at 13:36

Does the Bill of Rights Act protect your rights enough? Why?

No, it doesn't go far enough in protecting individual rights. It does a reasonable job at protecting very basic rights but it doesn't address any of the more subtle yet destructive influences individuals face. Recent events have highlighted some of these, specifically the collection of communications information and metadata for analysis with the aim of fighting crime. This is a threat to the individual (and society as a whole) because this information confers a lot of power to those who have it, and without rigorous oversight or transparency, such information will be abused, used for personal gain and to advantage special interests at the expense of the public. This will undermine democracy and liberty.

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

The Act needs to protect us from manipulation by powerful special interests. From unagreed-upon surveillance, spying and analysis by any group, including collection of metadata, or the same without a court order.

Government, universities and marketers already analyze public information, which is not only fine, but important to understanding our society and enables better planning.

The right to communicate privately should be added to the Act. An alternative would be to completely open surveillance data and make all communication public, so that no interest is disadvantaged - but I don't think our society is ready for that.

What other things could be done to protect rights?

Transparency and oversight in all government departments and stricter standards of behaviour for all institutions, including corporations and NGOs. The more power an organisation (or individual) has, the more transparent their processes should be. This simple principle helps balance power by conferring privacy to private citizens, and opening up large organisations (and powerful individuals) to scrutiny so they are less prone to corruption.

Ideally, there would be no concentrations of power in any sector, but reality has shown that government rarely relinquishes power willingly, and it is all too easy to form monopolies and duopolies in private sector industries. Transparency, oversight and separation of power are very important to protecting rights.

But perhaps the most important thing that could be done to protect rights is to increase the

quality of education. In the Information Age, some of the older forms of education that require rote learning have lost value. Although we already have a reasonable education system, focusing more on analytical skills, logic, critical and creative thinking and the ability to absorb and integrate information would be invaluable. Teaching empathy and morality would guide the application of these skills. This is important, because an educated, informed and moral populace is less prone to manipulation by special interests and other unsavoury forces.

3784c

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 30/07/2013 9:19 a.m.
Attachments: Maori-views.odt

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

Full Names: Sean Huggins Organisation Name: Err Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region: Postal Post
Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: How should Māori views be represented in
Parliament?

Firstly, we are human. Secondly, we are New Zealanders. Only thirdly, are we Māori or pākehā or Indian or Chinese or European. In all social discourse (including Parliamentary debates), our local, ethnic and tribal affiliations must come after these first two considerations.

Every group has the right to expect fair treatment and to seek redress for wrongdoings by others. But in the interests of positive social development, any Parliament in the mid-term future should aim to deny special rights to any specific group as this encourages separatism and sows discord. Therefore, the Māori roll, electorates and wards should be gradually phased out.

Put another way, if elements of a society don't have an internal will to flourish then trying to protect them by giving them special representation in Parliament is no substitute and will only encourage their stagnation. Māori culture is strong and doesn't need protecting any more.

We should also remember that change is the only true constant. Given enough time, groups of people that identify with a common history will change beyond the recognition of any of their ancestors. This process is accelerated in a multicultural society and there is nothing to fear from it. Māori, pākehā, NZ Chinese and other ethnic groups will continue to integrate.

In line with this process, the best of Māori views should be allowed to influence government policy for the benefit of all, not just Māori. For example, the respect for the land that Māori have is something Parliament could keep in mind when debating legislation.

This could help ensure we utilize our land for the benefit of all rather than, in the pākehā tradition, continuing to carve it up into ever smaller blocks that are then fenced off.

Submission Upload: Maori-views.odt

Submitted on the 30 July 2013 at 09:17

How should Māori views be represented in Parliament?

Firstly, we are human. Secondly, we are New Zealanders. Only thirdly, are we Māori or pākehā or Indian or Chinese or European. In all social discourse (including Parliamentary debates), our local, ethnic and tribal affiliations must come after these first two considerations.

