

2839

**From:** colin mackay <[REDACTED]>  
**To:** "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 5/07/2013 7:34 p.m.  
**Subject:** CAP submission

I believe the moari seats should be abolished.

Colin Mackay  
,

Auckland

1329

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 14/06/2013 7:46 a.m.  
**Subject:** Constitutional Review

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

Regards

Darryl MacKay

## MAORI REPRESENTATION

### 1. The Maori seats

#### **1.1 The retention or the abolition of the Maori seats should be a choice for Maori.**

The establishment of the Maori seats in 1867 came on the back of a plea from Maori chiefs to retain 'the last vestige of a lost autonomy.'<sup>1</sup> Is it fair, in our proud multi-cultural society that Maori still rely on the whim of a majority-minded Parliament in order to know if their one guaranteed form of representation will continue? Are they not owed the respect and dignity to decide for themselves, and have the security of entrenchment if so?

As stated by the Royal Commission in their 1986 electoral system report 'the Maori seats have a significance for Maori in ways that go beyond the issue of political representation.'<sup>2</sup> This symbolic importance inherent in the Maori seats illustrates one reason for their retention. They are a physical manifestation of Maori as *tanagata whenua*, and guarantee the right to participate in a process where a representative is chosen by a *Maori* electorate, to be accountable and represent *Maori* voters, in a *Maori* way.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Andrew Geddis *Electoral Law in New Zealand: Practice and policy*. (LexisNexis, Wellington, 2007) 93 at 98

<sup>2</sup> JH Wallace, JH Darwin, KJ Keith, RG Mulgan and W Wereta *Report of the Royal Commission on the Electoral System. Towards a Better Democracy* (1986) Chapter 3: Maori Representation at 82.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* at 19.

The symbolic significance is tied intrinsically to the Maori right to tino rangitiratanga as laid down in Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi 1840.<sup>4</sup> The weight placed on this connection should not be underestimated, and any unilateral attempt by the government to abolish the Maori seats, could be taken as a breach of the duties owed to Maori peoples under the treaty. As described by one High Court judge, the seats are a 'treaty icon.'<sup>5</sup>

The Royal Commission in 1986 came to the conclusion that the Maori seats were actually detrimental to Maori representation, but due to overwhelming opposition from Maori, it would be illegitimate to abolish them.<sup>6</sup> Setting aside the reasons why the Commission thought the seats should be abolished, the view in itself that Maori were failing to act in their own best interests is unashamedly paternalistic. The symbolic value that Maori place on the seats is seen as a 'mistaken' reason why they should be retained.<sup>7</sup> This is an entirely majority-centric, Pakeha-based frame of reference. Maori seats are, and continue to be, a great source of mana to the Maori community,<sup>8</sup> and simply because a Pakaha majority do not place such value on electorate seat, does not translate into symbolic significance being an illegitimate reason for retention.

Some may argue the conditions that the seats emerged under in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century gives reason for their abolition. The idea that they were intended to only be

---

<sup>4</sup> Andrew Geddis "A Dual Track Democracy? The Symbolic Role of the Maori Seats in New Zealand's Electoral System", (2006) 5(4) Election LJ 347 at 358

<sup>5</sup> *Taiaroa v Minister of Justice* CP99/94, 4 October 1994 at 45

<sup>6</sup> *Towards a Better Democracy*, above n 1 at 90

<sup>7</sup> Augie Fleras "From Social Control Towards Political Self-Determination? Maori Seats and the Politics of Separate Maori Representation in New Zealand" (1985) 18 Canadian Journal of Political Science 551 at 564

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid*, at 568.



temporary, and established without consultation of Maori, superficially could be linked to a rejection of the seats as an effective form of representation. However this kind of attitude is simply a repetition, albeit in reverse, of the unilateral decision to establish the seats. For better or worse, the Maori seats have become part of our system, and Maori have attributed meaning to them beyond their original purpose. Any abolition of the seats that is not the collective decision of Maori is simply echoing the lack of consultation upon the establishment of the seats, and withholding the right for Maori to decide for themselves whether the seats are their best method for representation.

This right for Maori to decide, rather than through a majority parliament, is also enshrined in the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, under Article 3; the right to self-determination.<sup>9</sup> Although New Zealand accepted only a caveated version of the Declaration, Dr. Pita Sharples, in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly, stated that New Zealand would “continue to rely upon, its own distinct processes and institutions that afford opportunities to Māori...”<sup>10</sup> with regards to indigenous involvement in decision-making. If the New Zealand Parliament does not afford Maori the right to decide whether to abolish or retain the Maori seats, they are not even holding to their caveated acceptance of the Declaration, a move that will not bode well with the international community.

---

<sup>9</sup> United Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, art 3 “Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.”

<sup>10</sup> Dr. Pita Sharples, Minister for Maori Affairs “Mihi to United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (Tauparapara)” (Ninth session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, 19 April 2010)

There is a temptation to resort to the 'one law for all'<sup>11</sup> stance, which National has adopted as their official party line, and abolish the Maori seats on this basis. The argument goes that we should have neutral laws, which are colour-blind, and thus promote equality for everyone as New Zealanders, including our electoral rolls. However, it is through such 'formal equality' that inequalities become institutionalised,<sup>12</sup> and uphold the current status quo of Maori interests taking a perpetual backseat.

Another issue also arises; if we are all 'one', whose version of 'one' must we be? The answer can only be a version of the majority. As argued by Arapeta Tahana, 'I'd like to, in arguing against the notion of abolition, reject the patronizing remarks to the effect that when we have abolished the Maori seats, then we will be equal to the Pakeha. What is being confused here is the distinction between equality and conformity.'<sup>13</sup>

Must Maori surrender their distinctive cultural identity in order to be a New Zealander, or could New Zealand alternatively become a 'bi-cultural enterprise'<sup>14</sup> where it is cooperation rather than assimilation, which forms the basis of our electoral system? This would allow Maori to preserve their cultural and social structures, while contributing to a distinctive New Zealand identity.

---

<sup>11</sup> Herald Online "Don Brash pushes "one law for all" message again" *The New Zealand Herald* (New Zealand) 9 November 2011, [http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c\\_id=1&objectid=10764866](http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10764866)

<sup>12</sup> Larissa Behrendt *Achieving Social Justice. Indigenous Rights and Australia's Future* (The Federation Press, Sydney, 2003) at 15

<sup>13</sup> Arapeta Tahana "Maori Political Representation" *Nga Tumanako, Maori Representation Conference* Ranganiu Walker (ed) (Centre for Continuing Education Auckland, 1985) 9 at 10

<sup>14</sup> Moana Jackson "Where Does Sovereignty Lie?" in Colin James (ed) *Building the Constitution* (Institute of Political Studies, Wellington, 2000) 196 at 197

Therefore, all who qualify as Maori under s3(1) of the Electoral Act 1993 should be able to collectively decide, as a people, if they wish to maintain this form of representation, rather than by a unilateral majority decision within Parliament. This could be achieved through a referendum of Maori, or adopting a similar approach to the Royal Commission's report in the 1980's in which a series of hui took place around the country.

