



Nick Smith responds to claims he is New Zealand's worst behaved politician **January 8, 2007**

Previously Wikinews published an article where New Zealand politician, Honourable Peter Dunne claimed that the Honourable Doctor Nick Smith was the worst behaved politician in the House, "by a country mile".

Gabriel Pollard (Nzgabriel), accredited Wikinews reporter, asked Hon Dr Smith what he thought of Hon Dunne ranking him the worst behaved politician. Hon Dr Smith did not respond to the e-mail when the story was first published, but now has.



Hon Dr Smith said that Hon Dunne's way of assessing the behaved politicians is flawed. Hon Dunne only takes into account being asked to withdraw and apologise for a

statement and for being asked to leave the House, both are enacted by the Speaker. Hon Dr Smith said that personal attacks, like those on Don Brash and Prime Minister, Helen Clark, are not taken into account when ranking the behaviour of politicians. "Nor do one fingered salutes, which the Speaker chose not to punish," referring to the three times when MP, Ron Mark did it.

Hon Dr Smith also has defended the

time when he has been asked to leave the House, mainly because when it has happened it was because he had been trying to make the government accountable for various public interest issues. Dr Smith gave an example: "I was thrown out for disagreeing with Margaret Wilson about Dover Samuel's not having to answer questions on the Whangamata Marina because his public comments were as a previous councillor and not a Minister (yeah right)."

Hon Dr Smith also challenges the speaker of the House, Margaret Wilson, saying that she is biased as the three top offenders on Hon Dunne's list, are from the opposition, National, Dr Smith, Honourable Tau Henare and Gerry Brownlee respectively.

"I make no apologies for taking the fight to the Government," Hon Dr Smith said.

Number of breaches during New Zealand's end of year exams **January 9, 2007**

Wikinews has acquired, under the 1982 Official Information Act, documents that show how many breaches of exam rules occurred during New Zealand's end of year National Certificate of Educational Achievement (NCEA) exams in 2004 and 2005. The breaches includes all levels: level one, level two, level three and scholarships.

During the external exams, the supervisors have to report all breaches of the rules. Those breaches are then given a punishment, which includes a written warning, exam results from a subject being withheld, all exam results being withheld for a year or banning the student from sitting any external exams the next year which has only ever happened once. The student was banned for constant breaches of the rules and constant disruptions in numerous exams. If a student causes disruption to other students during the exam, that student can expect harsh penalties as New Zealand Qualifications Authority say they consider a disruption very seriously.

In the first year of NCEA, 2004, a total of 129,853 students took part in external exams and of those, 186 breaches were filed by supervisors. 89 of those students had some subject results withheld. And, bringing the total to 90, one student had all results withheld and was prevented from sitting exams the next year.

In 2004 "Accessing Information or Materials" rules included, bringing in own paper which happened 13 times; using an electronic translator, 17 times; using a mobile phone, 18 times; bringing in notes, 41 times; using book(s), once. Rules relating to "Influencing/Assisting or Hindering" are, disturbing or communicating with other students, which happened 11 times and 26 times respectively. "Not following Instructions" rules are,

drawing or writing rude notes on the answer paper, happened 20 times; continuing to write after exam has finished, eight times; listening to a music player, four times; prematurely starting the exam, four times; refusing to stay under supervision, two times; cheating (includes attempts to), 12 times; altering an answer booklet then getting it reconsidered, once. An Information Management external exam had to be held over several sessions due to low resources. All students were required to remain in a secure environment for 30 minutes after the exam following theirs had started, two did not which was considered a breach of the rules. And seven peoples' submitted portfolios had authenticity issues.

"Forms of Misconduct" was changed in 2005, so the definitions have slightly changed.

Out of 132,241 students sitting exams, 208 of them broke the external exam rules.

95 of those students had some of their results withheld and only one person had all of his exam results withheld, for a year. The other students, 112, received written warnings.

89 students were investigated for "Accessing Information or Materials"; 13 for having a cellphone with them; 40 for having notes in the exam; 13 for copying, or attempting to copy, other students work and four were investigated for altering their answer booklet and then having it reconsidered. 70 students were investigated for "Not following Instructions"; 47 for writing rude messages on the answer booklet and/or drawing rude pictures. 14 students were investigated for "Influencing/Assisting or Hindering". 29 students were investigated for "Performance Based Authenticity",

which is where a group of students work looks very similar to the other.

