

# Our Weekly News Digest for Employers

Friday, 20 November 2020



## In this Issue

**CASES** 1  
Employment Relations Authority:  
Six Cases

**EMPLOYER NEWS** 6  
Jump in apprentice and trainee  
numbers  
Producers' prices whey down for  
dairy manufacturers  
First Cabinet decision supports  
small business

**LEGISLATION** 9  
Bills open for submissions: 13 Bills

**CONTACT DETAILS** 10  
Employment Relations Consultants  
Health & Safety Consultants  
Legal Team

## Cases

### Employment Relations Authority: Six Cases

#### Employee awarded \$25,000 in compensation following a constructive dismissal

Ms Darnley was employed by The Chief of the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) as a Human Resources Site Lead from 31 July 2017 until 24 June 2019. Ms Darnley claimed she was constructively dismissed by NZDF and sought compensation and costs.

NZDF denied Ms Darnley's claim, and said it acted fairly and reasonably towards her. NZDF claimed Ms Darnley breached her duty to deal in good faith and breached her individual employment agreement (IEA) by not giving notice of her resignation. It said that Ms Darnley's failure to notify of her resignation resulted in her being paid after the date on which she had commenced new employment. NZDF sought the imposition of a penalty against Ms Darnley for breaches of good faith. It also sought an order for the repayment of any wages it is found to have overpaid Ms Darnley.

Ms Darnley's position included representing NZDF in employment relationship problems involving its staff and the negotiation of settlement agreements. In December 2018, the Chief People Officer (CPO) at NZDF issued a directive that provided policy guidance for the control and management of pay-outs being made to departing employees. Ms Darnley was put in charge of a settlement agreement with a former staff member in January 2019. In February 2019 Ms Darnley received written notification of a formal investigation into allegations that she had breached the CPO directive regarding the January 2019 settlement agreement. The investigation was carried out by an NZDF manager, supported by an NZDF HR Business Partner. It was completed in March 2019 and the finalised investigation report was dated 1 April 2019.

The investigation report found the allegations were proven and constituted conduct capable of amounting to a breach of Ms Darnley's obligations set out in NZDF's Code of Conduct. The investigation report identified several mitigating factors for the decision maker to consider, but made no recommendations as to whether Ms Darnley's actions amounted to misconduct or serious misconduct.

On 14 May 2019 Ms Darnley was told that her actions amounted to serious misconduct and that the disciplinary meeting would take place the next day. After leaving the workplace on 14 May 2019, Ms Darnley did not return to work. Ms Darnley alleged there were elements of constructive dismissal in the way she was treated by NZDF between February and May 2019. She alleged that NZDF repudiated her employment by acting unfairly and unreasonably in that timeframe.

## Contact Us

**NZ** 0800 300 362  
**AU** 1800 300 362  
**E** [advice@ema.co.nz](mailto:advice@ema.co.nz)  
[ema.co.nz](http://ema.co.nz)

---

# Employer Bulletin

Friday, 20 November 2020

Unbeknownst to Ms Darnley, the investigation report listed out concerns NZDF had around her performance which dated back several months. Ms Darnley therefore had no opportunity to address those concerns and, if necessary, modify her actions to meet her employer's requirements.

The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) found that NZDF breached its obligation to treat Ms Darnley fairly and reasonably by addressing a performance issue with her directly. Ms Darnley's evidence was that she lost trust that NZDF would treat her fairly. She said that following the delivery of the preliminary decision to dismiss her for serious misconduct, there was nothing she could do or say that would change NZDF's view. The Authority held that NZDF had breached its obligation to treat Ms Darnley fairly in relation to the performance concerns it had about her. That breach was so fundamental that her resulting resignation was foreseeable. The Authority held that Ms Darnley had established her case for constructive dismissal.