### **1.2 A step further- entrenchment.**

If a consensus is reached to retain the Maori seats, entrenchment in a similar way to the general seats under s268(1) of the Constitution Act 1986 should be considered. With a firm National rejection that Maori seats should be a part of our constitutional framework, there is an ever-present possibility that the Maori seats could be abolished upon the whim of a National-led parliament. This situation was avoided in 2008 by National's need for Maori Party support, but the question must be raised whether it is fair that the future of the seats remains an inherently unpredictable matter of politics.<sup>15</sup> Some may dismiss this possibility as unrealistic, however historically, both Labour and National, as well as the courts, have given an inconsistent message to Maori as to how they will be received. Attitudes regarding Maori have swung from early measures of protection,<sup>16</sup> to treatment as 'barbarians'<sup>17</sup>, and then in the opposite direction to 'treaty partners'<sup>18</sup>, back to an arbitrary enactment of the Foreshore and Seabed Act in 2004. Maori deserve security in their guaranteed form of representation,

---

<sup>15</sup> Andrew Geddis *A Dual Track Democracy* above n 3 at 348

<sup>16</sup> *R v Symonds* (1847) NZPCC 38

<sup>17</sup> *Wi Parata v The Bishop of Wellington* (1877) 3 NZLR 72 at [7]

<sup>18</sup> *New Zealand Maori Council v Attorney-General* [1987] 1 NZLR 6413 at 643



and also for it to be respected in the same manner as the general seats. It must be noted that Parliament could still reverse such protection by repealing the entrenching provision.

## **2. Publicity**

### **2.1 The Maori Electoral Option.**

The Maori Electoral Option and its consequences for the Maori seats are anything but clear, causing difficulties for Maori voters. 56.8% of participants in a recent study on Maori electoral participation by Massey University agreed that politics are too complicated.<sup>19</sup> Making it difficult for Maori to vote, by not allowing them onto the roll of their choice at election time, will not encourage a group that already tends towards lethargic participation<sup>20</sup> to join the democratic process. By adopting the Justice and Electoral Committee's recommendation that the Maori Electoral Option be held every three years before an election<sup>21</sup>, rather than in conjunction with the census, much confusion could be avoided, which would make it easier for Maori voters to transition onto the Maori roll and increase Maori participation.

Furthermore, because the option is only held every five years, it is quite possible that Maori will be barred from voting on the roll they wish to, if they miss the

---

<sup>19</sup> Eljon Fitzgerald Brendan Stevenson and Jacob Tapiata *Maori Electoral Participation, A Report Produced for the Electoral Commission. Best Outcomes for Māori: Te Hoe Nuku Roa* (School of Māori Studies, Massey University Palmerston North, 2007) at 26

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Justice and Electoral Committee *Inquiry into the 2005 General Election* 2006 at 9

Maori electoral option. This has been described as 'tantamount to disenfranchisement.'<sup>22</sup>

In line with international trends, it has been found that low levels of Maori participation may not necessarily be about being Maori, but about the socio-economic factors which go hand in hand; being younger, less affluent and less educated.<sup>23</sup> It has been shown that if voters fail to participate in their first election, they are less likely to vote at future elections.<sup>24</sup> Therefore, publicity needs to be targeted at this younger Maori demographic in order to increase Maori participation rates in the long term. A 1994 Waitangi Tribunal report found that Maori methods of raising awareness about the Maori roll, such as tapping into Maori networks and *kanohi kit te kanohi* (face-to-face contact), proved particularly effective in increasing Maori enrollment.<sup>25</sup> Such methods could be combined with publicity targeting youths, especially in lower wealth areas. This may have an immediate effect on Maori participation, and also lead to future gains.

Another strong trend arising out of the Massey University study is that Maori actually hold a strong interest in politics, but are disillusioned and feel their voices are not heard.<sup>26</sup> Nearly half of the participants in the study believed the

---

<sup>22</sup> "Workshop A" in Ranganui Walker (ed) *Nga Tumanako Maori Representation Conference* (Centre for Continuing Education, Auckland, 1985) 12

<sup>23</sup> *Maori Electoral Participation* above n 18 at 23

<sup>24</sup> Ann Sullivan, "Maori Participation" in Miller (ed) *New Zealand Government & Policy* (Oxford University Press, Auckland, 2010) 538 at 543

<sup>25</sup> Waitangi Tribunal *Maori Electoral Option Report* (Wai 413, Department of Justice, 1994) at [4.2]

<sup>26</sup> *Maori Electoral Participation* above n 18 at 26

reason Maori did not vote was due to disempowerment.<sup>27</sup> Intense and comprehensive advertising, intended to ensure that Maori feel their vote is important and necessary, may help to decrease this statistic. Combined with the earlier suggestions regarding entrenchment, and the right to decide whether the Maori seats are retained, may contribute to an increasing sense of worth and subsequently increased Maori participation.

A related corollary to increased advertising is to clarify that Maori seats are not extra seats; rather, as A. Geddis termed them, they are 'reserved seats.'<sup>28</sup> Eradicating this misleading conception may eliminate some of the stigma surrounding Maori seats and encourage more Maori to enter onto the Maori roll.

### **3. Structural changes**

#### **3.1 Acknowledging Maori forms of democratic participation**

Radical changes New Zealand's constitutional system have been proposed by some in order to better incorporate Maori representation. Moana Jackson, for instance, argues for three separate houses- a tikanga Maori house, a tikanga Pakeha house, and a Treaty house, in order to create legislation.<sup>29</sup> Others have

---

<sup>27</sup> Ibid, at 24

<sup>28</sup> Andrew Geddis *Electoral Law in New Zealand* above n 1 at 103

<sup>29</sup> Whata Winiata "How Can or Should the Treaty be Reflected in Institutional Design?" In Colin James (ed) "Building the Constitution" (Institute of Political Studies, Wellington, 2000) 205



advocated a tribally based organisation of the Maori seats.<sup>30</sup> This suggestion has appeal, as it recognises the tribe, or hapu, as the fundamental social unit for Maori<sup>31</sup>. However, it may cause issues with a basic principles of democracy, being the right of all citizens to participate equally in the electoral system.<sup>32</sup> The argument that Maori seats undermine this principle is alleviated by a system where the rules surrounding the Maori seats are exactly the same as the general seats. However, a tribally based determination could be attacked for democratic incompatibility.

