

Chapter 2

Reconstituting the Constitution: Opening Address I

Greg Robins

2.1 Introduction

It is an honour for Catherine Harwood and me to present the opening addresses to this Conference. I would like to thank Dr Petra Butler and Professor Jonathan Boston for inviting me to speak, and the Institute of Policy Studies and the New Zealand Centre for Public Law for hosting this Conference.

When we were invited to present the opening addresses, it was suggested we should include personal anecdotes relating to the constitution. How had it affected us? As young lawyers, as New Zealanders? How do we see it changing, evolving and operating in our everyday lives? What form would our ideal constitution take, and what should be in it?

Like many young New Zealanders, and until beginning tertiary education, I had no in-depth knowledge or awareness of our constitutional history or arrangements. There were no copies of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 on our classroom walls and I never pledged allegiance to a flag, a set of laws, a form of government, or a Queen, Governor-General, Prime Minister or President. I probably knew (or thought I knew) more about the American Constitution than the New Zealand equivalent.

Some might think that is a deficit. But consider this: growing up, I had no reason to be concerned about police brutality, or any restriction of access to education, or the right to freedom of speech or peaceful assembly. Our country was not born of a constitutional struggle and change within our borders is regularly peaceful and piecemeal. Like many young New Zealanders, I knew I lived in a country where we

Greg Robins is an Associate Crown Counsel, Crown Law Office, Wellington. Any views expressed in this paper are entirely those of the author and not those of the Crown Law Office.

G. Robins (✉)

Crown Law Office, PO Box 2858, Wellington 6011, New Zealand

e-mail: Greg.Robins@crownlaw.govt.nz

could achieve whatever we wanted to achieve, without fear of interference from the government.

It needs to be said that I was fortunate enough to be brought up in a family and in an environment that gave me access to an excellent education, and there are many people today who do not have those same opportunities. As such, and given the relatively peaceful history we have enjoyed, is it any wonder that as a generation, or even as a country, we are obsessed less with our constitution and more with who trains as backup to Dan Carter? There is something to be said for living in a country where you can afford to be ambivalent about our constitutional arrangements.

2.2 The Relevance of Constitutional Change

The challenge we face now is making our constitution relevant, and finding a way to include the people of New Zealand in shaping it. The danger of allowing for ambivalence is that we will be unprepared to approach constitutional change in an informed manner when we need to. Because constitutional change *is* happening, and it *does* affect each of us.

In just the 10 years since the *Building the Constitution* conference, held here in April 2000, we have seen the application of the Human Rights Act 1993 to the government, the creation of our indigenous Supreme Court and the abolition (and re-introduction) of knighthoods and the title of Queen's Counsel.¹ We are witnessing ongoing debate about the foreshore and seabed and a proposal to remove the right of all prisoners to vote.² We will soon deal with the complications and power of the Auckland "Super City" and we will vote in at least one referendum on electoral reform. And this week, in advance of this Conference, we have seen the reignition of the debate of the role of the monarchy in New Zealand's constitutional arrangements.

2.3 The Contents of a New Constitution

It is obvious that constitutional change surrounds us constantly and so we must return to the original question. What form would our ideal constitution take, and what should be in it? Where should we go next?

My own view is that certain developments are inevitable and desirable: I believe that we will, one day, become a republic which will have at its core one or more

¹ The Lawyers and Conveyancers Amendment Bill, which would reinstate the title of Queen's Counsel, passed its first reading on 13 October 2010.

² The Electoral (Disqualification of Convicted Prisoners) Bill passed its second reading on 20 October 2010.

documents that have “supreme law” status. We should retain the diversity and collaborative spirit that proportional representation promises (and occasionally delivers), and we should seek to protect our founding document – the Treaty of Waitangi.

Like a republic, we already elect our representatives in Parliament in fair and regular elections, and Parliament passes laws after consulting with the New Zealand public through select committees.

We have a judiciary which has delivered judgments on our Bill of Rights Act for 20 years and is already well-versed in the principles of the Treaty.

None of those ideas is new or radical. Nor do they represent an overhaul of our current system of government. But in order to achieve these goals – or indeed to keep the status quo – I am far more interested in the steps that are taken to create and shape our constitution as the manifestation of the will of the people. As a young lawyer, and as a New Zealander, I am keenly interested in the fairness of the process and the informed nature of the debate. Rather than asking “what should be in our constitution?”, the key question for me is “how do we get there?”.

2.4 The Need for a Conversation

Any constitution must be well-understood by the public and built from the ground up: there must be democratic “buy in” from all sectors in society.³ We are at the point in our nation’s history where any constitutional change of the kind being discussed at this conference requires the broad agreement of the people.

Gaining that broad agreement, that legitimacy, means more than giving the people of New Zealand a list of choices in a referendum, holding select committees, or brokering deals between politicians.⁴

In order to change the constitution, we need to have a conversation: a conversation which takes place outside Parliament and our universities, and takes place in the living rooms of every household. A key part of that process is providing for better civics education in our schools, the fostering of public understanding of constitutional issues, and facilitating ongoing public discussion about our

³ That is not to say that all sectors of the public need to agree on the final form of the constitution, but instead should have the right of full participation in the debate and be able to endorse it as a legitimate, working model. As the Royal Commission on the Electoral System noted (in relation to our voting arrangements): “Members of the community should be able to endorse the voting system and its procedures as fair and reasonable and to accept its decisions, even when they themselves prefer other alternatives.” (Royal Commission on the Electoral System 1986, p. 12.)

