ITIONS

(1986)

(Palmer, 2002)

Coalition culture: 1

n perfected as an art form, the limited use in the new coaling e of the most important points.

selves to new heights right no embers of the Labour Party at ose you could argue that hatte ce.

1996 election, there is a gre and there are going to have on you are going to have each coalition party is going going to go to which partner conduct and initiate thou e no tradition of it. One of the the Alliance and the Labour n a political of view mon, and they have to work This is not an easy thing for tablished traditions of parties e had a coalition governmen 5; it was not a very successful urse caused problems at that life substantially. There is no who has had any experience ition government raises an than those with which our to learn another political pon which to draw in this earning curve is steep. It is themselves. What they have m is "look, you have to conces, but you are elected to lent da government you cries of elections all lave ir positions out with each

yatt Creech, I think it was, Ie says that other countries I have rules, written rules, Id of coalition government to the Governor-General.

See Geoffrey

I think a written constitution, which is entrenched as part of New Zealand's fundamental law, that cannot be altered by a simple majority in Parliament, is an idea whose time has come. You have said that for quite some time.

Kim Hill Sir Geoffrey

I have been saying it for several years now, and I think that there is greater support for it as people see that really a single vote in Parliament should not be capable of determining the vital issues about what are the rules of the game. If we did have an entrenched written constitution, we have the basis of what should be in it now. We have the Constitution Act 1986, we have the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, and we have the Treaty of Waitangi. If you put all those three things into an entrenched written constitution, none of them would be novel; all New Zealanders would know that they have been part of our system for a long time; at least you would have some of the rules beyond dispute and beyond easy alteration. I think that is pretty important. I expect that will occur some time in the next decade but, at the moment, what we have to learn is to somehow change the way in which negotiation and politics are conducted in New Zealand.

Kim Hill

Sir Geoffrey

Is it a step in the right direction then to have people suggesting that politicians should sign contracts so they will not defect to other parties? The ball and chain concept does not seem to be a step in the right direction towards conciliation and coalition.

Very hard to enforce from a practical point of view and from a legal point of view. Very difficult to say "thou shalt not act in accordance with your conscience". If someone in a Parliament is going to be forced to vote for something they do not believe in, sooner or later you will find that they will not do that. It is really from a practical point of view almost impossible. The rules of the Labour Party have attempted to get people to do this for years, but they do not always succeed. Mr Anderton did not follow them, and that is what led to the setting up of the Alliance. You can try and get people to vote within a caucus discipline, but you do not always succeed. One might argue that party discipline will be stronger under MMP. You could argue that.

Kim Hill Sir Geoffrey

You could? How?

Because some of the parties will be smaller, and if you do not get a place on that party list, you are not going to get in. The result is, therefore, that if you are de-selected, and not selected for that party, your place in Parliament will be lost. It is going to be much harder, I think, to win constituency seats than if you

261

and there are name to be a so and the confinence of the confinence

es, bur you are clear
cas a government
we dies of electric
a positions our very

air Greech, I think is a le says that other count grave rules, written m the coalition governor to the Governor Gauss

The septiment of the second second of the se

refer to grave the contracts so they will not defect to the functions should agree contracts so they will not defect to the functions should and chair concept does not seem to be a set that the fight direction rowards conditions and coalition. I the fight direction a practical point of view and from a very difficult to say "thou shalt not act in the same one to a faction of the force of the vote for something they do not believe and or first you will find that they will not do that. It is appear to a ractical point of view althout impossible. The third can be although the get propole to do the fact of the factors of the factors

serial valsable they do not always succeed, Mr Anderson did the cave dienes, and that is what led to the setting up of the flag can us, and get people to your within a caucus supplier, but you do not always succeed. One might argue as pair discipline will be suronger under MMP fon could receive.

ausesome of the parties will be smaller, and if you do not a given of that party list, you are not going to get in; The directors, that if you are de-selected, and not selected any party your place in Parliament will be lost; it is going thanks harder, think, to win constituency sears than if you

ook, the New Zealand st profound change was ting system. That altered

ised to characterise the tive dictatorship where ted. It was a system of inder MMP, where the ct has been to weaken 'arliament. Parliament down and complicated ome as coherent but

overnment proposes a tent, it has to get the up the coalition, but be sufficient numbers

MP system. That has the New Zealand mentally. It has been a lot of broadcasts er it is a good idea, ag now that we have s still learning to go

rell. It has worked buld have expected sure as about it. ive a serment. It ernment does not a roughshod over make government. It is a vigorous anything it likes restraint suffuses

rule of law and rule of law is an What constitutes ment. Often that in be settled by

The broadcasts have covered the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 and the position that occupies in the constitutional system and the difference that it has made. It does make a difference in the Parliament, but it makes a bigger difference in the courts. The courts have now made hundreds of decisions about the Bill of Rights Act that show it to be a significant change to the way of Rights Act is a guardian against government. Eventually the Bill of Rights Act is a guardian against governmental power.