I would like to submit that it is not necessary to entirely upset the constitutional framework we currently have in place with regards to Maori representation. However, it must be acknowledged that the Westminster system in no way pays respect to New Zealand's indigenous peoples. To give Maori equal representation, there should be much more emphasis on Maori values (tikanga Maori) within our present framework. This includes incorporating into all areas of government fundamental Maori concepts such as, whanaungatanga (the rights and obligations stemming from an individuals place in a group), manaakitanga (sharing, hospitality), aroha (charity, generosity), and utu (reciprocity to maintain relationships).<sup>33</sup> These values could be introduced as a ideals to strive towards in relations between members of parliament, departments and civil servants, Not only would incrementally integrating tikanga Maori into our

---

<sup>30</sup> RJ Walker "Introduction" *Nga Tumanako, Maori Representation Conference*, in Rangianu Walker (ed) (Centre for Continuing Education, Auckland) 1 at 5  
Introduction by R J Walker- conference director

<sup>31</sup> Angela Ballara Iwi. *The dynamics of Maori Tribal organisation from c.1769 to c.1945* (Victoria University Press, Wellington, 1998) at 230

<sup>32</sup> Andrew Geddis *A Dual Track Democracy?* Above n 3 at 348

<sup>33</sup> Robert Joseph "Contemporary Maori Governance: New Era or New Error?" (2007) NZ Universities Law Review 22 at 693

Pakeha-augmented system strengthen New Zealand's bi-cultural relations, I believe it would add a valuable new dimension to our existing structures.

### **3.2 A guaranteed voice.**

Maori place particular emphasis on certain issues of cultural importance, for example the environment. This is illustrated in concepts such as kaitiakitanga, meaning stewardship and protection, especially of natural resources.<sup>34</sup> This traditional Maori connection with particular areas of policy, such as environmental considerations, means that Maori should have a guaranteed forum to express their specific concerns to the government on some defined issues. This could be based on an adapted version of an existing body such as the New Zealand Maori Council, or possibly based on the Waka Umanga model recently proposed for Maori governance entities.<sup>35</sup> Such a body could gather Maori opinion on a matter, ascertained through alternative forms of participation such as hui, hikoi, or poukai tribal gatherings<sup>36</sup>, collate it, and present it to Parliament or the government at some point in the process of creating a policy or enacting legislation. In this way, such a report could function much as the Attorney- General's s7 New Zealand Bill of Rights report does, but instead, reports on Maori opinion upon the issue at hand. It may be argued that Maori have the option to make their voices heard in the Select Committee process, however, in this alternative view, their perspectives, as the tanagta

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid, at 694

<sup>35</sup> Law Commission *Waka Umanga; A Proposed Law for Maori Governance Entities* (0113-2334 ; 92, 2006, Wellington NZ at 41

<sup>36</sup> Ann Sullivan above n 23 at 544

whenua of New Zealand, are being actively sought and considered. The establishment of such a body would need to be one which Maori feel they have developed to suit their particular concerns as a people, as was also suggested in the development of the waka umanga structure.<sup>37</sup>

A further commitment could be made, that such opinion must at least be taken into account by Parliament, for instance in the passing of a bill. This does not equate to the power of veto over legislation, nor to an impingement on Parliament's sovereign right to legislate. Rather, it provides a status to Maori interests which demonstrates that they cannot be justifiably ignored.

In concluding my submission, I encourage the Commission to look forward to the new possibilities and opportunities that allowing Maori an increased voice within our representational framework will provide. However, I do not believe we can look forward without accounting for what we have left behind. A cursory examination of New Zealand's history reveals a long line of injustices against a rich and distinctive culture. By giving Maori the choice whether to retain the Maori seats; by showing respect for their decision by affording the seats the same entrenched protection as the general seats; by ensuring Maori have a firm grip on how a voting system foreign to their traditional culture operates; and by incorporating Maori values into our structures as well as giving Maori a defined voice on culturally important issues, New Zealand would be taking steps in addressing some of our largest social issues, and in creating a truly bi-cultural nation.

---

<sup>37</sup> *Waka Umanga* above n 34 at 38





## 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.

Lachlan Mackay  
Wellington  
New Zealand



1790

To: Submissions Secretariat  
Constitutional Advisory Panel C/o Ministry of Justice  
DX SX10088  
Wellington

From: Fiona Mackenzie

Whangaparaoa

Phone:

Date: 28<sup>th</sup> May 2013

**Submission on New Zealand's Constitution  
for the Constitutional Advisory Panel (CAP)**

**1. Equality Before the Law**

For the sake of all New Zealanders, **equality of all citizens before the law** needs to be the basis of anything and everything our lawmakers do. Property rights issues must be based solely on citizenship, not ethnicity. There must be no preferment for any individual or group based on ancestry, ethnicity, gender, politics, religion, sports or hobbies. Matters of culture have nothing to do with government, except for the basic right of freedom of expression and belief.

*Every single thing in our constitution should be equally applicable to all New Zealanders.*

**2. Legitimate Change to NZ's Constitution**

Any entrenchment of New Zealand's constitution will only be legitimate if the precise changes and all their possible consequences are -

- fully explained, and
- approved by the majority of voters via a binding public referendum.

**3. A New Entrenched Constitution**

There is no popular demand for a new, single document, entrenched constitution. So there is no need to pursue this review.

Entrenched constitutions can quickly become outdated (e.g. like the USA's "right to bear arms") and can cause enormous problems, so I'd prefer to retain our current changeable system.

Neither I do not want to transfer law-making powers from elected MPs to unelected and unaccountable judges, thereby leaving voters with no control over what happens in this country.

And more importantly, should a new, set-in-stone constitution ever be developed, I do not want it based on a 173-year-old, much-interpreted and disputed document.

#### 4. The Treaty of Waitangi

The Treaty of Waitangi has no place in a current day constitution. Over and above the fact that no one actually agrees on the multitude of new interpretations applied to it, it was written for another time (1840).

*Every single thing in our constitution should apply equally to all New Zealanders.*

New Zealanders have blended their bloodlines, cultures and ways of living so much that it is farcical to divide us by some spurious notion of race or ancestral descent. Under current Treaty of Waitangi claims, we so often have the situation of people with a minority Maori bloodline making claims against those of his majority bloodline. It is a joke.

Progress in the developed world (and New Zealand) has happened because of these basic principles:

- One law for all – equality of all citizens before the law.
- Personal property rights.
- The financial system facilitating business growth, international trade and investment in education, health and welfare.
- The demise of tribalism.
- Universal suffrage has lead to one stable, sovereign government, elected democratically to do the bidding of the majority of voters.
- Law and order based on all of the above.

We have been undermining these principles to New Zealand's detriment. If this trend is not stopped and reversed soon, we will all suffer from a decline in every facet of our way of life.

This effort to recreate, expand and reapply the Treaty to the future will lead to those Kiwis not identifying as "Maori" being permanently treated as second-class citizens in their own country. Peace and prosperity cannot result.

#### 5. Bill of Rights Issues (property rights, entrenchment):

By contrast, electorate MPs should see their term out whether within/without a political party.

MPs should not have control over the structure of the political system as they have had under the recent review of MMP. The wishes of the majority of voters should be implemented forthwith.

