

PRESENTERS



Ross Carter, Parliamentary Counsel, Wellington

Ross joined the PCO in 1998 and has considerable experience drafting Government Bills and statutory regulations. He was previously a legal researcher at the NZ Law Commission. Ross has also been an adjunct lecturer in Legislation at Victoria University, and Private Secretary (Attorney-General). He is a member of the Commonwealth Association of Legislative Counsel and has written articles and presented conference papers on legislative drafting and statutory interpretation. Ross is a co-author, with Jason McHerron and Dr Ryan Malone, of *Subordinate Legislation in New Zealand* (2013) and the sole author of the recent edition of *Burrows and Carter on Statute Law in New Zealand* (5th edition, 2015).



Jason McHerron, Barrister, Wellington

Jason is experienced in resolving commercial, regulatory and public law disputes involving issues of statutory interpretation. Practising since 1996, he has appeared in a wide range of cases, in all the major courts. Before moving to the independent bar, Jason was a solicitor at Russell McVeagh and Crown Counsel at the Crown Law Office. He co-authored the Administrative Law title of *Laws of New Zealand*, is an author of *McGechan on Procedure* and a co-author, with Ross Carter and Dr Ryan Malone, of *Subordinate Legislation in New Zealand* (2013). Jason is a member of the NZLS Public and Administrative Law Committee.

The statements and conclusions contained in this booklet are those of the author(s) only and not those of the New Zealand Law Society. This booklet has been prepared for the purpose of a Continuing Legal Education course. It is not intended to be a comprehensive statement of the law or practice, and should not be relied upon as such. If advice on the law is required, it should be sought on a formal, professional basis.

Cover and text stocks used in this publication are from Forestry Stewardship Council certified mills, manufactured under the environmentally responsible paper manufactured environmental management system ISO 14001, using pulp from well managed forests and other controlled sources.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION – STATUTORY INTERPRETATION: WHY DOES IT MATTER (NOW AS MUCH AS EVER)?	1
2. STATUTORY INTERPRETATION: WHAT DOES IT MEAN?	3
ITS FUNDAMENTAL OBJECT—FINDING LEGISLATION’S LEGAL MEANING	3
“ART” OR “SCIENCE”? – NOT ALGORITHMS, TOOLS FOR ARRIVING AT PREFERRED ANSWERS	5
STATUTORY INTERPRETATION: MAIN GUIDING FACTORS	7
STATUTORY INTERPRETATION: SOURCES OF RELEVANT LAW AND PRACTICE	7
THE NEED FOR INTERPRETATION – ROUTINE AND DIFFICULT CASES	8
STATUTORY INTERPRETATION: PRECEDENT	10
3. TEXT – WHAT TEXT IS RELEVANT, AND HOW IS TEXT RELEVANT, TO FINDING LEGAL MEANING?	13
