STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUSTICE AND COMMUNITY SAFETY (LEGISLATIVE SCRUTINY ROLE)

SCRUTINY REPORT 32

11 MAY 2015

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Mr Steve Doszpot MLA (Chair)

Dr Chris Bourke MLA (Deputy Chair)

Mr Jeremy Hanson CSC MLA

Ms Mary Porter AM, MLA

SECRETARIAT

Ms Janice Rafferty (Acting Secretary)

Ms Joanne Cullen (Acting Assistant Secretary)

Mr Peter Bayne (Legal Adviser—Bills)

Mr Stephen Argument (Legal Adviser—Subordinate Legislation)

CONTACT INFORMATION

Telephone	02 6205 0173
Facsimile	02 6205 3109
Post	GPO Box 1020, CANBERRA ACT 2601
Email	scrutiny@parliament.act.gov.au
Website	www.parliament.act.gov.au

ROLE OF COMMITTEE

The Committee examines all Bills and subordinate legislation presented to the Assembly. It does not make any comments on the policy aspects of the legislation. The Committee's terms of reference contain principles of scrutiny that enable it to operate in the best traditions of totally non-partisan, non-political technical scrutiny of legislation. These traditions have been adopted, without exception, by all scrutiny committees in Australia. Non-partisan, non-policy scrutiny allows the Committee to help the Assembly pass into law Acts and subordinate legislation which comply with the ideals set out in its terms of reference.

RESOLUTION OF APPOINTMENT

The Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety when performing its legislative scrutiny role shall:

(1) consider whether any instrument of a legislative nature made under an Act which is subject to disallowance and/or disapproval by the Assembly (including a regulation, rule or by-law):

  (a) is in accord with the general objects of the Act under which it is made;

  (b) unduly trespasses on rights previously established by law;

  (c) makes rights, liberties and/or obligations unduly dependent upon non-reviewable decisions; or

  (d) contains matter which in the opinion of the Committee should properly be dealt with in an Act of the Legislative Assembly;

(2) consider whether any explanatory statement or explanatory memorandum associated with legislation and any regulatory impact statement meets the technical or stylistic standards expected by the Committee;

(3) consider whether the clauses of bills (and amendments proposed by the Government to its own bills) introduced into the Assembly:

  (a) unduly trespass on personal rights and liberties;

  (b) make rights, liberties and/or obligations unduly dependent upon insufficiently defined administrative powers;

  (c) make rights, liberties and/or obligations unduly dependent upon non-reviewable decisions;

  (d) inappropriately delegate legislative powers; or

  (e) insufficiently subject the exercise of legislative power to parliamentary scrutiny;

(4) report to the Legislative Assembly about human rights issues raised by bills presented to the Assembly pursuant to section 38 of the *Human Rights Act 2004*;

(5) report to the Assembly on these or any related matter and if the Assembly is not sitting when the Committee is ready to report on bills and subordinate legislation, the Committee may send its report to the Speaker, or, in the absence of the Speaker, to the Deputy Speaker, who is authorised to give directions for its printing, publication and circulation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

DISALLOWABLE INSTRUMENTS—NO COMMENT

The Committee has examined the following disallowable instruments and offers no comment on them:

