

PARLIAMENTARY BILLS OF RIGHTS

Both New Zealand and the United Kingdom challenge assumptions about how a bill of rights functions. Their parliamentary bills of rights constrain judicial review and also look to parliament to play a rights-protecting role. This arises from the requirement to inform parliament if legislative bills are not compatible with rights. But are these bills of rights operating in this proactive manner? Are governments encountering significantly stronger pressures to ensure legislation complies with rights? Are these bills of rights resulting in more reasoned deliberations in parliament about the justification of legislation from a rights perspective? Through extensive interviews with public officials and analysis of parliamentary debates where questions of compliance with rights arise (prisoner voting, parole and sentencing policy, counter-terrorism legislation and same sex marriage), this book argues that a serious gap exists between the promise of these bills of rights and the institutional variables that influence how these parliaments function.

JANET L. HIEBERT is a professor in the Department of Political Studies at Queen's University, Ontario.

James B. Kelly is a professor in the Department of Political Science at Concordia University, Montréal.



CAMBRIDGE STUDIES IN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

The aim of this series is to produce leading monographs in constitutional law. All areas of constitutional law and public law fall within the ambit of the series, including human rights and civil liberties law, administrative law, constitutional theory and the history of constitutional law. A wide variety of scholarly approaches is encouraged, with the governing criterion being simply that the work is of interest to an international audience. Thus, works concerned with only one jurisdiction will be included in the series as appropriate, while at the same time the series will include works which are explicitly comparative or theoretical – or both. The series editors likewise welcome proposals that work at the intersection of constitutional and international law, or that seek to bridge the gaps between civil law systems, the US and the common law jurisdictions of the Commonwealth.

Series Editors

David Dyzenhaus
Professor of Law and Philosophy,
University of Toronto, Canada
Adam Tomkins
John Millar Professor of Public Law,
University of Glasgow, UK

Editorial Advisory Board

T.R.S. Allan, Cambridge, UK
Damian Chalmers, LSE, UK
Sujit Choudhry, Berkeley, USA
Monica Claes, Maastricht, Netherlands
David Cole, Georgetown, USA
K.D. Ewing, King's College London, UK
David Feldman, Cambridge, UK
Cora Hoexter, Witwatersrand, South Africa
Christoph Moellers, Goettingen, Germany
Adrienne Stone, Melbourne, Australia
Adrian Vermeule, Harvard, USA

Books in the series

Parliamentary Bills of Rights: The Experiences of New Zealand and the United Kingdom

Janet L. Hiebert and James B. Kelly

Lawyering for the Rule of Law: Government Lawyers and the Rise of Judicial Power in Israel

Yoav Dotan

Balancing Constitutional Rights: The Origins and Meanings of Postwar Legal Discourse Jacco Bomhoff



Judges on Trial: The Independence and Accountability of the English Judiciary

Shimon Shetreet and Sophie Turenne

Proportionality and Constitutional Culture

Moshe Cohen-Eliya and Iddo Porat

The Politics of Principle: The First South African Constitutional Court, 1995–2005

Theunis Roux

The New Commonwealth Model of Constitutionalism, Theory and Practice Stephen Gardbaum

Searching for the State in British Legal Thought: Competing Conceptions of the Public Sphere

Janet McLean

Judging Social Rights

Jeff King

Proportionality, Constitutional Rights and their Limitations

Aharon Barak

Parliamentary Sovereignty, Contemporary Debates

Jeffrey Goldsworthy





PARLIAMENTARY BILLS OF RIGHTS

The Experiences of New Zealand and the United Kingdom

JANET L. HIEBERT and JAMES B. KELLY





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

> www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107076518

> > © Janet L. Hiebert and James B. Kelly 2015

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2015

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data Hiebert, Janet, 1960- author.

Parliamentary bills of rights: the experiences of New Zealand and the United Kingdom experiences / Janet L. Hiebert, James B. Kelly.

> pages cm - (Cambridge studies in constitutional law) Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-07651-8 (Hardback)

- Civil rights-New Zealand.
 Legislation-Great Britain.
 Legislation-Great Britain.
 Kelly, James B. (James Bernard), 1968- author. II. Title. K3240.H54 2014

342.4108'5-dc23 2014027892

ISBN 978-1-107-07651-8 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



> For Wayne For Michèle, Fiona and Liam





CONTENTS

	List of tables and appendices xi Acknowledgements xii List of abbreviations xv Table of cases xvi Table of legislation xviii
1	Introduction 1
I	The New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 31
2	Political origins of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 33
3	The New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 and MMP 72
4	The Misuse of Drugs Act 1975 and prisoner disenfranchisement 113
5	The Attorney General, select committees and penal populism 174
II	The United Kingdom's Human Rights Act 1998 233
6	Political origins of the Human Rights Act 235
7	Pre-legislative compatibility assessments under the HRA 262
8	Parliamentary review of national security measures 304
9	Parliamentary review: equality and democratic issues 346
10	Conclusion 401
	Appendix I 413 Bibliography 422 Index 463