Every group has the right to expect fair treatment and to seek redress for wrongdoings by others. But in the interests of positive social development, any Parliament in the mid-term future should aim to deny special rights to any specific group as this encourages separatism and sows discord. Therefore, the Māori roll, electorates and wards should be gradually phased out.

Put another way, if elements of a society don't have an internal will to flourish then trying to protect them by giving them special representation in parliament is no substitute and will only encourage their stagnation. Māori culture is strong and doesn't need protecting any more.

We should also remember that change is the only true constant. Given enough time, groups of people that identify with a common history will change beyond the recognition of any of their ancestors. This process is accelerated in a multicultural society and there is nothing to fear from it. Māori, pākehā, NZ Chinese and other ethnic groups will continue to integrate.

In line with this process, the best of Māori views should be allowed to influence government policy for the benefit of all, not just Māori. For example, the respect for the land that Māori have is something Parliament could keep in mind when debating legislation. This could help ensure we utilize our land for the benefit of all rather than, in the pākehā tradition, continuing to carve it up into ever smaller blocks that are then fenced off.

3784d

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 30/07/2013 10:08 a.m.
Attachments: Treaty.odt

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

Full Names: Sean Huggins Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region:
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?

There is still distrust between Māori and pākehā. A constitution as a single document is a fresh chance to promote harmonious living.

The text of the Treaty should not be included in our constitution. The Treaty is a document with strongly negative connotations. Māori and pākehā should not have to carry, shame and guilt respectively, into the future because of the poor decisions of our ancestors.

However, the constitution should definitely contain reference to the Treaty with regard to lessons learnt. There should also be a clear section describing how the Treaty would bring about it's own obsolescence by informing a path to mutual respect and conciliation.

In summary, the Treaty's role in our constitution should be a temporary one: to see it's own annulment in a manner that is bipartisan and positive, and leave behind a concordant society that no longer needs the Treaty.

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

The Treaty is an agreement that was made between ancestors of only two of the ethnic groups that live here. In our modern multicultural society its relevance is declining. Every individual and every group has a right to fair representation in public affairs.

Treaty principles such as Partnership undermine the progress of modern society by encouraging an "us versus them" mentality.

In the mind of almost everyone, the Treaty is a negative document. We should not base our future, even partly, on a document that has negative emotion surrounding it.

So, no, the Treaty should definitely not be made a formal part of the constitution. Doing so would not honour the past, nor give a nod to history by acknowledging maltreatment of Māori by British settlers.

History can be acknowledged through a suitable reference to the Treaty regarding lessons learnt.

A positively worded resolution acknowledging the mistakes surrounding the Treaty should be written into the constitution, to ensure the same sorts of mistakes are not made again. Submission Upload: Treaty.odt

Submitted on the 30 July 2013 at 10:06

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

There is still distrust between Māori and pākehā. A constitution as a single document is a fresh chance to promote harmonious living.

The text of the Treaty should not be included in our constitution. The Treaty is a document with strongly negative connotations. Māori and pākehā should not have to carry, shame and guilt respectively, into the future because of the poor decisions of our ancestors.

However, the constitution should definitely contain reference to the Treaty with regard to lessons learnt. There should also be a clear section describing how the Treaty would bring about its own obsolescence by informing a path to mutual respect and conciliation.

In summary, the Treaty's role in our constitution should be a temporary one: to see its own annulment in a manner that is bipartisan and positive, and leave behind a concordant society that no longer needs the Treaty.

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

The Treaty is an agreement that was made between ancestors of only two of the ethnic groups that live here. In our modern multicultural society its relevance is declining. Every individual and every group has a right to fair representation in public affairs. Treaty principles such as Partnership undermine the progress of modern society by encouraging an "us versus them" mentality.

In the mind of almost everyone, the Treaty is a negative document. We should not base our future, even partly, on a document that has negative emotion surrounding it.

So, no, the Treaty should definitely not be made a formal part of the constitution. Doing so would not honour the past, nor give a nod to history by acknowledging maltreatment of Māori by British settlers. History can be acknowledged through a suitable reference to the Treaty regarding lessons learnt.