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-36 being the Architects Board Appointment 2015 (No. 1) made under subsection 70(2) of the *Architects Act 2004* **appoints a specified person to the Australian Capital Territory Architects Board as the academic architect member.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-40 being the Civil Law (Wrongs) Professional Standards Council Appointment 2015 (No. 2) made under Schedule 4, section 4.38 of the *Civil Law (Wrongs) Act 2002* **appoints a specified person to be a member of the Professional Standards Council, representing Victoria.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-42 being the Civil Law (Wrongs) Professional Standards Council Appointment 2015 (No. 1) made under Schedule 4, section 4.38 of the *Civil Law (Wrongs) Act 2002* **appoints specified persons to be members of the Professional Standards Council, representing Queensland and New South Wales.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-43 being the Civil Law (Wrongs) Professional Standards Council Appointment 2015 (No. 3) made under Schedule 4, section 4.38 of the *Civil Law (Wrongs) Act 2002* **appoints specified persons to be chairperson and members of the Professional Standards Council, representing South Australia, the Northern Territory and New South Wales.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-44 being the Utilities (Technical Regulation) Listed Dams Determination 2015 (No. 1) made under section 69 of the *Utilities (Technical Regulation) Act 2014* **declares that specified dams owned and leased by Icon Water to be listed dams.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-45 being the Electoral (Electoral Commissioner) Appointment 2015 made under section 12 of the *Electoral Act 1992* **appoints a specified person as the Electoral Commissioner.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-46 being the Taxation Administration (Amounts payable—Utilities (Network Facilities Tax)) Determination 2015 (No. 1) made under section 139 of the *Taxation Administration Act 1999* **revokes DI2014-17 and determines a new rate for the calculation of Utilities (Network Facilities Tax) payable under the *Utilities (Network Facilities Tax) Act 2006.***

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-47 being the Taxation Administration (Special Arrangements for Making Returns) Revocation 2015 made under section 42 of the *Taxation Administration Act 1999* **revokes DI2001-36, being the Taxation Administration (Special Arrangements for Making Returns) Approval 2001.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-48 being the Public Place Names (Moncrieff) Determination 2015 (No. 2) made under section 3 of the *Public Place Names Act 1989* **determines the names of five roads in the Division of Moncrieff.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-49 being the Long Service Leave (Portable Schemes) Governing Board Appointment 2015 (No. 1) made under section 79E of the *Long Service Leave (Portable Schemes) Act 2009* **and section 78 of the** *Financial Management Act 1996* **revokes DI2012-122 and appoints a specified person as a member of the Long Service Leave Governing Board, representing employee organisations.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-50 being the Road Transport (General) Application of Road Transport Legislation Declaration 2015 (No. 3) made under section 12 of the *Road Transport (General) Act 1999* **declares that the road transport legislation does not apply to a road or road related area that is a special stage of the Blue Range Rally Sprint.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-66 being the Financial Management (Directorates) Guidelines 2015 (No. 1) made under section 133 of the *Financial Management Act 1996* **revokes DI2014-52 and prescribes certain directorates for the purposes of the Act.**

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-67 being the Financial Management (Territory Authorities) Guidelines 2015 (No. 1) made under section 133 of the *Financial Management Act 1996* **revokes DI2012-4 and prescribes the entities that are territory authorities for the purposes of the Act.**

SUBORDINATE LAWS—COMMENT

The Committee has examined the following subordinate law and offers these comments on it:

Issues arising from the Explanatory Statement / Human rights issues

Subordinate Law SL2015-10 being the Dangerous Substances (General) Amendment Regulation 2015 (No. 1) made under the *Dangerous Substances Act 2004* **requires owners of residential properties affected by loose-fill asbestos insulation to have an inspection, by a licensed asbestos assessor, of the living areas of the premises.**

This subordinate law amends the *Dangerous Substances (General) Regulation 2004*, to impose on the owners of residential premises that are affected by asbestos contamination, to require those homeowners to have an inspection of the living areas of the premises for loose-fill asbestos contamination. The Explanatory Statement for the subordinate law states:

> The purpose of the Amending Regulation is to require those homeowners of affected residential premises to have an inspection of the living areas of the premises for loose-fill asbestos contamination and to have this inspection by 15 May 2015.

The Committee notes that 15 May 2015 is the commencement date for the subordinate law. However, it is not clear from the substance of the subordinate law how the Explanatory Statement can state that the inspections must be completed by 15 May 2015.

The Committee seeks the Minister's advice as to how the Explanatory Statement can state that inspections must be completed by 15 May 2015.

In making this comment, the Committee notes that a later subordinate law, the Dangerous Substances (General) Amendment Regulation 2015 (No. 2) (SL2015-13) refers back to – and, indeed, re-makes some of the amendments made by – this subordinate law. However, it is not apparent how this later subordinate law, which commences on 1 February 2016, assists in relation to the issue identified immediately above.