TABLES AND APPENDICES

3.1	New Zealand government formation, 1975–2014 85
3.2	Section 7 reports to parliament by bill category, 1990–2014 98
3.3	Section 7 reports, 1990–2014, bills passed or presently before
	parliament 101
4.1	Select committees and party standings under MMP, 45th to 50th parlia-
	ments (1996–2014) 121
4.2	Section 7 reports and policy context, government bills passed into law
	under MMP 137
4.3	Section 7 reports: voting results under NZBORA, 1990-2014, bills passed
	into law under MMP 147
5.1	Section 7 reports sent to select committees under MMP, 1996–2014, bills
	passed into law or before parliament 180
5.2	Subject matter of Section 7 reports under MMP, bills passed or presently
	before select committees, 1996–2014 182
5.3	Standing orders and select committee allocations, select Section 7
	reports 184
5.4	Attorney General conclusions on NZBORA inconsistency 192
Appendix 1	Section 7 reports to the New Zealand Parliament, 1990–2014 414



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The idea to collaborate on this book occurred during a conversation one summer afternoon in 2003 in Parma, Italy, where we were both participating in a meeting of Research Committee 9 (Comparative Judicial Studies) of the International Political Science Association. After comparing notes on our independent research projects on whether, how and why the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms has influenced legislative decision-making, we discovered we were both curious about what changes might arise elsewhere. More specifically, our curiosity arose from recent political reforms in New Zealand and the United Kingdom two other Westminster-based systems that have chosen to marry a statutory bill of rights with a new statutory requirement to alert parliament when government is proceeding with a legislative bill despite being advised that it is inconsistent with protected rights. We had originally included Australia in this research project, as the first Rudd government began a national consultation on an Australian bill of rights. However, the Rudd government failed to act on the recommendations of the Brennan Commission, and thus our study focuses on the bills of rights in New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

Family and administrative responsibilities delayed the anticipated completion date of this project and, as one colleague has gently chided, the book has had a substantial gestation period. Fortunately, we have benefited from the extended opportunity to observe and reflect on how the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act and the United Kingdom's Human Rights Act have evolved, and the significance of changes that have occurred in how bureaucratic, executive and parliamentary actors engage in their new responsibilities to confront how legislative initiatives implicate rights.

A crucial element of understanding the significance of political reforms is discussion of how new statutory requirements are interpreted and how they influence the perspectives and responsibilities of those who help shape and advise on legislative policy developments. We are extremely



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

xiii

grateful to the more than 70 public and political officials who met with us for interviews in Wellington and London. We also wish to express our sincere gratitude for the contributions of our dedicated research assistants, who helped with the time-intensive task of understanding how rights considerations influence the life of a legislative bill, and want to acknowledge our gratitude to Jeremy Clarke, Matthew Hodgetts, Matt Kersten, Emmett Macfarlane, Nazeer Patel, Kate Puddister, Arjun Tremblay, Nickolas Tzoulas and Tom Wilson.

We have both presented papers drawn from the research for this book at conferences and in other scholarly venues, and have also discussed the innovative and ambitious idea of a parliamentary-centred bill of rights in our classrooms. We appreciate and have benefited from the critical observations and questions of colleagues, research assistants and students. In particular, we would like to acknowledge and thank Andrew Byrnes, Tom Campbell, Fergal Davis, Fiona de Londras, Julie Debeljak, Rosalind Dixon, David Erdos, Keith Ewing, Stephen Gardbaum, Conor Gearty, Andrew Geddis, Claudia Geiringer, Marco Goldoni, Aileen Kavanagh, Francesca Klug, Christopher Manfredi, Christopher McCorkindale, Danny Nicol, Paul Rishworth, Francesca Scala, Richard Schultz, Alex Schwartz, Adrienne Stone, Adam Tomkins, Mark Tushnet and George Williams. We are also grateful to the opportunity to visit and share ideas with members and other visitors at the Centre for Comparative Constitutional Studies at University of Melbourne, the Gilbert and Tobin Centre of Public Law at the University of New South Wales, the New Zealand Centre for Public Law at Victoria University of Wellington and the New Zealand Centre for Human Rights Law Policy and Practice at University of Auckland.

We would also like to thank the three anonymous reviewers for their advice and constructive criticisms.

In addition, we are extremely proud and pleased to have worked with Cambridge University Press and want to thank Finola O'Sullivan, Rebecca Roberts, Richard Woodham, Bindu Vinod, and Kristy Barker.

We would like to acknowledge the financial support we received from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.

As always, our greatest support came from our spouses. Thank you, Wayne and Michèle, for your unwavering support for us throughout this long project.

Janet L. Hiebert acknowledges the incorporation of arguments and ideas in this book from the following prior publications:



xiv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Janet L. Hiebert, 'Governing Under the Human Rights Act. The Limitations of Wishful Thinking', (2012) *Public Law*, 29–46.

Janet L. Hiebert, 'The HRA: Ambiguity about Parliamentary Sovereignty', (2013) 14 German Law Journal, 2253–74.