In the circumstances in which the breach occurred, the Authority did not find it appropriate to impose a penalty on Ms Darnley for not informing NZDF she had accepted new employment. NZDF claimed Ms Darnley breached the terms of her IEA by failing to provide one month's notice of her resignation. Having found Ms Darnley to have been constructively dismissed, this claim was dismissed. Ms Darnley did not lose wages because of her personal grievance, but sought compensation for hurt and humiliation.

The Authority found that Ms Darnley was constructively dismissed from her employment and NZDF's counterclaims were dismissed. NZDF was ordered to pay Ms Darnley compensation of \$25,000.

---

*Darnley v The Chief of the New Zealand Defence Force* [[2020] NZERA 440; 23/10/2020; T MacKinnon]

---

## Employer ordered to pay entitlements owed to employee

Ms Colclough worked for Live It Up Limited (Live It Up) from October 2016 until 19 November 2018 when she resigned. Ms Colclough sought orders for payment of wage arrears of 105 hours, termination holiday pay and interest on those sums.

On 31 October 2019, Ms Colclough filed a Statement of Problem in the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority). On 8 November 2019, at Ms Colclough's request, her application was put on hold. Ms Colclough stated the reason for the request was because she had entered an arrangement with Live It Up to resolve her wage arrears. On 1 July 2020 Ms Colclough contacted the Authority to progress her claim as Live It Up had not paid the wage arrears as agreed. On 6 July 2020 the Statement of Problem was served on the registered offices of Live It Up.

On 4 September 2020, a minute created by the Authority identified the issues to be investigated and determined, proposed timetabling directions including that the matter be determined on the papers. The parties were invited to file any objection to the proposal. The minute directed Live It Up to file documents relating to Ms Colclough's employment including her employment agreement, wage and time records, holiday and leave records, pay slips and final pay details. The minute stated that Live It Up would require leave to file a Statement in Reply. The minute also directed Live It Up's accountant to file information within its possession and control, relevant to Ms Colclough's claim.

Live It Up's accountant filed all directed information. Ms Colclough filed witness statements in support, pay slips and IRD earnings summary for the relevant period. This information was served on Live It Up. Live It Up did not seek leave to file a Statement in Reply, file a proposed Statement in Reply or comply with any directions given by the Authority. Live It Up did not contact the Authority or provide any comment on the information received from the accountant.

An employee may bring a claim for recovery of wages pursuant to section 131 of the Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act). Where an employee's employment has come to an end before annual leave has been taken, the employer is obliged to pay annual holiday pay in the final pay, pursuant to section 27 of the Holidays Act 2003.

Ms Colclough did not seek penalties against Live It Up for the statutory breaches alleged. The Authority is unable to impose a penalty of its own motion. If Ms Colclough had sought a penalty, Live It Up may have been vulnerable to a penalty for failing to comply with the statutory obligations it owed Ms Colclough.

# Employer Bulletin

Friday, 20 November 2020

The Authority was satisfied that Ms Colclough was owed wages arrears for 105 hours. Ms Colclough was entitled to holiday pay calculated and paid when her employment ended. The pay records provided showed that Ms Colclough was not paid out the leave balance in her final pay. Ms Colclough was also entitled to holiday pay on the 105 hours wage arrears calculated at eight percent of the gross total.

Ms Colclough was entitled to an award of interest on the total wages claimed, including the holiday pay component. The Authority has the power to award interest under clause 11 of the Second Schedule of the Act. The Authority noted that it is appropriate where a person has been deprived of the use of money to make an award for interest. The Authority ordered Live It Up to pay interest, using the civil debt interest calculator. Interest is payable in accordance with Schedule 2 of the Interest on Money Claims Act 2016.

Live It Up was ordered to pay Ms Colclough wage arrears of \$1,995, holiday pay entitlements of \$1,233.80, interest on the sum of \$3,228.80, and the filing fee of \$71.56.