The Committee also notes that Explanatory Statement for the subordinate law also states that the new requirements imposed by this subordinate law are intended to give effect to the purposes of the *Dangerous Substances Act 2004*, in relation to the identification of hazards.

The Explanatory Statement goes on to offer the following statement in relation to the possible human rights implications of the subordinate law:

> Human Rights Implications
>
> The Amendment Regulation may engage section 12(a) of the *Human Rights Act 2004*. That section requires that everyone has the right not to have his or her privacy, family, home or correspondence interfered with unlawfully or arbitrarily. The Amendment Regulation is not an arbitrary or unlawful interference with the right. In any case, the limitation on the right is reasonable and may be justified on the basis of a valid public purpose in managing the health risks associated with a dangerous substance. The Amendment Regulation's potential interference with the human right is minimal and the importance of its purpose is such that the limitation is reasonable.

The Committee draws the attention of the Legislative Assembly to this explanation.

This comment does not require a response from the Minister.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES

The Committee has received a response from:

- The Attorney-General, dated 6 May 2015, in relation to comments made in Scrutiny Report 31 concerning the Human Rights Amendment Bill 2015 (attached).

The Committee wishes to thank the Attorney-General for his helpful response.

Steve Doszpot MLA
Chair

11 May 2015

OUTSTANDING RESPONSES

BILLS/SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

Report 3, dated 25 February 2013

Disallowable Instrument DI2013-5—Road Transport (Third-Party Insurance) Early Payment Guidelines 2013 (No. 1)

Report 20, dated 31 July 2014

Red Tape Reduction Legislation Amendment Bill 2014

Report 27, dated 3 February 2015

Disallowable Instrument DI2014-284 - Gene Technology (GM Crop Moratorium) Advisory Council Member Appointment 2014 (No. 1)

Public Sector Bill 2014

Report 31, dated 28 April 2015

Disallowable Instrument DI2015-41 - Crimes (Sentence Administration) (Sentence Administration Board) Appointment 2015 (No. 1)

Simon Corbell MLA

DEPUTY CHIEF MINISTER

ATTORNEY-GENERAL
MINISTER FOR HEALTH
MINISTER FOR THE ENVIRONMENT
MINISTER FOR CAPITAL METRO

MEMBER FOR MOLONGLO

Mr Steve Doszpot MLA
Chair
Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety
ACT Legislative Assembly
London Circuit
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Dear Mr Doszpot

Thank you for Scrutiny of Bills Report No. 31 of 28 April 2015. I offer the following response in relation to the Committee's comments on the Human Rights Amendment Bill 2015.

Does proposed subsection 27(2) cut across existing HRA rights to an extent that is unacceptable?

The Committee notes that "a law which confers on certain persons rights not afforded to others cuts across the right to equal protection of the law" (s 8(3) *Human Rights Act 2004* (HRA)).

Recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural rights is consistent with recommendation 3 of the Report of the Expert Panel on Constitutional Recognition of Indigenous Australians (the Report), which recommends Recognising Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Peoples in the Constitution.

That recommendation proposes that a new section be inserted into the Australian Constitution "acknowledging the continuing relationship of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples with their traditional lands and waters and respecting the continuing cultures, languages and heritage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples".

The Expert Panel also recommended that the Government not "preclude the making of laws or measures for the purpose of overcoming disadvantage, ameliorating the effects of past discrimination, or protecting the cultures, languages or heritage of any group".

The Report argues that "recognition of the cultures, languages and heritage of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples would declare an important truth in Australian history, and assist in sustaining their cultures and languages into the future".