ACCESS TO DIFFERENT KINDS OF LEGISLATION IN FORCE IN NEW ZEALAND	13
<i>Kinds of enactments</i>	13
ACCESS TO LEGISLATION: FINDING IT, MOVING WITHIN IT, AND UNDERSTANDING IT	13
JUDICIAL NOTICE, “OFFICIAL VERSIONS”, AND AUTHENTICITY OR ACCURACY PRESUMPTIONS	14
<i>Judicial notice</i>	14
<i>“Official versions”, and authenticity or accuracy presumptions</i>	14
<i>Printed and electronic official versions – “officialisation” of NZ legislation database</i>	14
<i>How to tell whether website versions have been officialised</i>	15
<i>Will printed official versions continue?</i>	16
SUBJECT AREAS, AND COMMON CATEGORIES AND DISTINCTIONS, IN LEGISLATION	16
<i>Subject areas</i>	16
<i>Common categories or distinctions</i>	17
KINDS OF STANDARD PROVISIONS (“LANDMARKS”), AND THEIR FUNCTIONS	18
DRAFTING STYLES AND INNOVATIONS – DO 2016 ACTS DIFFER FROM MUCH OLDER ACTS?	18
<i>Innovations in current legislative drafting practice</i>	18
<i>Demonstrable improvements and occasional problems</i>	22
<i>Newer is better, constant scrutiny, and an endless journey</i>	24
SUBSTANTIVE, TEMPORAL, OR OTHER APPLICATION (IS IT IN FORCE, VALID, AND RELEVANT?)	26
PLAIN, ORDINARY, OR NATURAL MEANING OF TEXT – WHEN READILY ASCERTAINABLE	27
<i>Meaning from text</i>	27
<i>Text may be the main factor</i>	28
WHEN TEXT’S MEANING ISN’T PLAIN – EXAMPLE 1: (A) BROAD AND “MOBILE” EXPRESSIONS, AND (B) IMPLICATIONS	33
<i>Using dictionaries to help identify and resolve verbal ambiguity in broad expressions</i>	33
<i>“Mobile expressions” whose meaning changes (as attitudes, values, or technology change)</i>	35
<i>Implications – when they are necessary (for example, to make powers workable)</i>	36
WHEN TEXT’S MEANING ISN’T PLAIN – EXAMPLE 2: DRAFTING ERRORS	38
<i>An exception to textualism – notional changes to text to rectify errors</i>	38
<i>First UK example of error-correction applying the Inco Europe test – OB v Director of SFO</i>	38
<i>Second UK example of error-correction applying the Inco Europe test – Ghany</i>	40
<i>Dramatic “corrective surgery”, but only if an error clearly exists</i>	41
4. PURPOSE – WHY IS PURPOSE A SECOND KEY DRIVER OF STATUTORY INTERPRETATION?	43
INTRODUCTION	43
PURPOSE? OR INTENTION OF PARLIAMENT?	45
<i>Purposive interpretation helps defeat the tyranny of language</i>	46
BRIEF HISTORY OF PURPOSIVE INTERPRETATION	48
<i>Purposive interpretation: a modern version of the mischief rule</i>	49
<i>Are some enactments not susceptible to a purposive interpretation?</i>	51
WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF AN ENACTMENT?	57
PURPOSE BASED ON GOVERNMENT POLICY	57
WHY (BUT ALSO HOW) LEGISLATION DOES WHAT IT DOES	58
PURPOSE – WHERE IS IT AUTHORITATIVELY STATED?	60