---

*Colclough v Live It Up Limited* [[2020] NZERA 416; 13/10/2020; M Urlich]

---

## Employee unjustifiably dismissed for raising concerns of mistreatment by employer's cousin

Mr Choi claimed that he was unjustifiably dismissed by Kaipara Scaffolding after he made a complaint to Mr Kapea, sole Director of Kaipara Scaffolding, stating that he was being mistreated by a fellow colleague, Mr Hemana. Mr Hemana was Mr Kapea's cousin. Mr Choi claimed that he suffered hurt and humiliation as a result of the dismissal, which he claimed was unjustified. Mr Choi sought reimbursement of lost income and compensation.

Mr Choi filed a witness statement and swore an oath that his evidence was true and correct. Mr Kapea and Mr Hemana both filed short witness statements on behalf of Kaipara Scaffolding. Neither however, attended the Employment Relation Authority's (the Authority) investigation meeting to swear or affirm that their evidence was true and correct. The Authority noted that as a result, if there was ever a dispute with the information provided to the Authority, the Authority would prefer the evidence of Mr Choi.

Prior to starting work at Kaipara Scaffolding, Mr Choi was on the unemployment benefit. He was referred by Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ) to a job vacancy as Scaffolding Labourer at Kaipara Scaffolding. Mr Choi called Mr Kapea and was requested to meet at the scaffolding yard. On 19 July 2019, Mr Choi and Mr Kapea met and discussed the role, stated that he would be paid \$20 an hour and could start immediately. A few days later, Mr Kapea asked Mr Choi for his IRD number, tax code and physical address, which Mr Choi provided.

Information provided by Kaipara Scaffolding to the Authority claimed that Mr Choi was a contractor. Mr Choi stated that there was never a discussion about him contracting to Kaipara Scaffolding and always understood that he was an employee.

The Authority held that Mr Choi was an employee as payslips provided showed PAYE was deducted from Mr Choi's wages. The bank account statements showed that Mr Choi was paid wages less PAYE. Mr Choi was also instructed by Kaipara Scaffolding in his work. Kaipara Scaffolding also received the wage subsidy for around 14 employees. The Authority held that these factors all supported Mr Choi's understanding that he was an employee of Kaipara Scaffolding.

Mr Choi claimed that shortly after starting his employment, he was given a hard time by Mr Hemana. Mr Hemana allegedly pushed and slapped Mr Choi while he was working as he thought it was funny. On 25 July 2019, Mr Hemana allegedly took Mr Choi's phone and refused to return it. Mr Choi stated that he asked repeatedly for Mr Hemana to return it, but Mr Hemana allegedly laughed at the request and promised to return it, but never did.

Mr Choi stated that he raised issues to Mr Kapea regarding Mr Hemana's actions towards him during his first week of employment. He told Mr Kapea that he was not happy with how he was being treated. Mr Choi was allegedly told by Mr Kapea not to be disruptive. Mr Choi claimed he spoke to Mr Kapea again on 1 August 2019 regarding having his phone returned. Mr Choi claimed that Mr Kapea became angry and told him to "*f- off and not come back*". Mr Choi claimed that this was humiliating and that he attempted to resolve the matter after his dismissal, but was unsuccessful.

---

# Employer Bulletin

Friday, 20 November 2020

The Authority held that Mr Choi was unjustifiably dismissed. The Authority noted that to be told to “*f- off and not come back*” after raising claims to his employer of mistreatment by a colleague and asking for his phone to be returned, were not the actions of a fair and reasonable employer. The Authority found that Mr Choi was hurt and humiliated as a result of his unjustified dismissal.

After his dismissal, Mr Choi went to live in a boarding house for the homeless for two months. Mr Choi lost income in the three month period following his dismissal. The total loss of remuneration was \$8,320 net. During this period, Mr Choi received income from WINZ of \$2,367.25. After deducting this income, Mr Choi’s loss of remuneration amounted to \$5,952.75. Mr Choi was also entitled to holiday pay on his income.

The Authority ordered Kaipara Scaffolding to pay Mr Choi lost remuneration in the sum of \$5,952.75, holiday pay in the sum of \$102.40 and compensation in the sum of \$8,500 under section 123 of the Act. Kaipara Scaffolding was also ordered to pay Mr Choi costs in the sum of \$2,250 and the filing fee of \$71.56.