ACT LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

London Circuit, Canberra ACT 2601 GPO Box 1020, Canberra ACT 2601
Phone: (02) 6205 0000 Fax: (02) 6205 0535 Email: corbell@act.gov.au
Twitter: @SimonCorbell Facebook: www.facebook.com/simon.corbell

CANBERRA

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures are a crucial part of the ACT's cultural identity and must be recognised and valued. Aboriginal peoples have inhabited the Canberra region for over 20,000 years. Central to the notion of culture for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people is a relationship with land and waters. Proposed section 27(2) recognises these distinctive and unique relationships.

Clause 7 of the preamble to the Human Rights Act states that "although human rights belong to all individuals, they have a special significance for Indigenous people – the first owners of this land, member of its most enduring cultures, and individuals for whom the issue of rights protection has great and continuing importance."

Despite this acknowledgement in the preamble, the Act does not presently contain substantive protections of the right to culture for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Social Justice Commissioner and Australian of the Year Professor Mick Dodson has stated that:

> It is because Indigenous rights encompass both categories [citizenship rights and distinct Indigenous rights] that a comprehensive recognition of Indigenous rights requires a balancing act; holding in one hand the principle of equality or equity, and in the other the principle of difference.[1]

Special measures to achieve equality of opportunity or to provide members of a relevant class of people access to opportunities to meet the special needs they have as members of the relevant class are recognised as legitimate and non-discriminatory in Australian anti-discrimination laws including the *Discrimination Act 1991*.

Proposed section 27(2) is based on section 19(2) of the Victorian *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities 2006* (the Charter) – a similar provision recognising Aboriginal cultural rights.

In the Charter case of *Parks Victoria (Anti-Discrimination Exemption)* [2011] VCAT 2238 (28 November 2011), Parks Victoria applied to the Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal for an exemption from certain provisions of the Victorian Equal Opportunity Act 2010 to allow it to advertise for and employ only Indigenous people working to care for and protect Wurundjeri country. The Tribunal found that this measure was proportionate and appropriately targeted to "provide opportunities of connection and care for the Wurundjeri country by its traditional owners and also for the maintenance of the culture associated with the country". The Tribunal found that those purposes had the broader purpose of realising substantive equality for Indigenous people and was satisfied that it would be undertaken in good faith.[2]

The Member also concluded that having regard to the "legislative means by which the connections to country and culture have been recognised and the Charter right created by section 19, it is apparent that the purpose of the proposed conduct is to realise substantive equality for Indigenous applicants for the field and office based positions and more broadly for Indigenous people...is a special measure ... shown to be necessary, genuine, objective, and justifiable."[3]

---

[1] M Dodson, 'The unique nature of the Australian Indigenous experience' (1996) 9 *Without Prejudice* 3, cited in Close the Gap Campaign Steering Committee for Indigenous Health Equality, Submission.

[2] Human Rights Law Centre, *Tribunal considers special measures and discrimination under the Charter and new Equal Opportunity Act – Case note* (28 November 2011) available at http://hrlc.org.au/tribunal-considers-special-measures-and-discrimination-under-the-charter-and-new-equal-opportunity-act/

[3] *Parks Victoria (Anti-Discrimination Exemption)* [2011] VCAT 2238 (28 November 2011) at para [52]

This case illustrates the interplay of rights to equality and non-discrimination and special measures to improve opportunities to members of groups that have been disadvantaged. It also highlights a practical example of how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural rights might be relied on to maintain and develop connections between Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and the land.

Will the rights to have material and economic relationships with land "recognised" apply to interests in land now lawfully held by third parties?

It is not anticipated that this amendment will have an impact on land rights in the ACT. It is likely that native title has been extinguished in the ACT through the operation of the *Native Title Act 1994* (in conjunction with *the Native Title Act 1993* (Cth)).

Currently the *Heritage Act 2004* makes provision for the cultural significance of land for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. It is already routine that any development application that may impact the heritage values of an area or object registered or provisionally registered under the *Heritage Act 2004* is referred to the ACT Heritage Council for advice. Heritage Council advice will include reference to Aboriginal connections to the area of land or water where appropriate.

It is not anticipated that formal acknowledgement of cultural rights in the Human Rights Act will give rise to any new claims of native title in the ACT. Where any claims arise, they will continue to be dealt with under the Native Title Act.