## 10. Maori Representation

All separate Maori representation should be abolished. It is anachronistic, totally unwarranted and is breeding resentment in this country. It has been successful in imposing a mafia-like power, legalized corruption and waste of taxpayer resources in all levels of government. Under this racist system, voters have no rights, only obligations to pay.

Apartheid is destructive. It does not advance the health of the country, our people and their place in the world. All it does is benefit the elite tribal gang of "Maori" who provide each other with positions of power at the taxpayers' and their tribe's expense. It does nothing to improve the lot of ordinary New Zealanders of Maori lineage. It is, in fact, tyranny by the minority.

People are fundamentally the same. We all have the same basic needs, wants and psychology - so we should be served by the one trustworthy system.

## 11. Flawed Review Process

I would like to make a complaint about the Constitutional Advisory Panel's review process:

- a. A significant amount of time, effort and taxpayer monies have been invested in holding hui for select Maori audiences around the country. Meanwhile, very little effort has been made to organise general public meetings for all other New Zealanders (of every ethnicity). We have had no opportunity to hear about or discuss these issues and the possible consequences. Therefore, this review seems extremely biased and simply cannot present the opinions of many New Zealanders.
- b. Many of the complex issues covered by the Advisory Panel have been camouflaged by superficial, leading questions. By failing to point out the important implications of possible constitutional change, the review process is failing to fully inform the public and obtain their considered and true opinions.
- c. It is so obvious that this review has been initiated and structured by the Maori Party for its own racist, political ends. It does not serve the best interests of New Zealanders.



## 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.

Sarah Mackenzie  
Wellington  
New Zealand

## Submission for the Constitution Conversation

Your name:

Sarah Macfarlane

Name of the organisation you represent (if applicable):

Postal address or email address:

Wellington

SUBMISSION:

I believe that the constitution conversation is a brilliant opportunity to express my concern about the human rights situation in New Zealand. New Zealand was once a leader in this area but I believe we are slipping. As a student I think it is essential to promote knowledge of the civic system and rights in schools. This will provide greater awareness to our country about their rights in their country. To strengthen human rights in this country we should introduce economic, social, and cultural rights to the bill of rights. Then enshrining this act will provide



Safety and protection of human rights  
in New Zealand. I also support  
establishment of a human rights select  
committee, with increased accountability  
around human rights. All levels of  
government should also take a  
human rights approach through their  
decision and policy making.

17499  
Quick Submission

Your name:

Sarah Mackenzie

Name of the organisation you represent (if applicable):

Postal address or email address:

There is a current inconsistency in the legal protections of all rights in New Zealand. That inconsistency, which weakens the overall human rights fabric, can easily be addressed with the inclusion of economic, social, and cultural rights into the Bill of Rights Act. Additionally I support,

- The entrenchment of the Bill of Rights Act;
- For judges to have the power to provide remedies; and
- Ratification of the Optional Protocol to the ICESCR, including opting in to its inquiry and interstate mechanisms.

The human rights fabric will further be strengthened by:

- The establishment of a human rights select committee, and increased accountability around select committees to ensure that human rights issues are noticed and taken seriously;
- The requirement of all levels of Government to take a human rights approach to addressing human rights issues and mainstreaming rights through their decision and policy making.
- Increased human rights education initiatives to increase public awareness of economic, social, and cultural rights.

**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](http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz)**



1749b

received 4/2/13

Submission for the Constitution Conversation

Only 1 page

Your name:

Sarah Macdonald

Name of the organisation you represent (if applicable):

Postal address or email address:

Wellington

SUBMISSION:

New Zealand is resting on its laurels as a human rights leader. Which is why I welcome the opportunity provided by the constitutional review to urge NZ to pick up the mantle of former Prime Minister Peter Fraser, a champion of economic, social, and cultural rights when the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was being drafted post Second World War. It can deliver on Fraser's promise of a future 'free from want' for all New Zealanders by incorporating economic, social, and cultural rights into the Bill of Rights Act. Such leadership is timely when





considering New Zealand's aspirations to  
be on the United Nations Security  
Council, and would strengthen its position  
for this bid.

For that reason I urge,  
the inclusion of economic, social, and cultural  
rights into the Bill of Rights Act, the entrenchment  
of the Bill of Rights Act; for Judges to  
have the power to provide remedies; establishment  
of a human rights select committee and  
increased accountability around select  
committees to ensure that human  
rights issues are noticed and taken  
seriously; the requirement of all levels of  
Government to take a human rights approach  
to addressing human rights issues and  
mainstreaming rights through their decision  
and policy making. Increased human  
rights education initiatives to increase public  
awareness of economic, social, and cultural  
rights.





1726

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 29/06/2013 1:29 p.m.  
**Subject:** <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission  
**Attachments:** Constitutional reviewMackereth.docx

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

Full Names: Judith Gayleen Mackereth Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB:  
Postal City: Postal Region: Auckland Postal Post Code: Postal  
Country: New Zealand Submission: Submission Upload: Constitutional review  
Mackereth.docx

Sent on the 29 June 2013 at 13:28



The values and aspirations we have in common:

A peaceful and crime free society based on shared heritage, understanding and desire to put others before self. Laws based on Christian values . Other religions free to worship but not to radicalize as seen elsewhere.

Ensuring equality for the people of New Zealand

We want a democratic country based on the Westminster system which can change with the times by adapting , modifying and passing new laws to fit the circumstances.

**We do not want a republic.**

As our children and grandchildren become half Chinese, half Indian, Half Samoan, Half Maori half middle Eastern, we want NO RACIAL discrimination based on history. All old world countries have repeatedly been overcome and settled by other ethnic groups. We must have laws which can be changed yet remain democratically constant for ALL citizens regardless of race.

The Treaty of Waitangi;

We must not have a written Constitution. We need an adaptable Constitution. We MUST NOT set the Treaty of Waitangi as the foundation of our Constitution The Treaty agreed guarantee the use of Maori owned things to their owner's use to place Maori under the same protection of law as others and which has now been extrapolated to justify every claim for intangible or uncountable resources such as wind, water, airwaves 4G networks and probably the air we breathe.

We need an adaptable Constitution as our population changes.

Participation and representation in the decisions that affect us;

We want all those of NZ Citizenship, not "right to occupy" i.e. residency to have the vote aged 18 and above. As for politicians we abhor unelected members and List MPs getting full votes.

Protection of Māori culture and identity;

We need to protect Maori culture-what is it? Perhaps "tradition" would be a better word. We need to encourage the learning of Maori by all those who wish to learn the language and all who are of Maori descent but compulsory Maori will cause huge rifts.

The balance between majority power and minority rights

We can keep MMP but we must deal with the ridiculous case of List MPs and small parties pulling in lots of MPs.



We must not allow racially based minority parties to overlord other parties . We must keep the open Christian basis for our Parliament. We do not want terrorist groups gaining a foothold in the future

processes and principles of constitutional change

We do not want a Republic

The Queen +William and Kate will do us fine.

