

Week 1 - Introduction

- Section 2 *Constitution Act 1902* (NSW)
 - Recognises Aboriginal peoples as traditional custodians and occupants of the land of NSW and spiritual, social, cultural and economic relationship with their traditional lands & waters.
- Constitution **does not recognise this**
- High Court of Australia ('HCA') hours principles embedded into Australian Constitution
- HCA = **originalist** (prudent) vs South Africa High Court (transformative).
- Ronald Dworkin (Freedom's Law) is impossible to have a judge of a Supreme Court / High Court, that is **not political**.
- Australia's High Court is more rigid** vs activist in other countries.
- Interpretation**
- The Text (provision)**
 - Context is important when reading text. Especially when strong legal opinion is (especially important in Australia, as constitution is old).
- Principle**
 - To find a principle, we need to make a construction.
- Constitutional Practice**
 - What Judges have said about the meaning of the constitutional text
- These three elements allow for construction (interpretation)
- Living Theory of Constitution**
- Created in Canada
- Views the Constitution as a 'living thing' whose nature adapts, and the nature of it adapts over time
- Popular in United States:** 1920's Supreme Court wanted to maintain economic liberalism

Week 2 - Indigenous Peoples and the Constitution

- Sovereignty** = supreme authority in a territory
- Clash of sovereignty during the English colonisation
- The concept is tied to political power and authority, often determined through military might or control.
- Sovereignty in legal and political contexts often differs, with Indigenous notions of sovereignty incorporating cultural and spiritual dimensions, emphasizing the ancestral connection to the land.
- Indigenous Sovereignty**
- The Landing: **26 Jan 1788**
 - Governor Arthur Phillip arrives with First Fleet: **declares British sovereignty**
 - Established colony of NSW
 - Terra Nullius: Fiction that **land was uninhabited** because Indigenous peoples had no pre-existing systems of laws.
 - Indigenous people **never ceded sovereignty** to the British (no treaties etc).

- James Cook was originally instructed to 'take possession of convenient situations with consent of the natives'.
- Arthur Phillip was instructed to 'by every possible means, to open an intercourse with the natives, and to conciliate their affections, enjoining all our subjects to live in **amity and kindness with them**.

- Colonisation

- Edward Wilson (1856): 'In less than twenty years, we have nearly swept them off the face of the Earth'
- Lack of Consent and Sovereignty**
- R v Ballard* (1829) - **Justice Dowling**: I know of no reason human or divine which ought to justify us interfering with their institutions even if such interference would be practicable
- R v Bonjon* (1841) – Willis J urged that treaties should be made with Indigenous peoples
- Section 51(xxvi) - The Race Power**
 - The Parliament shall, subject to this Constitution, have power to make laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to (xxvi): the people of any race, other than the aboriginal race in any State for whom it is deemed necessary to make special laws.

Reference to **Aboriginal race was removed in 1967 referendum**

Constitution & Discrimination Against Indigenous Australians

- Laws denying right to vote
 - Laws and policies enabling unequal wages
 - Restrictionist policies (controlled where they could live, who they could marry, property rights etc). – *White Australia Policy*
 - Policy banning languages
 - Laws preventing ATSI people being paid welfare (e.g *Tuberculosis Act* **prevented Indigenous TB patients from** accessing welfare support)

Major Formal Constitutional Change Examples

- Change via legislation and policy practice**
 - S 28 Constitution contemplates banning races of voting
 - rendered inoperative largely by the ***Racial Discrimination Act 1975 (Cth)***. *Roach and* how voting rights decisions suggest that the franchise can now no longer be significantly wound back, demonstrating how legislative change and judicial interp of the *Constitution* can combine to effect formal change.
 - Additional example = S 113 state may make anything but gold and silver coin a legal tender in payment of debts) – **challenges under this basis re payment electronically** have been struck out.
- Via Constitutional Conventions**
 - Republic issue = **gradual diminishment of Britain's influence**, and the ceremonial nature of the G-G as rep of Monarch.
 - Informal evolution = **Monarch and G-G's has been Australianised**: is there any need for formal change?
 - E.g **British King** titled 'King of Australia' under *Royal Style and Titles Act 1973*, also removed references to UK.

