

18 November 2021

New Zealand Productivity Commission

PO Box 8036

The Terrace, Wellington 6143

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to provide my comments on *Immigration: A fit for the future*. Due to the limited time, I would only comment on two main draft recommendations:

- (1) Formally recognising efforts to learn te reo in decisions about residence or permanent residence; and
- (2) Limiting rights to return for permanent residents who leave.

Comment for (1):

Who is not an immigrant in NZ?

Treaty of Waitangi has two signatory parties: the Crown; and the Māori. Both parties have privileges and obligations. Before we formally become the Crown's subjects (NZ citizens), we, as new immigrants, are not a signatory party of the concerned treaty. We may try to dive into your society, ONLY based on curtesy. We immigrants do not have the historical burden, so please do not take us to share your loads.

Additionally, NZ is a country with over 160 ethnic groups (having more than 100 people) living in New Zealand. According to Human Rights Act, all ethnic groups have equal rights. Therefore, all ethnic groups' cultures shall carry equal weights. Can you require resident applicants to learn all these cultures and languages?

We all come to this land to seek new lives, and the only difference among us is the time of coming (someone earlier, someone later). Since NZ has people living on its land, who is not an immigrant?

Besides, if your Commission so much cares about te reo, please also publish all consultation documents (including this one) in the Māori language.

I would recommend withdrawing this unfair recommendation which also lacks legality.

Comment for (2):

Don't be harsh to people who are rigorously selected, and don't be too confident about NZ's attractiveness

When you reach the conclusion of limiting returning rights of permanent residents, have you considered:

- (a) What is the leaving rate of citizens who obtain their citizenship by grant? And how is it compared with the leaving rate of permanent residents?

I would recommend tightening up the requirements of being a citizen by grant, rather than being harsh on permanent residents.

- (b) When permanent residents have no ultimate returning rights, what is NZ's attractiveness regarding

immigration?

Take an example: an AU resident or citizen can enter into NZ as a resident automatically, while NZ has no choice in most cases. Will competent people still consider NZ as their primary choice of migration? Why not choose AU first? Look at these fascinating advertisements:

AU residency = AU residency + NZ residency as a giveaway

OR

One Visa, Two Countries

Among all common migration countries (CA, AU, US), what is NZ's outstanding advantages after removing ultimate returning rights? (Ratio of income/housing price? Comprehensiveness of labour market? Good education system? Resilience in supply chain?)

I would recommend removing the automatic residency grant for AU citizens and residents.

(c) Why not extend the time needed to be a permanent resident?

Currently, transferring from a resident to a permanent resident requires 2 years only.

I would recommend two options:

- Option A: How about extending it to 5 years? (such as: staying in NZ 183 days or more per year in past 5 years, then a resident can be granted by permanent residency with ultimate returning rights)
- Option B: Use a staged residency plan: initial resident visa (holding for 2 years) -> subsequent resident visa (holding for 2 more years) -> permanent resident with ultimate returning rights

Regards,

Tianyu Xu