A positively worded resolution acknowledging the mistakes surrounding the Treaty should be written into the constitution, to ensure the same sorts of mistakes are not made again.

818

TAURANGA

11 May 2013

Constitutional Advisory Panel
C/- Ministry of Justice
DX SX 10088
WELLINGTON

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

It may require some alterations in the future, but not a raced based Constitution.

C A Hughes

4690

From: "lynngorgehughes"
To: "Justice govt" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 31/07/2013 2:17 p.m.
Subject: Submission Re Constitutional Review !!

In regard to the proposed New Constitution for New Zealand

{a} Any NEW Constitution should only be accepted if endorsed by a Public Referendum.

{b} There is no reason to include the Treaty of Waitangi, as the Constitution should make EVERY citizen absolutely equal under the law. With NO racial or cultural bias.

Any less will cause a festering sore for future generations to endure.

Yours Sincerely

George and Lynn Hughes

819

TAURANGA

11 May 2013

Constitutional Advisory Panel

C/- Ministry of Justice

DX SX 10088

WELLINGTON

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

It may require some alterations in the future, but not a raced based Constitution.

G S Hughes

1444

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 18/06/2013 7:25 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Michael john charles hughes Organisation Name: individual Email Address:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal
AddressB: Postal City: Napier Postal Region: Hawkes bay Postal Post Code:
Postal Country: new Zealand Submission: I Dont beleive the Constitution needs changing and it
should NOT be race based or have anything to do with the treaty of waitangi

Sent on the 18 June 2013 at 19:23

3987

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 28/07/2013 9:34 p.m.

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

Full Names: Michael Hughes Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region: Postal Post
Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: What are your aspirations for Aotearoa New
Zealand?

I hope that one day New Zealand will be:

- An egalitarian nation, where all people are intrinsically valuable and important, entitled to the same legal and political rights and enjoy the same opportunities for advancement.
- A place where people are courteous, respectful of authority and mindful of discipline.
- Full of hard-working, enterprising, ambitious and provident people.
- A place where people are prepared to do an honest days work in order to get ahead and achieve success.
- Full of resourceful, practical and adaptable people who take a pragmatic approach to problem solving.
- A place where people value education, skill, responsibility, effort and efficiency.
- A place where people are friendly, amiable, easy going and hospitable.
- Full of "do-it-yourself", sports minded people with a great love for the outdoors.

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

- By a government that is amiable, accessible, efficient and dependable.
- Law, order and justice is a priority and there's a feeling that someone is "in charge".
- The welfare state is a thing of the past and individuals are motivated by occupational rewards such as pride in craftsmanship, the satisfaction of doing one's best, self-fulfillment and the excitement of solving problems and overcoming obstacles.
- Government departments are efficient, effective and highly rewarding places to work.
- Problems are identified and solved in a pragmatic and efficient way.
- We need a long term plan in place which spans political terms and ensures people are protected

from economic disaster and other types of crisis.

Submitted on the 28 July 2013 at 21:33

3987a

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 28/07/2013 9:56 p.m.

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

Full Names: Michael Hughes Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Auckland Postal Region: 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?

Although I sympathise with people who feel as though the Treaty of Waitangi has been breached, I truly believe that the world has moved on since the treaty was signed and we should start afresh with a new constitution with all New Zealanders being equal in the eyes of the law. We have an opportunity to use the constitution to focus on a positive future for all Kiwis. The constitution shouldn't be the means to resolving historical issues. Historical issues should be resolved using the systems we have in place already.

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

No I don't believe it should.

Why?

The original treaty was fraught with legal issues and misunderstandings and simply isn't sophisticated enough to cover a modern society like New Zealand is today. We need to acknowledge that Maori were in New Zealand long before the waves of mass immigration and there were some serious issues but should we let this hold us back as a country? No, we should respect the past and iron out the historical issues but we also need to sort out how we're going to move forward together and focus on the many many positives. The word has changed radically for everyone.