---

*Choi v Kaipara Scaffolding Limited* [[2020] NZERA 430; 19/10/2020; A Fitzgibbon]

---

## Employees ordered to pay contribution towards employer costs

The New Zealand Nurses Organisation (NZNO) sought an order requiring Ms Neil and Ms West to contribute to the costs incurred in successfully responding to their personal grievance applications. NZNO also sought costs incurred in their application for a compliance order and for opposing the application for removal to the Employment Court. NZNO claimed an effective tripling of costs that the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) would typically award was warranted, because of the way the applicants had conducted their case. Furthermore, Ms Neil and Ms West had rejected an earlier settlement offer.

The awarding of costs is guided by well-established principles. These include conduct that unnecessarily added to costs, whether the costs were necessary and reasonable, and any settlement offers. Other factors are the liable party’s means to pay, and the preparation required in particularly complex matters. In this case, two factors in particular favoured an upward adjustment.

The first was the settlement offer made to Ms Neil and Ms West. NZNO had offered to pay three months lost wages, \$15,000 in distress compensation and \$10,000 towards the costs of representation, but this offer was rejected. The Authority takes a stern approach to setting costs where a party has turned down a reasonably made offer on terms better than ultimately achieved through proceedings. On that basis, a 40 percent upward adjustment of the usual tariff rate for investigation meetings was deemed appropriate.

The second factor was the way the case was conducted by Ms Neil and Ms West. It was found that they had increased the costs incurred through additional legal work. A ten percent upward adjustment was made due to improperly raised or misconceived claims, and confidentiality breaches. After the adjustments \$22,500 was awarded in total for preparation and attendance at the investigation meeting.

NZNO also sought an order requiring the applicants’ advocate, Mr Halse, to comply with an earlier Authority order prohibiting publication of the names and details of three witnesses. Mr Halse had made strident allegations in social media, and considered non publication orders were “*illegally raised*”, and ignored them. This conduct, on behalf of Ms Neil and Ms West, was determined to be unreasonable. Mr Halse’s wilful disregard of established law amounted to exceptionally bad behaviour. It was therefore determined that Ms West and Ms Neil pay \$3,735 sought by NZNO as indemnity costs for its application for a compliance order.

For the removal application, NZNO sought \$1,500 based on one third of the daily tariff, which was also duly awarded. There was no submission on behalf of Ms West and Ms Neil that any adjustment should be made to take account of their personal financial situations or ability to pay costs. Consequently, no adjustment was made.

NZNO’s claim for travel and accommodation expenses was declined because engaging out of town counsel was not a cost to be reasonably visited on an unsuccessful party. Reimbursement of \$479 was, however, ordered for printing, binding and courier fees. Altogether, the required contribution towards the costs and expenses of NZNO totalled \$28,214.

---

## Employer Bulletin

Friday, 20 November 2020

Accordingly, Ms Neil and Ms West were each ordered to pay \$14,107 to NZNO within 28 days of the date of the determination.

---

*Neil v New Zealand Nurses Organisation* [[2020] NZERA Auckland 342; 26/08/2020; R Arthur]

---

### No process followed to dismiss for alleged theft

Ms Findlay was employed to work as a painter from 20 November 2018. Ms Findlay said that she was unjustifiably dismissed between 15 and 17 April 2019 and that such dismissal was without procedural fairness and substantive justification. Ms Findlay sought a finding that she was employed by Mr Murdoch. She also sought compensation in the sum of \$23,000, reimbursement of lost wages, payment of her final wages and costs. The company denied that Ms Findlay was unjustifiably dismissed.

There was a dispute as to who employed her as she was not a party to a written employment agreement. Ms Findlay claimed that her employer was Mr Murdoch. Mr Murdoch claimed that Ms Findlay was employed by Steves Painting & Decorating Limited (in liquidation) (Steves). Mr Murdoch was the sole Director of Steves. The liquidator of Steves, Mr Reynolds, sent an email dated 5 June 2020 stating that Ms Findlay was employed by Steves with reference to show she was paid with schedules lodged with the Inland Revenue Department (IRD).