We need to keep the 3 year electoral term

We need to maintain the checks and balances on the exercise of power by the three branches of state (judiciary, parliament, and the executive)

J G Mackereth

4284

**From:** Jim Mackie  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 30/07/2013 9:49 p.m.  
**Subject:** Constitutional matters.

---

With Respect,

The basic things to enshrine in a Constitution are:-

- A. Lock in our present rights under "The Bill of Rights Act", "The Electoral Act" and other Acts and Regulations, bringing it tidily together into one Act.
- B. Include rights outlined in The United Nation's "Universal Declaration of Human Rights".
- C. Make it clear that "Rights" are balanced by "Responsibilities".
- D. Lock these Rights in legislation that is not easily changed. For example requiring a majority in Parliament of, say, sixty or seventy per cent for those changes.

I wish you well for this mammoth but worthwhile task.

Jim Mackie

(Andrew James Mackie)

Tasman.

Phon

840

**From:** Katherine Mackie

**To:** "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 14/05/2013 3:11 p.m.  
**Subject:** CAP submission Urgent  
**Attachments:** My submission regarding the NZ Constitutional Review.docx

My submission regarding the NZ Constitutional Review is that I want no change to New Zealand's unwritten constitution as it has served us well since the 1852 NZ Constitutional Act was passed, our founding document. It may require some alterations in the future, but not a race based Constitution.

Equality for all, One People One Nation

Yours sincerely,

Lawrence and Kathie Smith



1332

**From:** "Richard"  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 14/06/2013 11:37 a.m.  
**Subject:** CAP

No change to the Constitution please

"ONE PEOPLE ONE NATION, EQUALITY FOR ALL"

Thank you

Richard and Susan Mackinnon

Hawkes Bay

1332a

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 7/08/2013 4:42 p.m.

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

Full Names: Richard and Susan Mackinnon Organisation Name: Retired Email:  
Postal City: Napier Postal Region: Hawkes Bay Postal Country:  
New Zealand Submission: 1. Reduce, better still abolish list MP's

2. End the seabed and foreshore pay out

3. The Constitution should be written in a single document AND have a higher legal status---a Supreme Law!

4. New Zealand must have a Supreme Law

Submitted on the 12 June 2013 at 10:22

2491

**From:** Duncan Mackintosh ·  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 4/07/2013 10:02 a.m.  
**Subject:** CAP Submission

I do not think there should be Maori seats , Those that think they are  
maori can contest any or the seats. I know a lot of part Maori that do  
not think there should be Maori seats. We should all be treated equal.  
There is great doubt that the Maori was first in NZ. So the treaty of  
Waitangi should be forgotten about. I think the constitution should  
remain as is.

857

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 17/05/2013 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: Rebecca mackle Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal Region:  
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: 1.What are your aspirations for  
Aotearoa New Zealand?

I would like to see all new Zealanders being treated equally, and having a say in political decisions in the future. I believe there needs to be an improvement on how politics are being taught in schools. so kiwis are informed enough to participate thoughtfully in elections and actions such as this.

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

With a focus on all New Zealanders being brought up to equal standing in society- both economically and socially. I want to see the govt. focussing on lowering (if not abolishing) the poverty rate, and focussing on the little people as well as businesses' and money

Sent on the 17 May 2013 at 09:22



857a

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 17/05/2013 9:29 a.m.  
**Subject:** <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Rebecca Mackle Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal Region:  
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: 1) Yes- it provides clarity and enables schools etc. to teach it easily.

2) the constitution should be our baseline laws if I understand correctly- would that not mean it is at least equal to supreme law?

3) the courts, parliament is too reliant on individual parties political agenda

Sent on the 17 May 2013 at 09:27

8576

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 17/05/2013 9:33 a.m.  
**Subject:** <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Rebecca mackle Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal Region:  
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I think the Treaty principles  
(Three P's) are an important part of how New Zealand should operate, and so yes I believe the Treaty  
should be an important part of the Constitution, as it is what New Zealand is meant to be founded on

Sent on the 17 May 2013 at 09:32

857c

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 17/05/2013 9:38 a.m.  
**Subject:** <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Rebecca Mackle Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Postal Region:  
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: 1. How should Māori views be represented in Parliament?

Maori representatives for each political party? so they can give Maori perspectives on each political parties agendas and how these agendas will affect Maori

2. How could Māori electoral participation be improved?

Teach politics and the importance of understanding them in schools!!!

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

I believe that local govt. and party members should be encouraged if not needed to consult local iwi on their perspectives

Sent on the 17 May 2013 at 09:37

857d

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 17/05/2013 9:51 a.m.  
**Subject:** <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Rebecca Mackle Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: 1 Postal Region:  
Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: 5 years for a term of  
parliament- allows the govt. to actually make some progress on their policies.

also, if a parliament member leave their party then they should be replaced by another member from that party

Sent on the 17 May 2013 at 09:49



4677<sup>2</sup>

**From:** "Mackley, Brooke"  
**To:** "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.gov...  
**Date:** 31/07/2013 1:47 p.m.  
**Subject:** Submission to Constitutional Review  
**Attachments:** img-731134338-0001.pdf

This electronic communication, which includes any files or attachments thereto, contains proprietary or confidential information and may be privileged and otherwise protected under copyright or other applicable intellectual property laws. All information contained in this electronic communication is solely for the use of the individual(s) or entity to which it was addressed. If you are not the intended recipient(s), you are hereby notified that distributing, copying, or in any way disclosing any of the information in this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately, and destroy the communication and any files or attachments in their entirety, whether in electronic or hard copy format. Since data stored on electronic media can deteriorate, be translated or modified, AECOM, its subsidiaries, and/or affiliates will not be liable for the completeness, correctness or readability of the electronic data. The electronic data should be verified against the hard copy.



CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW SUBMISSION – DEADLINE 5PM 31<sup>st</sup> JULY

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Courts

How should Māori views be represented in Parliament?

Through Their Elected Electorate Representative

How could Māori electoral participation be improved?

Education in Civic Responsibilities

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

In The Same Way As Everybody Else

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

Decrease

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

3 Years

Should the election date stay flexible or be fixed?

Flexible Within Certain Time Frame of Say 2 Months

Should the number of electorate stay the same?

Yes Other Than Consolidation To Match Total  
Seats in Parliament

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

No

Should electoral integrity legislation be re-introduced?

Yes

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

Yes

Should the parliamentary Maori seats be retained or abolished?

ABOLISHED

Should local government Maori seats be retained or abolished?

ABOLISHED AS BEING TOTALLY UNFAIR AND UNREASONABLE

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

NO. - TOO MUCH DAMAGE AND WASTED EXPENDITURE HAS RESULTED FROM ITS ADHERANCE

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

YES

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

YES, BUT WITH CHECKS AND BALANCES AS THE LEGAL FRATERNITY HAS A HABIT OF CANTING LAWS TO

Should the DECLARATION OF EQUALITY be enacted by Parliament? YES GIVE THEM MULTIPLE BITES OF THE CHERRY.

