AUSTRALIAN CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Examinable topics

- Judicial power Ch III
- Characterisation
- Acquisition of power s 51 (xxxi)
- Executive power and nationhood
- Federalism: state constitutions and melb corp
- External affairs
- S 109 Inconsistency of laws
- Implied freedom of political communication
- S 80 and trial by jury/religious freedom

Approach

- Issue (use as a subheading)
- Facts (in Con law these can include clauses within legislation as well as material facts)
- Rule(s) (cite the relevant section of the constitution, caselaw (might be conflicting judicial opinion) and legal doctrine)
- Application (of rule(s) to facts)
- Conclusion (explain the most 'probable' or 'likely' outcome)

TIPS

RULES: The relevant landmark cases discussing ISSUE e.g. judicial power are... Be careful not to start applying the law. Demonstrate you know what the law is first.

- Cite the broadest/test cases where the courts haven't really fleshed out all the issues.
- But in APPLICATION, you may compare other situations where this rule has arisen, more specific situations.

CONCLUSION: always talk in probable terms, never CERTAIN.

- Can use minority argument but assert majority argument, but acknowledge that there may be good policy/ethical views that would support the minority decision
- Consider important issues i.e. s 109 even if it is cancelled out midway

Answering a question

- 1. Judicial/Executive Power
- 2. Characterisation

Heads of power:

- a. Trade and commerce
- b. Implied incidental power
- c. Acquisition
- d. Nationhood
- e. External affairs
- 3. Constitutional limitations
 - a) Acquisition on just terms: s 51 (xxxi)
 - b) Cth laws and the States
 - i. Melbourne Corporation- intergovernmental immunities
 - c) State laws and the Cth
 - i. Implied immunity of instrumentalities doctrine- Cigamatic): ss. 109 & 5

- d) Trial by jury: s 80
- e) Implied freedom of political communication: ss 7, 24 & 128
- 4. S 109

Testing for inconsistency

- **1. Are both laws valid?** i.e. are they constitutional?
 - Valid and operative
- 2. Test for inconsistency (first two are 'direct' inconsistency, third is 'indirect'
 - a) Textual collision: impossible to obey both
 - **b) Rights + Duties**: possible to obey both but takes away some right conferred by one, talking about the same thing but set a different standard
 - c) Cover the field: looking at intention of Cth act
 - o Can be split into express and implied intention
 - Only talk about cover the field where there is a question whether Cth is trying to cover the field.

NOTE: choose one of them and prove inconsistency, don't prove them all

Is Cth Act valid?

- 1. Identify head/heads of power
- **2.** Characterisation: does this Act fit within the head/s of power?
 - **Subject matter power** → sufficient connection
 - Purpose power i.e. defence power, external affairs (treaties), nationhood power (implied) → proportionality 'reasonably appropriate and adapted' to fulfil the purpose of the head of power e.g. Is this law reasonably and appropriately adapted to protect us?
 - Incidental power → is it reasonably necessary to fulfil the head of power?
- **3. Limitations**: is there some limitation that makes this Act forbidden? E.g. s 92 trade amongst the states must be absolutely free, separation of powers
- **4. Read down** ignore the unconstitutional interpretation, interpret it as intended in a constitutional way (but only if it was truly intended that way)
- **5. Sever** remove the part of the Act that is unconstitutional- can't take words out within a section but can remove entire sections

NOTE: Think of 'read down' as you move down the steps, only consider 'sever' at the end! Do the steps for EACH section of the Act in question.

Is State Act valid?

- **1.** Plenary power (Union Steamships) → full power, States don't need to tag it with a specific HOP
 - A State (NSW in this case), can pass laws on ______ because it has plenary power (*Union Steamships v King*).
- 2. Limitations
- 3. Read down/sever