Submitted on the 28 July 2013 at 21:55

786

Constitutional Advisory Panel
c/- Ministry of Justice
Wellington

I am very concerned that a race-based Constitution is in the process of being formulated without reference to any European input, or any input from the numerous other ethnic New Zealanders.

Our Constitution of 1852 brought an amazing uniting of two races into being until 1975 when the Waitangi Act began the process of tearing this national unity apart.

I totally agreed with Maori over the return of Bastion Point and the land in Raglan, as well as some areas in Taranaki, but now the claims have become absurd.

Yours faithfully
Marion Hughes

817

TAURANGA

11 May 2013

Constitutional Advisory Panel

C/- Ministry of Justice

DX SX 10088

WELLINGTON

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

It may require some alterations in the future, but not a raced based Constitution.

S R Hughes

3738

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 22/07/2013 1:49 p.m.

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

Full Names: Trevor Hughes Organisation Name: Email: Phone:
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Wellington Postal Region: Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand
Submission: I am deeply concerned by aspects of this review. The Panel's explanatory material makes a number of substantial assumptions. For example, since when has the country been called "Aotearoa New Zealand"? What is meant when it is suggested the Treaty of Waitangi is New Zealand's "founding document"?

The Crown's sovereignty is whole and indivisible and cannot be shared with any particular race or other group of people. The Crown has a duty to act in good faith and with justice towards all New Zealand citizens including those of Maori descent. The entrenchment of racial preference in New Zealand would be disastrous for the country.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission.

Submitted on the 22 July 2013 at 13:47

658

I see this as a hang-over from the first past the post days. If Maori

believe they have an effective vision for New Zealand they need to be able to convince the electorate and win sufficient party or electorate votes. We disestablished the privilege associated with an upper house I see no reason to provide an electoral privilege associated with race. It is either a racist or condescending concept certainly one that has had its time.

*The Treaty of Waitangi
21st century model
*

Move on to a

I support the process of compensating Maori for the unscrupulous behaviour of the New Zealand government in previous decades. I recognise that the current compensation is more token than real in terms of the years of discrimination that occurred.

I am however, firmly of the belief that the Treaty of Waitangi has had its day.

What will serve the New Zealand population going forward is unlikely to be a document hastily drafted and badly translated by a naval captain and a missionary in 1840.

I firmly believe that we need a much more inclusive and modern document that better reflects the current position of New Zealand, its ethnic makeup, the modern place of women in our society and our future challenges as a country in Southeast Asia rather than a stone aged tribal society or a colony of mother England.

*Risk Do
what's best for the future not the incomes/prestige of a few *

My greatest fear for this constitutional review process is that it will be hijacked by people with personal agendas and it will:

- create a more formal recognition for an ageing, backward focused, sexist, feudal elite that currently control iwi
- be backward looking rather than positioning New Zealand and New Zealanders to compete in an increasingly global and technological world.
- Instigate changes that will generate enormous costs for the taxpayer and equally enormous financial returns to those in a newly created hierarchy, the legal profession and associated consultants as the impact of any change is worked through all the existing contracts, legal precedents and social arrangements.
- Deflect time and energy from the serious issues of today which in my opinion are:
 - educational achievement
 - youth unemployment
 - fiscally responsible policies that promote and increase the standard of living for all

· promoting an environment where children have the support of both their parents/caregivers, the resources to grow into competent/confident adults, in a crime and violence free environment.

Terry Hughes

Lower Hutt

All the best

Terry Hughes

293

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 13/04/2013 10:50 p.m.
Subject: http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/ form submission

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

Full Names: Wade Hughes Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:
Postal Region: Canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: Legalize medical marijuana for cronic pain suffers

Sent on the 13 April 2013 at 22:49

4272

From: <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 30/07/2013 9:22 p.m.
Attachments: constitution submission.doc

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

Full Names: Amuri Hughey-Cockerell Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal
City: Christchurch Postal Region: Canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New
Zealand Submission: Submission Upload: constitution submission.doc

Submitted on the 30 July 2013 at 21:21

Submission on constitution for New Zealand

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

Yes it should be a written single document because this would make it easy and clear for every New Zealander to understand the basis of the rule of law in our country.