DECLARATION: "We New Zealanders of all backgrounds, having founded and developed our society in equality, fairness, and comradeship, oppose any laws which establish or promote racial distinction or division.

- 1 We reject references to the Treaty of Waitangi or its principles in any constitutional document.
- 2 We ask that such references be removed from all existing legislation.
- 3 We ask that race-based Parliamentary seats be abolished.
- 4 We ask that race-based representation on local bodies be abolished.
- 5 We ask that the Waitangi Tribunal be abolished.

Therefore in the interests of New Zealand we call on the members of the House of Representatives to implement the principles of this Declaration of Equality to ensure that there is one law for all."

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

PUBLIC REFERENDUM AS THE QUALITY OF MOST MPs IS REPREHENSIBLE AND ESSENTIALLY UNFIT TO HANDLE THE RESPONSIBILITIES BESTOWED UPON THEM.

NAME: BROOKE MACKLEY

CITY: DUCKLAND

EMAIL: -

RETURN TO [constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz](mailto:constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz)



## 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.

Bianca MacLachlan  
Karratha  
Australia

3781 "

**From:** "Jenny Maclaren" nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 23/07/2013 10:26 p.m.  
**Subject:** CAP submission  
**Attachments:** CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW.docx

Please can you let me know that you have received this submission for the Constitutional Review.

Yours sincerely  
Jennifer Maclaren





## CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW - SUBMISSION

I would like to see our democratic process develop further; NZ scores well in the Democracy Index but there's room for refinement nonetheless.

I would like to see our country run more professionally than at present ie more co-operatively within parliament and more openly between the government and the people.

Whether or not to have a written constitution\* is a red herring really – a detail that distracts from the more important underlying improvements that could be made. The unwritten constitution serves us well enough and is more flexible as attitudes evolve over the years (look at the difficulties the USA finds itself in because of archaic laws set in stone). True, its 'bits and pieces' are not readily accessible to the public, but that could be overcome by including it in our education system, as we do with the Treaty of Waitangi, so that everyone could be more knowledgeable about the system and their rights under it.

The only part of our constitution that **perhaps** needs to be strengthened by entrenchment is the Bill of Rights. There would, however, need to be a separate, full public consultation on its contents first.

A binding "mission statement" which is a list of general qualities that our country/government should be aiming for eg justice, equality, compassion, respect for the environment, honesty, etc would be a positive step. MPs should have to swear an oath that they will do their best to strive for such values, instead of just swearing an oath of allegiance to the monarch, as at present. Australia has altered its parliamentary oaths in this way.

The chief obstacle blocking our way to more democratic government is our adversarial system of government, which has our MPs focussing on a demeaning power struggle rather than on what will most benefit the country. The party in government considers itself "in power" over the people instead of "in service" to the country – the old, outdated idea that government = ruler.

To remove that "power" element from our parliamentary system/process and allow MPs to concentrate on running the country constructively there are various measures that could be effective if combined.

The Swiss government has its 'cabinet' formed in proportion to the number of MPs elected to parliament in each party eg 5 from National, 4 from Labour, 1 from the Greens, 1 from a coalition of minor parties. There is no "winner takes all". Furthermore the role of the 'prime minister', who acts as chair of the cabinet, and head of state when one is required, is held by each of the ministers in turn for no more than one year at a time. The members of the cabinet can well be the same through several elections, providing greater continuity of policies and facilitating long-term planning. This is a much more democratic and co-operative system than **our** present one.

And it is not such a foreign idea. John Key has suggested extending the term of office to 4 years, 'as has happened before in NZ'. He neglected to point out however that this took place in times of national emergency (World Wars) when everyone was pulling together in a government of national unity. This should always be the case!

\*And numbers of MPs, length of term of office, etc.

The adversarial system is wasteful of time and energy, and brings MPs into disrepute, which damages the morale of our country. It is not used in the government of cities much larger than the whole of NZ or in **any** other organisation large or small – multinational companies or your local hockey club! In this system the opposition is supposed to be a check on the government, but is always *de facto* weaker in numbers than the ruling party/ies, so it is not actually a very effective mechanism. This function of the opposition could readily be replaced by strengthening the roles of some of our other bodies, to provide even better control on the possible abuse of power. For example, the Electoral Commission, the Higher Salaries Commission and the office of Governor-General could easily have their powers extended for this purpose.

Our Electoral Commission has already shown its competence and independence in the running of elections, the campaigns to review our electoral systems, and in ruling on issues like the payments to party leaders (recent case of United Future). Its powers could simply be extended to include such things as the date of elections, the nomination of a Speaker (an independent arbiter, preferably from outside Parliament), and the terms and conditions for the employment of MPs. In short, in combination with the Higher Salaries Commission, becoming a sort of objective employing/disciplinary authority. MPs may initially see this as an unwanted restraint, but actually it would free them from the sort of issues that bring them into contempt in the eyes of voters, and allow them to concentrate on governing.

The Governor-General should also have slightly increased powers. Firstly his/her independence from the political process should be enhanced by a more robust selection procedure. Ireland for example uses the choice of 75% of MPs or nomination from a certain number of Local Bodies. Also the Governor-General should **never** be an ex-MP. The Governor-General is our equivalent of an ‘upper house’ ie a check on the executive, so s/he should have similar powers – the right to veto or delay laws or actions that contravene NZ’s “mission statement” (see earlier) or the Bill of Rights. Other aspects of his/her role could remain as at present - in the Democracy Index countries with the non “presidential” style head of state (or representative of the head of state in our case) were more democratic.

Jennifer Maclaren

Takaka

23 July 2013

816

**From:** "Peter & MacLean"  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 11/05/2013 1:52 p.m.  
**Subject:** Cap Submission

My submission regarding the constitutional review is that I want no change to New Zealand's unwritten constitution.

It has served us well since the 1852 Constitutional Act was passed, our founding document. It may require some alteration

In the future, but not a race based constitution. 1 people, 1 Nation.  
Equality for all

Regards

Peter T MacLean.

234

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 12/04/2013 11:52 a.m.  
**Subject:** <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Wynne MacLellan Organisation Name: Email: Phone:  
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:  
Postal Region: Poverty bay Postal Post Code Postal Country: New Zealand  
Submission: I believe that the Treaty of Waitangi should play no role in any form of constitution.  
There is no definitive agreement on the precise meaning of provisions within the treaty, except  
perhaps for, all citizens will be equal under one law for all.

The partnership fallacy was invented by the 1984 Labour Govt when it placed references to "the principles of the treaty of waitangi" into legislation it passed. By not defining these so called principles in statute then allowed the Waitangi tribunil and activist judges on the court of appeal to usurp the proper lawmaking function of parliament.

Since when under NZ law have judges had the power to make law as opposed to interpretation of law created by parliament,

The preamble to this discussion has taken liberties around the meanings of parts of the treaty. The treaty as written has no principles, just provisions.