<i>Express statements of purpose</i>	60
<i>Statements of purpose explained in court cases</i>	61
BALANCE BETWEEN TEXT AND PURPOSE: <i>HOLLER V OSAKI</i>	64
<i>Facts and claim in High Court</i>	64
<i>Procedural issues – Tribunal’s exclusive jurisdiction to decide main preliminary issue</i>	64
<i>Tenancy Tribunal’s decision on main preliminary issue</i>	64
<i>District Court’s decision on appeal</i>	65
<i>High Court’s decision on appeal</i>	65
<i>Appeal to Court of Appeal – and wider implications</i>	66
<i>Court of Appeal’s decision</i>	66
PURPOSE OPERATES AT DIFFERENT LEVELS OR UNITS OF INQUIRY WITHIN AN ACT.....	67
RELATIVE STRENGTHS OF DIFFERENT APPLICABLE PURPOSIVE DIRECTIONS.....	73
APPARENT MEANINGS OF THE TEXT SHOULD BE CROSS-CHECKED AGAINST PURPOSE	74
OVER-PURPOSIVE INTERPRETATION	78
WHERE TEXT HAS WITHSTOOD ATTEMPTS TO READ IT (OVER) PURPOSIVELY	82
HOW PURPOSE CAN INFLUENCE THE INTERPRETATION OF THE TEXT	87
<i>Filling gaps</i>	87
COURTS MUST NOT USURP PARLIAMENT’S POLICY MAKING FUNCTION.....	91
WHEN WILL THE PURPOSIVE APPROACH NOT BE APPLIED?	92
5. CONTEXT – WHY AND HOW DOES CONTEXT AFFECT LEGISLATION’S PREFERRED MEANING?	95
INTRODUCTION	95
CONTEXT IS NOT “EVERYTHING” BUT IS IMPORTANT TO INTERPRETATION.....	95
INTERNAL CONTEXT: SECTIONS, ASSOCIATED WORDS, LIMITED CLASSES.....	96
<i>Associated words rule (noscitur a sociis)</i>	96
<i>Limited class rule (ejusdem generis)</i>	98
<i>Implied exclusion rule (expressio unius est exclusio alterius)</i>	100
<i>Battle of the canons: series qualifier vs limited antecedent rules: Lockhart v US</i>	101
THE ACT AS A WHOLE – ITS SCHEME – PARTS, SUBPARTS, GROUPING OF PROVISIONS.....	102
CROSS-REFERENCES TO PROVISIONS IN OTHER ENACTMENTS	104
INDICATIONS PROVIDED IN THE ENACTMENT	105
<i>Section headings</i>	105
EXTERNAL CONTEXT: GENERAL	106
<i>Caution needed</i>	108
<i>The facts of the case are critical</i>	109
OTHER CURRENT LAW.....	109
<i>Other Acts</i>	109
<i>Later Acts</i>	110
<i>Regulations</i>	112
<i>Treaty of Waitangi</i>	112
<i>International Law</i>	112
<i>Common law</i>	113
<i>Parliament taken to be aware of recent case law</i>	114
REPEALED ACTS AND REVOKED REGULATIONS.....	114
COMMON LAW THAT HAS BEEN REPLACED BY A STATUTE	117
SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND OTHER FACTORS.....	119
EVIDENCE ACT 2006, ss 128-129	120
LEGISLATIVE FACT EVIDENCE	121
INTERVENERS AND AMICI CURIAE	123
GOVERNMENT PRACTICE IN ADMINISTERING AN ACT AND INFORMATION BULLETINS.....	124
PARLIAMENTARY HISTORY	126
<i>Reports of committees or commissions recommending the legislation</i>	126
<i>Cabinet papers</i>	127
<i>Explanatory note accompanying the introduction copy of the Bill</i>	128
<i>Attorney-General’s report under s 7 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990</i>	130
<i>Drafting history</i>	130
<i>Changes not made to a Bill</i>	131
<i>Select committee commentaries on bills</i>	132
<i>Submissions to a select committee</i>	133
<i>Departmental reports</i>	134
<i>Debates in Parliament during a Bill’s passage</i>	134