Steves was incorporated on 9 March 2016 and carried on the business of painting houses. He claimed that all of the employees knew that Steves was their employer and he had told Ms Findlay about this. Mr Murdoch said that the process to prepare employment agreements were underway, however these were not available when Ms Findlay was employed. Ms Findlay sent her hours worked by text message to Mr Murdoch and Mr Murdoch said that he passed the information onto Ms Curtis, who undertook the payroll for Steves. Another employee who was hired after Ms Findlay had an employment agreement and sent a record of their hours directly to Ms Curtis. The evidence from Mr Murdoch was that payments were made to Ms Findlay through the company bank account. The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority), looking at all evidence, concluded that it was more probable than not that Ms Findlay was employed by Steves.

On 15 April 2019, Ms Findlay arrived at the job site, which was a residential home. She, along with another employee who also worked that day, noticed that some tools were missing. Ms Findlay sent a text message to Mr Murdoch and he spoke in turn with the other employee. Mr Murdoch arrived a short time later and made comments that suggested Ms Findlay had been involved in the theft. Ms Findlay told Mr Murdoch that she knew nothing about the break in. Ms Findlay was asked to leave the worksite on 15 April 2019, because she refused to work and “slandered” Mr Murdoch. She refused to leave and continued working. However, following further discussions, Ms Findlay was sent away from site. She did not return to work and did not contact Mr Murdoch.

The Authority found that Ms Findlay was sent away from her employment in the nature of a dismissal. Her last day of employment was 17 April 2019. The reason for dismissal appeared to be a view that Ms Findlay stole items from the site. She denied that she did. There was no investigation into the matter before she was ordered from site. The concern that she had stolen items was publicised by the Foreman on Facebook, without Ms Findlay ever having a proper opportunity to understand the nature of the concern and respond. None of the procedural fairness requirements in the test of justification had been satisfied. The dismissal was both procedurally and substantially unjustified.

The Authority ordered Steves to pay to Ms Findlay \$418 for unpaid wages, \$23,000 to compensate for hurt and humiliation suffered and \$1,950 for costs.

---

*Findlay v Steves Painting & Decorating Limited (in liquidation)* [[2020] NZERA 425; 15/10/2020; H Doyle]

---

### Outstanding holiday pay sought by employees in the Employment Relations Authority

Mr Verma, Mr H Singh, Mr A Singh and Mr Cho (the applicants) filed proceedings against their former employer Canterbury Compliance Centre Limited (Canterbury Compliance). The applicants claimed that they were not paid holiday

---

## Employer Bulletin

Friday, 20 November 2020

pay entitlements when their employment with Canterbury Compliance ended. Mr Verma sought payments of outstanding holiday pay in the sum of \$3,833, Mr H Singh sought holiday pay in the sum of \$2,103 and Mr Cho sought payment for holiday pay of \$2,157.

Canterbury Compliance did not dispute that there are amounts owing for holiday pay, however they said that they were not able to pay the money in full. Canterbury Compliance offered partial payments, however these were unacceptable to the applicants. The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) allowed the parties to make further comments following a case management conference in a notice of direction dated 24 August 2020.

In an email sent on 10 September, Canterbury Compliance noted that it had financial difficulties. The Authority acknowledged that there were financial difficulties, but that did not prevent Mr Verma, Mr H Singh and Mr Cho from obtaining orders for payment.

The Authority ordered Canterbury Compliance to pay Mr Verma outstanding holiday pay in the sum of \$3,833, Mr H Singh in the sum of \$2,103 and Mr Cho in the sum of \$2,157 within 28 days of this determination.