⁴ The 2005 report of the Constitutional Arrangements Committee noted that processes to change New Zealand’s constitutional arrangements have typically involved public discussion papers, expert advisory groups, Law Commission reports, referenda, select committee consideration and Royal Commissions (Constitutional Arrangements Committee 2005, p. 21).

constitution – as recommended by the Constitutional Arrangements Committee.⁵ Every citizen must feel as though he or she has had the opportunity to engage in matters of the state and have their voice heard. We must come up with innovative ways to encourage the participation of the public in shaping our state. Only then can any constitution claim to have the will of the people behind it.

But is this easier said than done and is it simply a lofty ideal? Our Canadian friends did not think so. To give but one example, in 2003 a Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform was established by the government of British Columbia to consider whether that province should change its electoral system. Ontario followed suit in 2006. Both Assemblies were composed of randomly selected citizens and spent over 8 months apiece learning about and debating different methods of electoral systems. Public hearings were held and experts were invited to speak. The British Columbia Citizens' Assembly recommended the adoption of a form of STV (Single Transferable Vote)⁶; their Ontario counterparts recommended MMP (Mixed Member Proportional).⁷

Unfortunately, neither proposal was accepted by the public in subsequent referenda, although the British Columbia model came very close to the required 60% "yes" vote.⁸ Regardless of the result of the referenda, the *conversation* that took place was one to admire. You could not criticise the Assemblies for being elitist, ill-informed, simplistic, or biased in the result. They were drawn of the people, and their one task was to recommend an electoral system that would serve the people. By all accounts, the experiences of the Assembly members were overwhelmingly positive. To quote the Chair of the Ontario Assembly:

The Assembly members constantly amazed me with their enthusiasm and deep commitment to the task they were given. Throughout the eight-month process, not one member withdrew from the Assembly. Members applied themselves to learning about electoral systems. They talked to people in their communities about the work of the Assembly and chaired public consultation meetings. Some members read hundreds of written submissions. Others participated on working groups to advise on the Assembly process or to do more research in specific areas. Many used an online forum to share information and discuss issues between meetings.⁹

⁵ Constitutional Arrangements Committee (2005), p. 5. In response, the government agreed to give further consideration to the idea of establishing generic principles to guide significant constitutional change, and that more should be done to continue to improve civics and citizenship education in schools. However, the Committee's recommendation that the government might consider whether an independent institute could foster better public understanding of, and informed debate on, New Zealand's constitutional arrangements was not accepted. See New Zealand Government (2006), pp. 2–4.

⁶ British Columbia Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform (2004), p. 1.

⁷ Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform (2007), p. 1.

⁸ "BC-STV" received majority support in nearly all of the electoral districts, but received only 57.69% of the popular vote (Elections BC 2005, p.9). A subsequent referendum in 2009 gathered only 39.09% support for BC-STV (Elections BC 2009, p. 17).

⁹ Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform (2007), p. 24.

How lucky we would be to have such enthusiasm for a topic as complex and – let's face it – as dry as electoral law. How rich that conversation must be.

2.5 The Challenge for the Future

I wish to conclude by emphasising that it is crucially important to embrace new and innovative ways of shaping our constitution. Regardless of the form of the constitution, or what it includes and what it does not, the people of New Zealand will be looking to have their say in a constructive and meaningful manner. All efforts must be made to encourage inclusion and the expression of ideas and to discourage apathy. Those present today must take responsibility for starting that conversation if we, as a nation, are to continue to create our own constitution.

References

- British Columbia Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform (2004) Making every vote count: the case for electoral reform in British Columbia. Final report, December. Available at: http://www.citizensassembly.bc.ca/resources/final_report.pdf
- Constitutional Arrangements Committee (2005) Report of the constitutional arrangements committee: inquiry to review New Zealand's existing constitutional arrangements. August. New Zealand House of Representatives, Wellington
- Elections BC (2005) Statement of votes: referendum on electoral reform. 17 May. Available at: <http://www.elections.bc.ca/docs/rpt/SOV-2005-ReferendumOnElectoralReform.pdf>
- Elections BC (2009) Statement of votes: referendum on electoral reform. 12 May. Available at <http://www.elections.bc.ca/docs/rpt/2009Ref/2009-Ref-SOV.pdf>
- New Zealand Government (2006) Government response to report of the constitutional arrangements committee on inquiry to review New Zealand's existing constitutional arrangements. Presented to the House of Representatives in accordance with Standing Order 253. New Zealand House of Representatives, Wellington
- Ontario Citizens' Assembly on Electoral Reform (2007) One ballot, two votes: a new way to vote in Ontario. 15 May. Available at: <http://www.citizensassembly.gov.on.ca/assets/One%20Ballot,%20Two%20Votes.pdf>
- Royal Commission on the Electoral System (1986) Report of the royal commission on the electoral system: towards a better democracy. December. New Zealand House of Representatives, Wellington

Reconstituting the Constitution

Morris, C.; Boston, J.; Butler, P. (Eds.)

2011, XII, 519 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-3-642-21571-1