James B. Kelly acknowledges the incorporation of arguments and ideas in this book from the following prior publication:

James B. Kelly, 'Judicial and Political Review as Limited Insurance: The Functioning of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act in "Hard" Cases', (2011) 49 Commonwealth & Comparative Politics 3, 295–317.



ABBREVIATIONS

BNA British North America Act 1867 BORA Bill of Rights Act vetting

BZP Benzylpiperazine

CMP Closed material proceedings

DCA Department of Constitutional Affairs
EACD Expert Advisory Committee on Drugs
ECHR European Convention on Human Rights
ECtHR European Court of Human Rights
FPP First-past-the-post electoral system

HRA United Kingdom's Human Rights Act 1990

ICCPR International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

JCHR Joint Committee on Human Rights
MFAT Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
MMP Mixed member proportional electoral system

ODPM Office of Deputy Prime Minister NZBORA New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990

PBL Parliament Business and Legislation Committee Secretariat

RIS Regulatory impact statement
SCNZ Supreme Court of New Zealand
SMP Single member plurality electoral system
SO Standing orders of the House of Representatives

SST Sensible Sentencing Trust
TFMPP trifluoromethylphenylpiperazine

TPIM Terrorism Prevention and Investigation Measures



TABLE OF CASES

New Zealand

Belcher v. Chief Executive of the Department of Corrections [2007] NZSC 54

Belcher v. Chief Executive of the Department of Corrections [2007] 1 NZLR 507 (CA)

Boscawen v. Attorney General [2009] NZCA 12

Ngati Apa v. Attorney General [2003] 3 NZLR 643 (CA)

RE Bennett [1993] 2 HRNZ 358

R. v. Hansen [2007] NZSC 7

R. v. Jeffries [1994] 1 NZLR 290 (CA)

R. v. Shaheed [2002] 2 NZLR 377 (CA)

Taunoa v. Attorney General [2008] 1 NZLR 429 (NZSC)

European Court of Human Rights

A and others v. Secretary of State for the Home Department [2004] UKHL 56 A and others v. United Kingdom, Application no. 3455/05 [2009] ECHR 1 [GC] Animal Defenders International v. The United Kingdom, No. 48876/08 (2013) [GC] Animal Defenders International, R (on the application of) v. The Secretary of State for

Culture

Chahal v. UK (1996) 23 EHRR 413

Ghaidan v. Mendoza [2002] EWC Civ 1533

Goodwin v. The United Kingdom, (2002) 35 EHRR 18

Greens and M.T. v. The United Kingdom, No. 60041/08 (23 Nov 2010)

Hirst v. United Kingdom, (2004) 38 EHRR 40

Hirst v. Attorney General [2001] EWHC Admin 239

Hirst v. United Kingdom (No. 2) [2005] ECHR 68, (2006) 42 EHHR 41, [GC]

Karner v. Austria, (2003) 38 EHRR 24

Media and Sport [2006] EWHC 3069 (Admin)

Schalk and Kopf v. Austria, No. 30141/04, [2010] ECHR 995

Scoppola v. Italy (No. 3) [2012] ECHR 868 [GC]

Secretary of State for the Home Department v. AE [2008] EWHC 585 (Admin)

Vgt Verein Gegen Tierfabriken v. Switzerland, No. 24699/94 (28 June 2001)

Wilkinson v. Kitzinger [2006] EWHC 2022 (Fam), [2007] 1 FLR 295

xvi



TABLE OF CASES

xvii

United Kingdom

Fitzpatrick v. Sterling Housing Association Ltd [2001] 1 AC 27
Ghaidan v. Godin-Mendoza (FC) [2004] UKHL 30
R (on the application of Chester) (appellant) v. Secretary of State for Justice (respondent);
McGeoch (AP) (Appellant) v. The Lord President of the Council and another
(respondents) (Scotland) (2013) UKSC 63
R v. A [2001] UKHL 25

Secretary of State for the Home Department v. AF (No 3) [2009] UKHL 28 Secretary of State for the Home Department v. E [2007] UKHL 47 Secretary of State for the Home Department v. JJ and others [2007] UKHL 45 Secretary of State for the Home Department v. MB [2007] UKHL 46 Willock v. Muckle [1951] 2 KB 844

William Smith (AP) v. KD Scott Electoral Registration Officer [2007] CSIH 9 XA33/04 YL v Birmingham City Council and others [2007] UKHL 27



TABLE OF LEGISLATION

Canada

Canadian Bill of Rights, S.C. 1960, c. 44, s. 2 Department of Justice Act, R.S.C., 1985, c. J-2

New Zealand

Children, Young Persons and their Families Amendment Act 2004 Citizens Initiated Referenda Act 1993 Criminal Investigations (Bodily Samples) Act 1995 Electoral Amendment Act 2002 Misuse of Drugs Act 1975 Misuse of Drugs Amendment Act 2005

United Kingdom

Local Government Act 1988, c. 9 Adoption and Children Act 2002, c.38 Communication Act 2003, c. 21 Gender Recognition Act 2004, c. 7 Prevention of Terrorism Bill, 2005 Terrorism Act 2006, c. 11, s. 23

xviii