Children could be taught in schools what the constitution states and it could be a way to teach each generation about the background rule of law for our country and the aspirations we have as a nation.

A written constitution could inspire each generation to improve our lifestyle and would inspire us to live up to the standards set by our ancestors.

The Treaty of Waitangi should become a central feature of the constitution and the entire would form a schedule to the constitution act. Rangatiratanga could be the set of principles that we all live by as a nation.

It would not be able to be changed by each generation or at the whim of the parliament. Changes would have to be made through national referendums

The rule of law is a fundamental constitutional principle and means that "the law rules" – society should be governed by clear and prospective rules which are applicable to all including the government and predicably enforced so citizens can act knowing the results.

A formal written one document constitution would make it easier for everyone to understand the law in New Zealand

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

I am of the opinion that the Treaty, like the Bill of Rights, should become part of New Zealand's new superior law Constitution. Because it makes a fundamental law and the basic framework underlying principles of the government. It is a supreme law by which all other laws can be made.

3. Constitution

Should be based on the Earth Charter and enshrine sustainability –ecological sustainability the view that development should be within the parameters of ecology and challenges the whole economic paradigm within which we presently operate. A good example to follow is the constitution of Bolivia.

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

The Courts as the the parliament should be bound by the supreme law. It is the courts function as one of the three arms of government.

5. Bill of Rights

Should be part of the supreme law in the constitution

6. Maori representation

Maori seats should be retained in parliament and created in local government and stipulated in the constitution. The number of seats should be population based but on a ratio of double that applied to normal representation in order to address past generations of discrimination

Maori should be able to enrol on the Maori roll whenever they choose.

7. Representation

Retain MMP as it is today

2325

From: "Beverly Walker"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 3/07/2013 6:17 p.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I believe the Maori seats should be abolished.

B. Hull.

2439

From: Simon Hull
To: "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 4/07/2013 8:36 a.m.
Subject: CAP Submission

I contend that the Maori Seats should be abolished for all the racial equality reasons espoused by most thinking Kiwis

Simon Hull

Sent from my iPad

332

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 14/04/2013 7:33 p.m.
Subject: <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Sharon Te marie Hume Organisation Name: Email:
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB:
Postal City: Postal Region: Wairarapa Postal Post Code: Postal Country:
New Zealand Submission: My aspirations for New Zealand is a country that treats each other fairly and without bias. The people are confident, independent and hopeful, and to strive to be the best individuals that they can be without hurting others on the way. I'd like this country to maintain the green image it has, and to preserve our best assets which is the land, streams, lakes, rivers, mountains, wildlife, culture, and of course our people.

I don't want to have to leave this country in order to follow money, I want all of us to be proud, and enjoy the richness of our nation.

I want this nation to work hard, and to encourage the hard workers to reach their goals.

I'd like education to be a major priority in the minds of children ahead of becoming an All Black or Silver Fern.

I'd like for our children to be able to afford the privilege of dreaming about a future that included their education instead of dreaming about a warm home and cupboards full of food.

Child poverty would be a prime target for the government, and government spending would be cut. Ministers would offer to give up their governmental perks and put the money into the disadvantaged children.

Health would be introduced into education, so primary aged children can learn the benefits of what foods lower cholesterol and what foods put you at risk of heart disease later on in life. The links of obesity and diabetes, and the fat content of takeaway foods.

Not just as a project but as a core subject like science, math and English.

I would love for racism to be a crime that is punishable with community service. Education of these people to learn to live with others and to learn that being different is acceptable not hated.

Bullying would also be a crime punishable in the same form as racism.

I would love for New Zealand to embrace it's amazing culture, and to understand the meaning behind such things as the haka, hongi, waiata, wero, powhiri etc, without wanting to dismiss it due to lack of knowledge.

