Overview of the Australian System of Public Law

- <u>UK:</u> unwritten constitution, parliamentary sovereignty, responsible/representative government, political constitutionalism, constitutional monarchy, conventions.
- <u>US:</u> written constitution, federalism, separation of powers, legal constitutionalism, judicial review, bicameralism.
- <u>Sir Ivor Jennings (1959: 33)</u>: 'constitution' = a document setting out "the rules governing the composition, powers and method of operation of the main institutions of government and the general principles applicable to their relations to the citizens."
- James Bryce (1901), adopted by Dicey (1959): flexible and rigid constitutions.
- <u>Goldsworthy (2007):</u> legal authority from UK Parliament, political authority from people of colonies; federalism from America, responsible government and rights from UK.
- <u>Baron de Montesquieu (1949: 150):</u> "Political liberty is to be found only where there is no abuse of power."
- <u>Phillips and Jackson (1987):</u> true distinction between powers in their procedure rather than nature; complete separation of powers not possible, rather a check of one power by another.
- <u>Williams (2001: 376):</u> "Judicial review involves the High Court assessing governmental action for consistency with the Constitution"; pros and cons of judicial review.
- <u>Administrative Review Council (2012):</u> four mechanisms for review of administrative government: internal and external merits review, administrative investigation (Ombudsman) and judicial review.

Constitutionalism and the Rule of Law

- Political constitutionalism:

 Tomkins (2003: 18): "those who exercise political power... are held to constitutional account through political means, and through political institutions."

- Legal constitutionalism:

 Tomkins (2003: 19): "the principal means and the principal institution, through which the government is held to account is the law and the court-room."

- Rule of law:

- o <u>Tamanaha (2004):</u> definition of rule of law is contested; formal v. substantial theories of rule of law.
- Dicey (1959): three meanings of rule of law:
- Supremacy of regular law cf. arbitrary power
- Equality before the law
- Constitution is the consequence of individual rights defined by common law courts.
- o <u>Tamanaha (2004):</u> rule of law is not a legal mechanism but a political ideal.
- o Sir Ninian Stephen (2003: 8): four principles:

- Government should be under law
- Judges independent of government
- Ready access to courts
- Laws certain, general and equal

o Tamanaha (2004):

- Government limited by law
- Formal legality
- Rule of law, not man
- o <u>Turpin and Tomkins (2007):</u> accountability has a link with democracy and rule of law.

A 'Washminster' Hybrid

- UK:

- 13-15th century: Anglo-Saxon kings and development of Parliament
- 15-17th century: Tudor period and development of parliamentary as consultative assembly
- o <u>1628:</u> "the competing demands for supremacy by King and Parliament were irreconcilable" (58).
- o 1629-40: Eleven Years' Tyranny
- o <u>1640s:</u> English Civil War; victory of the parliamentary forces and execution of Charles I.
- o <u>Interregnum:</u> failed to produce an alternative.
- o 1660: Monarchy restored with Charles II
- o <u>1688:</u> Bloodless Revolution; Parliament as supreme law-maker; *Bill of Rights 1688* (Eng).
- 1701: Act of Settlement 1701 (Eng); King compelled to govern through Parliament and accept independence of judiciary.
- 1867: Reform Act 1867 doubled size of electorate, centralised and modernised political parties; constitutional conventions developed.
- o 19th century: decline of monarchical involvement, rise of cabinet, formalisation of parties → representative and responsible government.

- US:

- o 1775: War of Independence
- o <u>1776:</u> Declaration of Independence
- o <u>1783:</u> Treaty of Paris 1783; colonialists win
- $\circ \quad \underline{1777\text{-}81\text{:}} \text{ Articles of Confederation adopted}$
- <u>1787-90:</u> Constitution of the United States of America drafted and adopted.
- Horizontal division of powers: "breaking up of power across the three arms of government" (80).
- <u>Vertical division of powers:</u> between state and federal governments.
- Burgess (2006: 57): "the significant contribution of The Federalist was 'the presentation and

justification of a new form of government, neither federal nor national, but an admixture of both characters."

Political and Legal Constitutionalism

- Dicey (1959):
- "Parliamentary sovereignty means that Parliament thus defined has... the right to make or unmake any law whatever, and... no person or body is recognised... as having a right to override or set aside the legislation of Parliament" (39-40).
- "bounded or controlled by two limitations" (76)
- From within, because the legislature is the product of a certain social condition (81)
- the power of imposing laws is dependent upon the instinct of subordination (81)
- <u>Goldsworthy (1999: 234):</u> 10 reasons for accepting Parliamentary sovereignty
- <u>Allan (1993: 290):</u> "The limits of legislative supremecy are to be discovered, then, in that deeper constitutional morality from which the rule of law derives its strength and virtue."
- <u>R (Jackson) v Attorney-General [2006]</u> per Lord Steyn: "The supremacy of Parliament is still the general principle of our constitution. It is a construct of the common law."
- <u>Dicey (1959: 407)</u>: "The command of Parliament... always take the shape of formal and deliberative legislation."
- Judge's statutory interpretation the most effective means of reconciling Parliamentary sovereignty with rule of law (e.g. *Potter v Minahan*).
- <u>Marbury v Madison (1803) (US) per Marshall CJ:</u> Constitution is "the fundamental and paramount law" and courts have the power to strike down legislations repugnant to the Constitution.
- Lucas (1966): Supreme Court an effective check
- <u>Hamilton (1987)</u>: The judiciary best suited to interpret the Constitution; "It may truly be said to have neither FORCE nor WILL but merely judgment."
- <u>Stone (2008)</u>: rights-based judicial review v. structural judicial review.
- <u>Gardbaum (2013)</u>: pros and cons of political and legal constitutionalism
- <u>French (2009):</u> Legal constitutionalism in Australia through judicial review and statutory interpretation
- <u>Saunders and Le Roy (2003)</u>: rule of law, Parliament and courts.