In 1922 Sir Apirana Ngata summarised the effect of the treaty in these terms: Article 1 of the treaty transfers all chiefly authority to the queen forever, and the embodiment of that authority is now the NZ parliament.

Nothing is broken, we do not need a written constitution until such time as NZ becomes a republic.

Parliament is the highest power in this country and is controlled by the people through democratic election.

Sent on the 12 April 2013 at 11:51

2226

**From:** "Brett MacLeod" :>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 3/07/2013 2:17 p.m.  
**Subject:** CAP Submission

---

Abolish seats - they are not representative and promote racial inequality.

---



## 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.

Morgan MacLeod  
Dunedin  
New Zealand

3736

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 22/07/2013 11:19 a.m.

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

---

Full Names:	Tracey Ann MacLeod	Organisation Name:		Email:		Phone:	
	Postal AddressA:		Postal AddressB:		Postal City:		
Auckland	Postal Region:	Auckland	Postal Post Code:		Postal Country:	New Zealand	

Submission: I believe the Treaty was entered into as a partnership document. At the time of its ratification the Maori population was 99% compared to European at 1%. That has significantly changed now for a number of reasons including historical political/legal and economic.

I do not believe that a single New Zealander of European descent would consider it was ok to change a contract they had entered into merely because the numbers game had changed.

Eg I buy a house through a legitimate contract. However 20 years later a majority of the people in the country now consider that times have changed so I need to understand that the house is no longer mine. The contract is now broken and the country wants to sell my house to someone else.

IF the Treaty is seen as somehow redundant it is because of political and educational failings.

It was a partnership between Britain and Maori. It is irrelevant if there are now more Pacific Islanders in NZ than Maori, Pacific Islanders have their own nations and did not enter a partnership agreement.

People failing to understand a law or a document is not reason to water it down or remove it. We don't accept such ignorance waters down other documents or laws (ignorance of the law is no defence in criminal cases).

I consider it is an important founding document and one I take seriously. To my knowledge I have no Maori blood. My ancestors were Scottish. I have a strong sense of fair play, and the Treaty was all about fair play. 99% of the population have the 1% huge access and rights and on

that basis a nation was grown, a peoples marginalised and killed. When you remove land from a Maori you remove their sense of being, their foundation and their ability to provide for themselves.

The passage of time does not change that inequity.

The Holocaust was a little over 70 years ago and yet it is spoken of regularly. The injustice, the right to justice, to compensation that it must never happen again. Yet we are seemingly happy to renege

on a foundation document because now we are the majority?

Shame on us.

Submitted on the 22 July 2013 at 11:16

---



5214

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 8/08/2013 12:00 p.m.

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

Full Names: Craig Robert MacLugash Email: Postal City: Auckland  
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I would like to see all New Zealanders Treated equal.

I would like to see NZ remain as NZ with NZers in it...regardless of your ethnicity.

I would like the Government take more control on who enters our country, ensure they have positive intentions and intergrate into our society. Any beleifs they may have , be it religious or otherwise should not encrouch on our society, culture or Christian

way of life.

Retain the natural beauty that nature has blessed on our Country and be able to share it with the Tourists in a safe manner.

Removing all race based funding /employment/Local and National Government  
Departments/Parlimentary seats.....

Prisons be self sufficient, welfare payments monitired/scrutineered so as to lower the burden on Tax Payer.

I want to be proud of New Zealand, the blend of cultures, people treated fair and equl regadless of race, creed or colour, at present we are headed the other way....

Submitted on the 10 June 2013 at 14:07



318

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 14/04/2013 4:19 p.m.  
**Subject:** <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: David Maclure Organisation Name: Email: Phone:  
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Linwood Postal City: Christchurch  
Postal Region: Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I  
believe that current 3 years term should be remain because has more election opportunities and more  
voting history among eligible voters.

House of Representative should be more honest model and attitudinal model rather than rushed bills  
submit to allow consultative referendum before the bill passed this to ensure the public their voices  
heard.

The right of living New Zealanders should be recognise be part of the Bill of rights for all.

Non discriminatory provision clause should be part of Bill of Rights for workplace and social security  
be applicable based on equal values within the society.

Designate Cabinet Ministers on the recommendations of the Prime Minister should be submit  
oversight committee prior to ministerial appointment of cabinet for approval.

Ministers should take responsibilities of ministerial duties including to policy development should be fit  
for NZ society based on non foreign modeled implement domestic policy area should be based NZ  
own and developed policies choices.

Policy influences must not be tempted or copies from oversea experiences.

Greater transparency needed for any cabinet ministers to held accountable to parliament and the  
Prime Minister.

Vice regal representative should play more active role in delegation to any national interests due  
public obedience and causes.

Speaker of the House of Representative also Deputy and Associate Speakers should not be linked to  
any political parties affiliation because too lenient to government sides as should more stand alone  
and independence from political parties.

Introduce Deputy Minister to replace Associate Minister because more nicer titles.

Prime Ministerial election should be introduced to general election rather than political parties chosen as that already existed in Israel.

More public participation needed to get involved in debate before government.

Ministerial jurisdiction should be investigation more decision based on public interest.

Greater per-legislative consultation rather than minister alone to law making through draft bill before the House of Representative as a reason without other view due missed point or missed part of the provision to ensure balance drafting between clear definition and balance on people abilities to understand the law clearly.

Sent on the 14 April 2013 at 16:18

218a

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 19/07/2013 3:01 p.m.

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

Full Names: David Maclure Organisation Name: Email: Phone:  
Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City: Christchurch Postal Region: Postal  
Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: I believe disability rights should  
be entrenched in constitution clause should be part of within binding document.

Reason make easier for people with disabilities to empower their rights within the whole society.

Submitted on the 19 July 2013 at 15:00



4830

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 31/07/2013 4:38 p.m.

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

Full Names: Colin Grant MacMillan Organisation Name: Email: m  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:  
Postal Region: Wellington Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New  
Zealand Submission: I do not believe that the Treaty of Waitangi should be written into governing  
law. As it stands, the Treaty is recognised, and the benefactors compensated. I believe that to write  
into law a poorly understood 150 year old document, that in some cases both  
parties disagree upon, can only lead to Government sanctioned apartheid. Treaty settlements will  
never be settled, and to write this (often) misinterpreted document can only give cause to greater  
division.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 16:37



2082.

**From:** Barry Macpherson <  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 3/07/2013 7:51 a.m.  
**Subject:** CAP Submission

---

On the basis of equality of opportunity for all, the Maori seats should be abolished.

The statistics of the recent by-election illustrates passivity and indifference to the democratic process - the dereliction of a basic human right, say no more.