The Authority assessed whether interest be awarded in accordance with Schedule 2 of the Interest on Moneys Claims Act 2016. All three applicants had waited a considerable period for their holiday pay. Interest was awarded from 1 October 2019 to the date of this determination. Canterbury Compliance was ordered to pay Mr Verma \$101.70, Mr H Singh \$55.81 and Mr Cho \$57.26 for interest. The applicants were also all entitled to reimbursement of the filing fee of \$71.56.

---

*Verma v Canterbury Compliance Centre Limited* [[2020] NZERA 371; 15/09/2020; H Doyle]

---

For further information about the issues raised in this week's cases, please refer to the following resources:

[Holidays Act](#)

[Full and Final Settlements](#)

[Employment Relations Act 2000](#)

[Personal Grievances](#)

[Termination of Employment](#)

## Employer News

### Jump in apprentice and trainee numbers

The number of New Zealanders taking up apprenticeships has increased nearly 50 percent, and the number of female apprentices has more than doubled. This comes as a Government campaign to raise the profile of vocational education and training (VET) begins.

Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern and Education Minister Chris Hipkins announced the campaign at Mulcahy Engineering and Fabrication this afternoon.

"The first phase of the VET marketing campaign includes social media influencer activity targeted at school leavers and learners under the age of 25, and radio announcer adlibs aimed at starting meaningful conversations about vocational education and training in the community," Education Minister Chris Hipkins said.

"The second phase of the campaign, set to begin next month, will include TV, radio and social media ads, digital displays and online videos.

---

# Employer Bulletin

Friday, 20 November 2020

“Vocational education and training plays a key role in New Zealand’s recovery from COVID-19. We know that many New Zealanders will be looking to retrain, and employers in key sectors will need more skilled people.

“The marketing campaign is supported by a range of initiatives put in place by the Government earlier this year to get more people into training and apprenticeships.

“We launched a \$320 million free Targeted Training and Apprenticeship Fund (TTAF) which makes all apprenticeships, as well as, certificates, diplomas and programmes in targeted industries, free for New Zealanders of all ages from 1 July 2020. This is targeted towards industries where demand will continue to be strong as we recover from COVID-19.

“Since we made all apprenticeships free in July this year, close to 14,000 new apprentices have started an apprenticeship nationwide, up from about 7,500 in the same period in 2019. Since July, more than 17,000 learners have also begun TTAF programmes in industries critical to our economic recovery. That’s compared with 12,800 learners enrolled in in the same window in 2019.

“In addition, the Government also launched the \$380 million Apprenticeship Boost fund which supports employers to retain and take on new apprentices, to help ensure New Zealand has a pipeline of skilled workers, and to avoid shortages in the future.

“These are extremely encouraging signs given the historical perception of vocational careers. Based on these numbers and research\* by the Tertiary Education Commission, New Zealanders’ views on vocational education and training are shifting.

“This is important because we know employers in key industries will need more skilled people. That’s why we have targeted our free trades training towards industries where demand is expected to grow.

“I also want to note that the number of female apprentices who started an apprenticeship more than doubled — increasing to 1,785 from 845 in the same period last year.

“It’s a welcome development to see more women going into these traditionally male-dominated industries. But I acknowledge that there’s still a long way to go,” Education Minister Chris Hipkins said.

---

 New Zealand Government [18 November 2020]

---

## Producers’ prices whey down for dairy manufacturers

“The dairy product manufacturing and dairy cattle farming industries are closely related and show similar trends over time.”

See Dairy exports dip in September for more information on the dairy industry.

Across all industries in the September 2020 quarter, prices received by producers from customers continued to fall (down 0.3 percent) while prices paid by producers to suppliers bounced back (up 0.6 percent).

“Falling global demand, higher freight costs, and disruption to business caused by the COVID-19 pandemic meant producers received lower prices from customers across a number of industries,” Mr Downes said.

“Producers received less for products in the forestry and logging, seafood, and textiles industries in the September quarter.”

### Prices paid for rent and fuel increase

Businesses paid more for commercial rent and fuel in the September quarter. Petrol and diesel prices increased by 7.0 percent and 9.2 percent respectively. This was a partial rebound from the fall in prices during the June 2020 quarter, when crude oil prices slumped after the COVID-19 pandemic spread around the world.