Then there has been the vexed position of the Treaty of Waitangi, a topic often discussed in these broadcasts over the years. There is still the debate going on about the nature of the commemoration of Waitangi Day and what it should be. But the place of the Treaty in our legal system is a much more fascinating and intricate question and there have been a number of broadcasts

Looking at the whole system of government covered by the broadcasts over the nine years, it is easy to conclude that the New Zealand system of government is unique. It has characteristics not to be found anywhere else now and it is becoming less and less like the Westminster system upon which it is based. While the major difference is MMP, there are other differences.

We have no Upper House as most other countries do. We have no formal written Constitution as most other countries do. Furthermore, the differences between this country and Britain are becoming more pronounced every minute as the UK legal system becomes more deeply enmeshed into that of Europe.

Australia has a written Constitution that is difficult to amend. It sets up a system of federalism. The Americans have a similar system and so do the Canadians. The United Kingdom has a Constitution similar to ours in some senses. Theirs is based on essentially a common law constitution – the essential elements were defined by the historical constitutional struggles that took place centuries ago. It is not to be found in writing in the sense of being contained in a document called a constitution. New Zealand has the Constitution Act 1986. It sets out the basic elements of the three branches of government – Parliament, the Executive and the Courts. It is not entrenched in the sense that it can be changed relatively easily by Parliament. No referendum is needed.

I have thought for some years it would be better if New Zealand had a more distinct form of constitutional arrangement where the power distribution was clearly set out and could not easily be altered. That may improve the quality of our governance. It would improve the sense that the citizenry have about what the government can or cannot do to them. It should also include the Treaty of Waitangi and the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act. In my view it should be entrenched so that it cannot be altered except by referendum or a 75 percent majority of Parliament.

To secure such a constitution is an enormous undertaking. Constitutional change of any magnitude is always difficult. In a conference organised by the Institute of Policy Studies at the Victoria University of Wellington in 2000 the

The leader in him occ. I have a leader to be a leader to be a leader to the leader to the description of the

Then deer has been (be yeard position of the freaty of Validogi, a sould often discipled in the ground of the feath Their sufficiency, a sould share discipled in the set of the continue of the continue of the continue of the continue of the feath in the discipled in the discipled in the feath out itself system is a ninch most laserable and natives requestion and there have been a number of broadlast about share.

Eordang at the whole system of government to cred by the broadcasts over the pure space, it is easy to continue that the Niew Zealand as sent of government is intequent massinated and one to be found any after when now and it is excounting less and less like the Westmakker system upon which has because when a contract the contract of the contract o

We have no tipped blooms as most other columnes do. We have no formal avoiding Constitution as most other countries do. Furthermore, the difference between this edunity and firm are becoming major pronopalesterer; manue as the UK lead by their occomes more chereful values occomes more chereful.

evitent of federalsia: The Americans haves similar systems and so do the Canadilans. The United Kingdom has a Constitution similar to ours in squee senses. There is based on essentially a committee law crossification - the assertion elements were defined by the branch a constitution in the sense of the sent place constitutes are. It is got to be found in average in the source of help constitution of Vew Zealand has the constitution of the following the fact that in the foundation of the fact that the

The caregivers connerved at word be better if New Zaaland had, more distinct form of constitutional arrangement where inerpower assurbution was clearly set one and could not cashe be alsered. That may suprave the quality of our governance it would unprove the serve enacting critically have also what the governance it would unprove the serve enacting critically have also also the serve enacting critically have also also the serve enacting critically have a some contractions of the serve enacting critically and the server enacti

to substance a constrained stant normous undertaking. Considered all barress of all barress of all barress of the substance of the stantage of the stantage of the stantage of the substantage of the subst

nal service de la company de l

ager to the crosse of any constant was a light constant where a submit of a light constant was a submit of a light constant of

Accument the feet the set the

(All aystem) That has leen the New Zenland arenally. It has been a not of broadcasts on its a good adeal agraw that we have see a still learning to go

All have expressed to have expressed to have the har in his property of the hard over the severance over the

the of law and students on What consumers that consumers on the consumer of th