I would love for Maori to feel proud of their unique culture and way of living, thinking, believing, and feeling. To get rid of any shame and to stand tall and confidently feel proud of who they are.

Celebrating ourselves, as the good bunch of people that we are.

I want our country to be run by people who know what it is like to live below the poverty line, to have insight to feeling cold, hungry, and powerless. To understand how a single parent feels when their children are hungry and there is no money to buy any.

I would like a government to understand it's people, and the realities of how the people of this country live everyday.

Prevention of illness, abuse, suicide, substance abuse, crime, the list goes on; I want my government to look at prevention instead of cure in some issues in this country. The government needs to open it's

eyes to issues of suicide, elder abuse, child abuse,
domestic violence, drug abuse and inequalities amongst the ethnicity's in the country.

I want the government to support the families who are struggling to buy socks for winter, who struggle to pay for the doctors fees and prescriptions for their 3 children who all have eczema, asthma, food allergies and have also been told by the dentist that their youngest needs braces.

I'd like the government to put education, health, environment, poverty and housing issues ahead of sports, entertainment and roading.

Our government should uphold the Treaty of Waitangi, as it created the nation that we love today. Yes it has a convoluted history but it set in motion to where we sit today.

I don't want a government who sells off our country, or who are out of touch with the realities of the people.

I don't want a government who tries to embrace a western world view, I want a government who has a New Zealand view, and embraces this great nation, embraces the people, the culture, and our amazing identity.

Lets stop cutting each other down and start building each other up, that's how a great nation is made.

And that is what I want for New Zealand.

Sent on the 14 April 2013 at 19:32

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

From:
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 18/02/2013 3:58 p.m.
Subject: The form on your contact page has just been submitted

Sent from Constitutional Advisory Panel.

Contact Name: Christina Humphreys
Phone:
Email:

Comment: I think we should stay with the status quo NZ 'unwritten constitution' it has served us well for many years. We have been a first in the world for many things like votes for Women, votes for Maori men & other labour reforms because of our 'unwritten constitution'.
'If it aint broke why fixit'.

The other thing is the 'Treaty of Waitangi' is not NZ

's founding document so it should not be incorporated in any 'Written Constitution.

I would like it to be said that this review is to be for a Fair & Equal New Zealand for all NZ & not just the select few. No more separatism!!!

Sign Up For Updates: Yes

Sent on the 18 February 2013 at 15:57

18 a)

From: <website@cap.govt.nz>
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 2/18/2013 3:58 p.m.
Subject: The form on your contact page has just been submitted

Sent from Constitutional Advisory Panel #link:<http://www.cap.govt.nz/>.

Contact Name: Christina Humphreys Phone:

Email:

Comment: I think we should

stay with the status quo NZ 'unwritten constitution' it has served us well for many years. We have been a first in the world for many things like votes for Women, votes for Maori men & othe labour reforms because of our 'unwritten constitution'.
'If it aint broke why fixit'.

The other thing is the 'Treaty of Waitangi' is not NZ

's founding document so it should not be incorporated in any 'Written Constitution'.

I would like it to be said that this review is to be for a Fair & Equal New Zealand for all NZ & not just the select few. No more separatism!!! Sign Up For Updates: Yes

Sent on the 18 February 2013 at 15:57

1375

From: " R Humphreys"
To: <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>
Date: 17/06/2013 7:35 a.m.
Subject: CAP submission
Attachments: My submission NZ Constitution Review.docx

To the NZ Constitutional Review Panel,

Attached are my submissions against any changes to our NZ unwritten constitution

And answers to other questions you have asked.

I hope you do read all submissions sent into you as Sir Michael Cullen suggested you

Wouldn't which I find arrogant and disrespectful, but it is what we have come to expect from this Panel!

How can you make an accurate summary of what NZ people think on the subject if you don't read all

The submissions?

Regards

Ramon Humphreys

Katikati

Phone

My submission regarding the NZ Constitution Review is that I want:

No change at this time to our 'Unwritten Constitution'.