---

 Stats New Zealand [18 November 2020]

---

## First Cabinet decision supports small business

Despite the continuing impacts of COVID-19, most New Zealanders rated their life satisfaction highly in the September 2020 quarter, and said they fared well across a range of wellbeing measures, Stats NZ said today.

The new data, collected as part of a supplement to the household labour force survey, showed little change in New Zealanders' wellbeing since the June 2020 quarter.

The September quarter began in July 2020, with the country at COVID-19 alert level 1. However, the Auckland region returned to alert level 3 and the rest of New Zealand to alert level 2 for a significant part of the quarter. Unemployment rates also rose over the quarter, as the impacts of COVID-19 on the labour market were felt more strongly.

These changes, however, did not have a strong impact on most people's general wellbeing. When asked to rate their overall life satisfaction, on a scale from 0 to 10 (where 0 is completely dissatisfied and 10 is completely satisfied), 84 percent gave a rating of 7 or higher. The average rating was 7.8 out of 10, compared with 7.9 in the previous quarter.

"While this indicates most New Zealanders continue to be happy with their lives, some groups are less satisfied," wellbeing and housing statistics manager Dr Claire Bretherton said.

"These include people who are out of work, underemployed, or have low job security."

### Some struggling financially

Financial hardship is an important factor for wellbeing. Most New Zealanders had enough money to meet their everyday needs, but 7.2 percent said they did not, and a further 24 percent said they had only just enough.

Groups that were most likely to not have enough money included the unemployed (29 percent) and those who were not in the labour force due to illness, injury, or disability (26 percent).

Around 1 in 5 people in these groups had received help in the form of food, clothes, or money from an organisation, such as a church or foodbank, in the last 12 months.

"A number of reports in the media suggested an increase in demand for services, such as foodbanks, over the last few months," Dr Bretherton said.

"The latest results from our survey estimated that about 200,000 New Zealanders had received help from one of these organisations in the last 12 months, which was nearly 39,000 more than reported in the June 2020 quarter."

### Happiness high, anxiety low

In the September 2020 quarter, questions about happiness and anxiety levels were included in the survey for the first time. Reported levels of happiness and anxiety indicated most people were experiencing good mental health.

To read further, please click the link below.

---

 Stats New Zealand [19 November 2020]

---

---

# Employer Bulletin

Friday, 20 November 2020

## Legislation

---

Note: Bills go through several stages before becoming an Act of Parliament: Introduction; First reading; Referral to select committee; Select committee report, Consideration of report; Committee stage; Second reading; Third reading; and Royal assent.

---

### Bills open for submissions: 13 Bills

13 Bills are currently open for public submissions to select committees.

[Overseas Investment Amendment Bill \(No 3\)](#) (N/A)

[New Zealand Superannuation and Retirement Income \(Fair Residency\) Amendment Bill](#) (N/A)

[Protected Disclosures \(Protection of Whistleblowers\) Bill](#) (N/A)

[Education \(Strengthening Second Language Learning in Primary and Intermediate Schools\) Amendment Bill](#) (N/A)

[Rights for Victims of Insane Offenders Bill](#) (N/A)

[District Court \(Protection of Judgment Debtors with Disabilities\) Amendment Bill](#) (N/A)

[Arms \(Firearms Prohibition Orders\) Amendment Bill \(No 2\)](#) (N/A)

[Electoral \(Integrity Repeal\) Amendment Bill](#) (N/A)

[Child Support Amendment Bill](#) (N/A)

[Oranga Tamariki \(Youth Justice Demerit Points\) Amendment Bill](#) (N/A)

[Insurance \(Prompt Settlement of Claims for Uninhabitable Residential Property\) Bill](#) (N/A)

[Crown Pastoral Land Reform Bill](#) (N/A)

[Land Transport \(Drug Driving\) Amendment Bill](#) (N/A)