CONCLUSION ON USE OF EXTRINSIC MATERIALS	137
6. VALUES – WHY AND HOW DO BASIC PRINCIPLES OR VALUES AFFECT LEGAL MEANING?.....	139
BASIC PRINCIPLES – INTERPRETATIVE CHOICES SERVE ONE VALUE OVER ANOTHER	139
SOURCES OF VALUES.....	139
<i>Values before and beyond the Bill of Rights</i>	139
<i>Presumption against expropriatory effect – Paki v Attorney-General [2012] NZSC 50, [2012] 3 NZLR 277</i>	140
<i>Property being taken or impaired under clear legislation, to serve other basic values – R v Elliot HC Gisborne CRI 2009-016-3799, 19 August 2010 at [73]–[74]</i>	140
OTHER COMMON LAW PRINCIPLES	141
<i>Access to justice</i>	141
<i>Extraterritorial application – Poynter and Ludgater</i>	143
<i>Preventing wrongdoers profiting from their own wrongdoing – Welwyn Hatfield BC</i>	143
<i>Principles of non-retrospectivity of legislation and double jeopardy</i>	144
PRACTICALITY, COMMON SENSE, WORKABILITY, CONVENIENCE, OTHER CONSEQUENCES	144
<i>Proposed meaning is unacceptably impractical – Contract Pacific</i>	144
<i>Another unacceptable and unintended result – Service and Food Workers Union</i>	145
TREATY OF WAITANGI.....	145
<i>Provisions referring to the Treaty of Waitangi</i>	145
<i>Presumption of consistency with principles of Treaty of Waitangi</i>	146
<i>Examples where Treaty-compliant meaning preferred – Barton-Prescott and Faulkner</i>	146
EFFECT ON DOMESTIC LAW OF OTHER INTERNATIONAL LEGAL OBLIGATIONS	146
<i>International legal obligations</i>	147
<i>International sale of goods, uniformity, and interpretation “autonomous” from domestic law</i>	149
STATUTORY INTERPRETATION FOR RIGHTS INCONSISTENCY USING THE NEW ZEALAND BILL OF RIGHTS ACT 1990.....	150
IS THERE A “RIGHT WAY” TO APPLY THE BILL OF RIGHTS?	151
CONSISTENCY NOT JUST IN MEANING, BUT ALSO IN APPLICATION.....	152
RIGHTS DEFINITION – IS THE RIGHT CONCERNED EVEN ENGAGED?	153
<i>Right not to be deprived of life (s 8) and right not to be subject to torture or cruel treatment (s 9)</i>	153
<i>Double jeopardy – s 26(2) – Gwaze</i>	153
<i>Right of person charged with an offence to appeal – s 25(h) – Paul</i>	154
<i>Right of person charged to trial by jury – s 24(e) – legislative changes</i>	154
<i>Unreasonable search or seizure – s 21</i>	155
RIGHTS DEFINITION ALSO INVOLVES ‘FACTORING IN’ JUSTIFIED LIMITS ON AFFIRMED RIGHTS	156
HOW TO TELL WHETHER A LIMIT ON A RIGHT IS JUSTIFIED UNDER S 5 OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS	157
<i>Proportionality in considering whether legislation imposes a justified limit on a guaranteed right – what is involved?</i>	157
PROPORTIONALITY IN ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION-MAKING	158
DIFFERENT KINDS OF INTERPRETATION ‘REMEDIES’	158
<i>Requiring words to be given a strained meaning – Adoption Act cases</i>	158
<i>Ascertaining exact meaning of vague or broad terms or concepts – Moonen, Brooker, Morse</i>	160
<i>Ascertaining scope, and influencing (placing side-constraints on) use, of powers – Schubert</i>	161
WHEN ENACTMENTS CANNOT BE GIVEN RIGHTS-CONSISTENT MEANINGS – S 4.....	162
<i>Rights-inconsistent enactments override, as a last resort</i>	162
<i>R v Hansen [2007] 3 NZLR 1 (SC)</i>	162
<i>Spark v R [2009] NZSC 130, [2010] 1 NZLR 599</i>	163
<i>Taylor v Attorney-General [2014] NZHC 2225, [2015] NZAR 705</i>	163
<i>Mangawhai Ratepayers’ and Residents’ Assoc Inc v Kaipara DC [2016] NZSC 48</i>	163
<i>Limits on the right to trial by jury (s 24(e)) – Porter – and limits on other rights</i>	163
<i>Rights-consistent enactments need not be narrow or have limited effect – Cropp v Judicial Committee [2008] 3 NZLR 774 (SC)</i>	164
EXPRESS RANKING, WAIVER, OR OVERRIDING PROVISIONS	165
REMEDIES FOR BREACH OF THE BILL OF RIGHTS.....	165
THE HANSEN APPROACH.....	167
THE PLANET KEY APPROACH “WHERE THERE IS ONE CONTESTED MEANING”.....	168

7. ALL THE PIECES MATTER – A STATUTORY INTERPRETATION CHECKLIST.....	169
TEXT.....	171
PURPOSE.....	171
CONTEXT.....	172
VALUES.....	173
8. CROSSWORD PUZZLE — SOME KEY POINTS IN OUTLINE.....	174
APPENDIX ONE: “MANIFEST INJUSTICE” (SENTENCING ACT 2002 S 86E, AND SS 86D(4), 102, 104).....	177
APPENDIX TWO: A BRIEF SURVEY OF SOME JUDICIAL USE OF S 7 REPORTS OR ADVICE.....	185