Maybe changes could be made in the future when the NZ government appoints a new Constitutional Committee that has more equal representation Of New Zealand citizens, one that is not race based, but has a more cross section of NZ people example;

5 Maori/1 Pacific Island/ 1 Asian/ 8 others and of European descent!

This is not what the committee consists of now!

Further points I wish to make are:

1. **What makes our country is**, all working together as one people. **NOT** the 'Maori Party's agenda in creating apartheid the way it's happening now. These **Attitudes need to change!**
2. The **values that should reflect the spirit** of this country are [as it once did] **'ONE PEOPLE ONE NATION'** 'one sun in the sky' **NO** separatism'! Please listen to **all New Zealanders!**
3. **NO Treaty of Waitangi enshrined in a 'Written or Unwritten Constitution'**. Also no references in our legislation to Treaty principles. The country needs to move forward not backwards in time. No Tribalism and Bolivian model government or separate Maori governments all this separatism it hasn't work in other countries why would it work here!
4. **The 1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act:** Waitangi Tribunal should be Repealed OR at the very least amended so it pertains to the original Treaty certainly not this 'and principles'. This document is so distorted from the truth as it stands now. There should a final end to Treaty claims a finite date, health, education other priorities suffer as a consequence of a constant drain on the finances of NZ.
5. **All race based Parliamentary seats and local government seats** should be abolished [separatism] Maori or any other race has shown they are very capable of being elected into Parliament on their own merit without preferential treatment [All this other is apartheid]

6. **Electoral Matters:** There should be no more than 99 MP's in Parliament. Keep the three year Parliamentary term as it stands at the moment it is the **only** time NZ People can have their democratic say. Maybe One day when our Politicians become more responsible to the NZ people a longer term could be considered.
7. Personally I would like to see the '**MagnaCarta**' restored back to our 'unwritten Constitution'. This was removed [barring clause 29] by a Labour government when they put though **1986 Constitution Act**. Removing this from our constitution has dangerous consequences to the NZ people's human rights/property rights [Common law]. **The 1990 NZ Bill of rights** does not do a lot as it Looks like a partial replacement gesture for what was removed in 1986! Once again all these acts and changes were made/slipped through without the public's knowledge.
8. Another contentious situation in NZ is when **NZ signed the 1920 League of Nations covenant** [along with Australia and Canada] and was given legal separation from Britain in 1931. New Zealand chose not to **ratify** the 1931 Statute, falsely believing it could still function as a British Colony. NZ was supposed to have severed those ties with Britain to be a League of Nations member. So now open for debate as to whether NZ Government has been passing laws since 1920 without pure Constitutional authority. The day after 10 Jan 1920, the 'Treaty of Waitangi would have ceased to exist, because of this, therein lays a dilemma. Maybe you have to sort out these issues before wanting to enshrine the Treaty in a constitution! So does this Constitutional Committee really have a mandate to do this review? Not from the NZ people it doesn't!
9. **Another issue is Sovereignty**, whether government realised it or not, this had not been passed from Britain to the NZ Government but was passed directly to the NZ people by virtue of the international covenants that all three countries signed [1920]. So this committee and Government need to start realising these facts and start showing **All the NZ people** a little more respect and consideration. There needs to be a mandate [referendum by law] from the people for such major changes to NZ constitution and

laws. Just because a Party is elected to Government does not just give them the right to change Laws and legislation at their whim!

10. That leads onto the fact **NZ needs either an Upper House** or more Practical would be like Switzerland the **100 day Facultative referendum system**, a way of NZ being informed on serious issues and being able to have an input within the 100 days.

11. **The NZ people require a Binding Referendum about any mooted changes being considered to their Constitution and certainly before any permanent decisions/changes are made.**

12. **STAY WITH OUR 'UNWRITTEN CONSTITUTION.** It has Served us well since the 1852 NZ Constitutional Act was passed. It gives us the flexibility to make decisive clear legislation in Parliament without having Lawyers/Judges involved debating every word as you would have if NZ had a 'Written Constitution.

