

Privative clause

- A privative clause is a provision in a statute that aims to prevent or restrict judicial review of administrative or other action, even if that action is flawed or illegal.
- Privative clauses are often found in the most litigated areas, for example
 - Migration Act 1958 (Cth), s 474 (*Plaintiff S157/2002 v Cth* (2003))
 - s 179 Industrial Relations Act (*Kirk v Industrial Court of NSW* (2010))

Reasons for Caution around PC?

- Undermines:
 - fundamental duty of courts to ensure public power is exercised according to law
 - separation of powers
 - right of individual to enforce their legal rights in court
 - human rights protections
- Increases:
 - government power without any check or accountability measure
 - parliamentary sovereignty at expense of rule of law
- Therefore it would appear unconstitutional to seek to deprive the High Court jurisdiction to require officers of the commonwealth to act within the law.

Rationales for Privative Clauses?

- Frees up government to make policy choices free from judicial scrutiny.
- Reduces:
 - high volume of court challenges
 - incentive to mount challenge in order to delay
 - cost of administration of justice
- Enhances:
 - certainty of administrative decisions
 - parliamentary sovereignty

Court's approach to PC (Cth)

- Courts have taken a very restrictive (and highly creative) interpretation of privative clauses.
- Cth Constitution ('CC').
 - The s 75(v) Cth Constitution has been interpreted as providing for an '**entrenched minimum provision of judicial review**' that must be respected by both Cth and State Parliaments.
 - If read **literally**, any statutory attempt to prevent the issue of these named remedies would be rendered invalid.
 - Yet, PC's interpreted creatively as consistent with CC (despite their terms) to preserve their validity.
 - Current position: Parliament cannot deprive HC of its original jurisdiction to issue the constitutional remedies on the basis of a jurisdictional error
 - This battle will keep going