<p>Should Australia become a Republic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Australia has taken steps toward independence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1986 <i>Australia Acts</i> severed most remaining ties with U.K ○ Function of King's domestic reps have diminished (role of G-G) ○ G-G is the de-facto HoS; King a symbol • President would replace Governor General. • Minimalist Models <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Appointed by Gvnmt except w/o involvement of the C. ○ McGarvie Model (1991): Council of senior Govts could act on PM's advice to select President. • Parliamentary Models <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Two-thirds parliamentary appointment - (UK) model. • Popularly Elected Model <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elected by the people. Considered appropriate, as G-G role is perceived to be political, whereas President is; could lead to power struggles etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Indigenous Advocacy Cases <i>Sea and Submerged Lands Case (1975)</i>: Asserted that "the acquisition of territory by a sovereign state for the first time is an act of state which cannot be challenged by the Courts of that state". 1979 Coe (No.1): Held there was no Aboriginal nation exercising sovereignty in Australia 1992 Mabo (No. 2): Recognised Native Title, however held that the issue of surviving Indigenous sovereignty is not justiciable in an Australian court [50] 1993 Coe (No 2): Rejected the claim that the Wiradjuri people were a sovereign nation, a line of argument seen in the U.S Koowarta (1982): Related to the Racial Discrimination Act, highlighting the use of the "race power" by the federal government and the lack of constitutional protection against racial discrimination • Recognition in other Constitutions • Rights guarantees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bill of rights (Canada guarantees Aboriginal and treaty rights) 1. Representative mechanisms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. I.e Maori people have reserved parliament seats b. Finland & Norway have advisory bodies 2. Cultural and Language Recognition
<p>Arguments For</p> <p>Maintaining the King maintains colonialism, inappropriate</p> <p>Modernisation: Australia must shed its Imperial past and become a proud, independent nation (Jones).</p> <p>The King is too remote: Inadequate as a symbol to reflect Australian identity (Keating).</p> <p>Crown symbolism is outdated: Undemocratic, aristocratic, sexist, sectarian, and unsuitable for a modern nation (Fidler).</p> <p>Need to fill a symbolic vacuum: Provides a clear national identity (Jones & McKenna).</p> <p>Maturity of government: A republic represents Australia taking responsibility for its own affairs, rather than maintaining a parent-child relationship with Britain (Keating).</p> <p>Public Support: Australian Republic Movement's 2023 research found 92% of Australians are opposed to a republic with 60% preferring an Australian head of state over King Charles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. South African constitution recognises indigenous languages b. New Zealand recognises Maori as national language 3. Agreement Making & Treaties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Canada, US, Treaty of Waitangi (NZ) b. Australia displays this through <i>Native Title Act</i> etc. - Discriminatory Provisions in Australian Constitution
<p>Arguments Against</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for change: Australia has a stable, successful Constitution—why alter it? • Proven success of constitutional monarchy: Four of the six oldest continuous democracies (Belgium, Canada, Sweden, Australia) operate under this system. • Uncertainty of change: Republican reform could introduce complexity and instability—better to maintain the tested system. • Independence already achieved: Australia's status as an independent nation does not require becoming a republic. • Symbolic change, not practical necessity: Michael Kirby argues republicans focus on symbols rather than constitutional realities. • Distraction from real issues: Reforming the system diverts attention from more pressing national concerns. <p>- The 1999 republic referendum failed due to divisions among republicans → some supported a parliamentary-appointed President, while others preferred direct election, leading to a split that monarchists exploited.</p> <p>- The final referendum result was 55% No and 45% Yes, rejecting the move to replace the Queen and Governor-General with a parliament-appointed President.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S.25 - Contemplates banning races from voting • S.51 (xxvi) - Gives Parliament power to make race-based laws (originally excluded ATSI) • S.127 - REPEALED: provided Aboriginal people were not counted as population for voting purposes • Korner Case (1998) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unclear and uncertain decision ○ Argued that law making power under s. 51 (xxvi) could be used to create laws that both were both advantageous and disadvantageous to ATSI Australians • Koowarta Case (1982) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Koowarta argued against the Government's refusal to allow Aboriginal Land Fund to purchase large tract of land and violated the <i>Racial Discrimination Act 1975</i> ○ HCA upheld the ALFA as an exercise of C-wealth's power to make laws with respect to external affairs under s. 51(xxxix) ○ Queen's Gov's policy breached the RDA, as it was discriminatory.
<p>Aus Republic Movement's 2023 Proposal</p> <p>- Outlines the "Australian choice" model, detailing a process where candidates for Head of State are nominated by parliaments, elected by the people, and held accountable.</p> <p>- The proposal presents a structured approach to transitioning to a republic, emphasizing democratic involvement and the responsibilities of the Head of State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kruger (1997) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The High Court confirmed the absence of equality before the law under the Constitution, allowing discriminatory laws towards Indigenous people. ○ If the Ordinance enabled the state to act beyond constitutional remit of the Parliament/Government
<p>Changing the Constitution Preamble</p> <p>- The preamble of the Australian Constitution is considered outdated, failing to acknowledge Indigenous peoples and Western Australia, prompting calls for change.</p> <p>- Two options for reform: altering the UK Constitution Act or introducing a new preamble via referendum to better reflect modern values and historical context.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mabo No. 1 (1988) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Queensland Government had passed the <i>Queensland Coast Islands Declaratory Act 1985</i> to extinguish Meriam people's rights to the islands.
<p>Section 44 – Disqualification of being elected to Parliament for Dual-Citizens</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCA ruling in Re Canavan (2017) set strict liability disqualification criteria under s 44(i) for Parliament members holding foreign citizenship at nomination, regardless of intent or knowledge. 15+ MP's & Senators disqualified from Plmt • Disqualification depends on foreign citizenship laws, with a narrow exception for individuals who took all reasonable steps to renounce but faced legal or practical barriers from other country. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mabo No. 2 (1992) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Overturned the doctrine of terra nullius (found to be wrong): HCA held that Indigenous rights to land could survive the acquisition of sovereignty by British, where the Crown had not already extinguished said rights ○ Confirmed indigenous sovereignty was a non-justiciable issue in domestic courts. ○ <i>Native Title Act 1993</i> was subsequently passed to give common law recog of native title.
<p>Referendum success = bipartisanship, proposal, need for change (that galvanises public), combat disinformation.</p>	