Only one student was investigated for "Impersonating another candidate".

Air New Zealand movie censored the word God January 10, 2007

Air New Zealand, national airline of New Zealand, played the movie *The Queen* in-flight where a bleep occurred when someone said "God". However in another in-flight movie, *The Departed*, a lot of swearing occurred but it wasn't censored at all, according to a passenger.

Both of the movies were played on the same Air New Zealand flight from New Zealand to London.

Pam Wong, spokesperson for Air New Zealand, claimed that they had been given the wrong version of the film, *The Queen*, starring Helen Mirren.

Air New Zealand has apologised for playing the censored film, stating that it is not Air New Zealand policy to censor any words.

Ms Wong said: "We don't have a policy of censoring any of our material because we have parental locks on movies with extreme violence or inappropriate language. A 'new version' should be available soon."

Peter Jackson banned from working with New Line January 12, 2007

Movie studio company, New Line Cinema has announced that movie director Peter Jackson will never be allowed to work on another New Line film. This announcement will also mean that Mr Jackson will not be allowed to film the prequel titled *The Hobbit* to *The Lord of the Rings* films he directed.

The announcement was made mainly because New Zealander Mr Jackson and his partner, Fran Walsh, filed a law suit against New Line in 2005 as they believed New Line owed them much more money than they received for *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy as shown to them by a partial audit of *The Fellowship of the Ring*. Mr Jackson described it as "financial anomalies," which New Line refused to account for. "Fundamentally, our legal action is about holding New Line to its contractual obligations and promises." The film trilogies have so far managed to earn US\$3 billion in ticket sales since 2001.

New Line has repeatedly refused permission for Mr Jackson to audit the other films in the trilogy *The Two Towers*, and *The Return of the King*, even though Mr Jackson described film auditing as a common practice. "We don't understand why New Line Cinema has taken this position," Mr Jackson said.

In an interview with the *Sci Fi Wire*, Robert Shaye, co-chairman of New Line and executive producer of *The Lord of the Rings*, said that New Line does not want to do any films, including *The Hobbit*, with Mr Jackson in the future. "I do not want to make a movie with somebody who is suing me. It will never happen during my watch."

"I don't care about Peter Jackson anymore. He wants to have another \$100 million or \$50 million, whatever he's suing us for," Mr Shaye said.

Mr Shaye said he has been offended by the lawsuit brought to his company by Mr Jackson. "He got a quarter of a billion dollars paid to him so far, justifiable, according to contract, completely right, [but then] turns around without wanting to have a discussion with us and sues us and

refuses to discuss it unless we just give in to his plan."

However Mr Jackson claims that he had been trying to discuss it with New Line, saying: "We attempted to discuss the issues raised with New Line for over a year but the studio was and continues to be completely uncooperative. ... Nobody likes taking legal action, but the studio left us with no alternative."

Mr Jackson has said that he has and will continue to have the highest respect and affection for Mr Shaye and has said that he regrets he has taken the lawsuit personally.

"[Jackson's] either had very poor counsel or is completely misinformed and myopic to think that I care whether I give him [anything]," Mr Shaye said.

Mr Shaye has said he is disappointed that many of the stars in The Lord of the Rings trilogy had refused to celebrate New Line's 40th anniversary. Mr Jackson said that the reason for that was probably because Mr Shaye had issues with the cast years before the lawsuit arose.

About Wikinews

We are a group of volunteer journalists whose mission is to create a diverse community where citizens from around the globe (including **you**) can collaborate to report the news on a wide variety of current events. By making our content perpetually available for free redistribution and use, we hope to contribute to a global digital commons.

If you would like to write for Wikinews then please go to: en.wikinews.org

**Got news and no computer?
Call the Wikinews Hotline**
+1-202-742-5918
(outside the U.S.)

License



This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 2.5 License. Articles appearing in this Print Edition were published on the English Wikinews website.

To view a copy of this license, visit:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.5/>
or send a letter to
Creative Commons
543 Howard Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, California, 94105, USA