197

**From:**  
**To:** <constitutionaireview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 10/04/2013 8:01 p.m.  
**Subject:** <http://www.ourconstitution.org.nz/> form submission

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

Full Names: Connor Alexander Grant Macpherson Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB:  
Postal City: auckland Postal Region: Postal Post Code: Postal Country:  
New Zealand Submission: the courts should have the power to decide whether legislation is  
consistent with the constitution. thanks

Sent on the 10 April 2013 at 20:00

1154

**From:** "Lyn Macpherson" <  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 7/06/2013 4:39 p.m.  
**Subject:** Submission

Herewith is my submission regarding the NZ Constitutional Review:

I want no change to New Zealand's unwritten constitution. I do not think it should be enshrined in one single document, and I also think that Parliament, and not the Courts should have the final say in any matter pertaining to it. The 1852 NZ Constitutional Act was our founding document and has served New Zealand well in the ensuing years. I realize that it may need to be updated in the future, but NOT TO A RACE-BASED CONSTITUTION, which will divide our country and there will be no going back.

"EQUALITY FOR ALL, ONE PEOPLE, ONE NATION"

Lynette Macpherson

Mount Maunganui

1154a.

**From:** "Lyn Macpherson"  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 4/07/2013 11:34 a.m.  
**Subject:** CAP Submission

I would very much like to see Maori seats in Parliament demolished. This should not be a race-based issue, which in my opinion, it most certainly is as it stands. Lyn Macpherson, Tauranga

4282

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 30/07/2013 9:41 p.m.  
**Attachments:** constitution submission.doc

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

Full Names: Alison Margaret MacTavish Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Moeraki Postal  
AddressB: Postal City: Palmerston Postal Region: Otago Postal Post Code:  
Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: Submission Upload: C:\Documents and  
Settings\Jinty MacTavish\My Documents\constitution submission.doc

Submitted on the 30 July 2013 at 21:39



New Zealand prides itself on being a democracy. But as a Swiss visitor said to me, "It's not a real democracy". I bridled at that, but, as he pointed out, Swiss people do not just elect a government for a term and then let them act as they wish. they are also required to keep up with issues by a series of referenda. This is participatory democracy, and this is the kind of democracy I think we should be striving to achieve.

We do not have enough checks and balances in the system to elect a government to reign unchecked over us for four years, and so I very strongly support the retention of a three-year term.

4617

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 31/07/2013 3:05 p.m.

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

Full Names: Jintv MacTavish Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: Postal AddressB: Postal City:  
Dunedin Postal Region: Otago Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand  
Submission: Thank you for this opportunity to submit to the Constitutional Advisory Panel. I am delighted that this dialogue about what is important to us as a nation, and about how it may be articulated in a document that helps guide our decision-making processes, is underway.

I am a 28 year old New Zealander living in Otepoti | Dunedin. I'm currently privileged to serve here as a city councillor.

The kind of Aotearoa I want to live in is one that actively champions sustainable, just, resilient communities, and close connections between people, and between people and their place.

There is little I find more depressing than inequity and disconnection in the communities I'm a part of - thankfully here in Dunedin there are many people working towards the vision I articulate above, so the times I feel depressed are limited!

I recognise that in order to achieve this vision, there is a need to continue to acknowledge Te Tiriti o Waitangi as the founding document of Aotearoa, and the need to enshrine this in our constitution.

I support the need for constitutional recognition of the rights of nature and the environment | Papatū ānuku. We can't expect to live in harmony here in Aotearoa until we have ensured protection of the ecosystem upon which we rely, is an integral part of our decision-making framework.

I support the need for the role of local government and community-led decision-making to be acknowledged and formalised in our constitution. Successive governments have recognised the importance of devolution of decision-making through the signing of many international agreements and conventions. Most recently, in the text that came out of the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, which noted 'the important role that [local and subnational] authorities and communities can play in implementing sustainable development'. Any constitution that hopes to achieve sustainable development outcomes, would do well to ensure the framework included a commitment to devolution of decision-making to communities, and to participatory and democratic decision-making.

I support the aim of distilling the outcome of this work into one document, as I think it will enhance citizens' understanding of, and the accessibility of, constitutional matters.

Whatever the outcome of this process, there is a dire need for more teaching and learning opportunities within schools, tertiary institutions and communities, about our democratic system and our nation's decision-making processes. A democracy is only as strong as the engagement from its citizens, and currently, there is much room for improvement in this area.

Good luck with your deliberations, and I look forward to hearing how the conversation progresses.

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 15:04

2860-

**From:** Jock MacVicar <----->  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 6/07/2013 9:26 a.m.  
**Subject:** CAP Submission

These seats are race based and should be abolished as they are patently racist . Any slight justification for them is long gone as there are no pure bread Maori left and the Maori have completely assimilated into the multi race society that NZ is .Maori have now been exposed to European society for over 200 years .

If you ever doubt the total assimilation of Maori , just look at their names , mostly European , and the people claiming to be Maori and speaking on their behalf are all European looking . The biggest farce is the Maori All Blacks , there is hardly a brown face in the team .The farce is complete when they have blue eyed blond players .



3070.

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.

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.

Colin Maddock  
Auckland  
New Zealand

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. So deal with it.

Disgusted With NZ's Government Which Is SO Not Cool, BTW  
Mt Roskill, New Zealand

2105.

**From:**  
**To:** "constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz" <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 3/07/2013 8:06 a.m.  
**Subject:** CAP Submission

Dear Sir/Madam,

I consider that the Maori seats should be abolished.  
I believe that New Zealand politics, law, education etc. should be equal in all aspects. I believe all cultures should be considered in making the law, and educational guidelines, but we are all Kiwi's and therefore should be treated equally and fairly. All other politicians need to be elected into parliament, if Maori want to be in politics then it is only fair that they canvass to get voted in. Surely the Maori population is large enough that they could have more Maori in politics if they voted them in!  
Kind regards,

Sue Maddren

Beach Haven

[ht

... .. e  
ool

;

Important Notice: This e-mail is only intended to be read by the named recipient(s). If you receive this message in error, please immediately notify the sender. You must not, directly or indirectly, use, disclose, distribute, print, or copy any part of this message if you are not the intended recipient.

4292

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 30/07/2013 10:18 p.m.

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

---

Full Names: Cornelia Mageanu Organisation Name: Women's Committee - Christchurch  
Multicultural Council Email: Phone: Postal AddressA:  
Postal AddressB: in Postal City: Christchurch Postal Region:  
canterbury Postal Post Code: Postal Country: New Zealand Submission: The  
Constitution must reflect the multiculturalism aspect of New Zealand today,

Submitted on the 30 July 2013 at 22:16

4687

**From:** <webmaster@ourconstitution.org.nz>  
**To:** <constitutionalreview@justice.govt.nz>  
**Date:** 31/07/2013 2:08 p.m.

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

Full Names: Derek and Wendy Maads Organisation Name: Email:  
Phone: Postal AddressA: \_ Postal  
AddressB: Postal City: Hamilton Postal Region: Waikato Postal Post Code: Postal  
Country: New Zealand Submission: The addition of fluoride in public water supply is against our  
Constitutional rights and should not be forced upon the masses

Submitted on the 31 July 2013 at 14:06