---

Overviews of bills - and advice on how to make a select committee submission - available at:

<https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/sc/make-a-submission/>

Full text of bills available at: <http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/legislation/bills>

---

The Employer Bulletin is a weekly update on employment relations news and recently published legal decisions. It is EMA's policy to summarise cases that contain legal issues relevant to employers. The purpose of the Employer Bulletin is to provide and to promote best practice in employment relations. If you would like to provide feedback about the Employer Bulletin, contact [advice@ema.co.nz](mailto:advice@ema.co.nz)

# Advisory Services



## Employment Relations & Human Resources Consultants



**Max McGowan**  
+64 27 241 4608  
max.mcgowan@ema.co.nz  
Auckland



**Peter Elder**  
+64 27 271 1384  
peter.elder@ema.co.nz  
Auckland



**Russell Drake**  
+64 21 686 621  
russell.drake@ema.co.nz  
Waikato



**Amanda Wallis**  
+64 21 042 0707  
amanda.wallis@ema.co.nz  
Bay of Plenty &  
South Waikato



**Tarrin Terry**  
+64 27 398 7339  
tarrin.terry@ema.co.nz  
Bay of Plenty &  
South Waikato



**Chris Longman**  
+64 27 403 1788  
chris.longman@ema.co.nz  
Bay of Plenty



**Sarah Selwood**  
+64 27 474 4954  
sarah.selwood@ema.co.nz  
Auckland



**Murray Broadbelt**  
+64 27 4300 113  
murray.broadbelt@ema.co.nz  
Northland



**Jason Tuck**  
+64 21 992 192  
jason.tuck@ema.co.nz



**Bruce Lotter**  
+64 27 535 1469  
bruce.lotter@ema.co.nz  
Auckland



**Clive Thomson**  
+64 274 372 808  
clive.thomson@ema.co.nz  
Bay of Plenty &  
South Waikato



**Myriam Heynen**  
+64 21 920 414  
myriam.heynen@ema.co.nz  
Auckland



**Ash Dixon**  
+64 21 21 265 909  
ash.dixon@ema.co.nz  
Auckland/Northland

## Health & Safety Consultants



**Geoff Brokenshire**  
+64 21 595 090  
geoff.brokenshire@ema.co.nz  
Bay of Plenty & Waikato



**Brent Sutton**  
+64 27 590 5442  
brent.sutton@ema.co.nz  
Auckland



**Keith Robinson**  
+64 27 278 7759  
keith.robinson@ema.co.nz  
Auckland

## Legal Team



**Matthew Dearing**  
Managing Solicitor  
+64 27 284 4042  
matthew.dearing@ema.co.nz



**Michael Witt**  
Senior Solicitor  
+64 274 053359  
michael.witt@ema.co.nz



**Beverley Edwards**  
Senior Solicitor  
+64 7 839 6223  
beverley.edwards@ema.co.nz



**Teresa Li**  
Solicitor  
+64 27 257 4879  
teresa.li@ema.co.nz



**Kent Duffy**  
Solicitor  
+64 275 699307  
kent.duffy@ema.co.nz



**Ruthi Bommoju**  
Solicitor  
+64 275 518 565  
ruthi.bommoju@ema.co.nz



**Julie Hardaker**  
Special Counsel  
+64 21 284 8618  
julie.hardaker@ema.co.nz

Take advantage of these services and more with your membership. Free call our team on 0800 300 362

## AdviceLine



**Sean Hanna**  
AdviceLine Team Manager  
0800 300 362



**Sandamali Gunawardena**  
Employer Advisor  
0800 300 362



**Samantha Butcher**  
Employer Advisor  
0800 300 362



**Bethany Shpherd**  
Employer Advisor  
0800 300 362



**Kitty Chan**  
Employer Advisor  
0800 300 362



**Waren Thomas**  
Employer Advisor  
0800 300 362



**Jess Husband**  
Employer Advisor  
0800 300 362



**Drew Prescott**  
Employer Advisor  
0800 300 362