Central to the notion of culture for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people is a relationship with land and waters. This amendment does not provide a right to own land, but to maintain a connection with significant areas of land and water.

The United Nations Human Rights Committee has stated that "one or other aspect of the rights of individuals protected under that article - for example, to enjoy a particular culture - may consist in a way of life which is closely associated with territory and use of its resources".[4] The Committee further stated that "with regard to the exercise of the cultural rights protected under article 27, the Committee observes that culture manifests itself in many forms, including a particular way of life associated with the use of land resources, [e]specially in the case of indigenous peoples. That right may include such traditional activities as fishing or hunting and the right to live in reserves protected by law. The enjoyment of those rights may require positive legal measures of protection and measures to ensure the effective participation of members of minority communities in decisions which affect them".[5]

A paper by the Special Rapporteur of the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations recognised a number of aspects of the relationship between indigenous peoples and their land which are "unique to indigenous peoples: (i) a profound relationship exists between indigenous peoples and their lands, territories and resources; (ii) this relationship has various social, cultural, spiritual, economic and political dimensions and responsibilities; (iii) the collective dimension of this relationship is significant; and (iv) the intergenerational aspect of

---

[4] UN Human Rights Committee (CCPR), *General comment No. 23: Article 27(Rights of cultural minorities)*, Fiftieth session (1994), available at http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2fC%2f21%2fRev.1%2fAdd.5&Lang=en at para [3.2].

[5] Ibid at para [7].

such a relationship is also crucial to indigenous peoples' identity, survival and cultural viability".[6]

The Victorian Charter Guidelines explain that decisions have been made by the UNHRC to extend article 27 to protect the cultural rights of Indigenous peoples and that these decisions have informed the drafting of section 19(2).[7] They also note that "in the context of international human rights law, the protection of the cultural rights of indigenous peoples under article 27 has often arisen in the context of economic development".[8]

For example, in the case of *Manuika v New Zealand* (2000),[9] the UN Human Rights Committee found in favour of the Government, which had acknowledged its duty to ensure recognition of the Maori right to culture, and appropriately given the Maori population an opportunity to contribute to the decision-making process concerning regulation of the fishing industry. The fact that the authors of the communication did not consider they had been adequately represented did not mean that the Government had failed in its obligations under minority cultural rights.

Will the right to protection of Aboriginal and Torres Strait islander peoples' "knowledge" lead to the recognition of new types of intellectual property?

No. As noted in the explanatory statement, the *Plant Breeders Rights Act 1994*, the *Copyright Act 1968*, *Designs Act 2003* and the *Trade Marks Act 1995* provide mechanisms for the assertion of intellectual property rights.

Michael Davis notes in a research paper for the Australian Parliamentary Library that "all these intellectual property laws are available to Indigenous peoples, some, such as copyright and patent laws, are more potentially relevant or useful than others".[10]

He continues that "the use by Aboriginal people over the past decades of the *Copyright Act* (and to a lesser extent other laws such as breach of confidence) and the judgements resulting from those actions, have extended the boundaries of the interpretation of intellectual property laws. They have also emphasised the conceptual gaps between western notion of intellectual property and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' perspectives, derived from their cultural systems."

Proposed section 27(2) requires that public authorities refrain from denying the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples to maintain, control, protect and develop their cultural heritage. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples are not prevented from enforcing their rights within the scope and processes of existing intellectual property rights law. Public authorities must not impede enjoyment of those rights. Proposed section 27(2) does not require the ACT Government to take positive action to introduce mechanisms for the recognition of these rights (notwithstanding the limited scope – if any – for the Territory to make such laws beside those existing laws of the Commonwealth).

---

[6] Final Working Paper on Indigenous Peoples and their Relationship to Land, UN Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/2001/21 (11 June 2001) available at http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/demo/RelationshiptoLand_Daes.pdf, [20].

[7] Justice Department, *Charter Guidelines, Section 19(2): Distinct Cultural Rights of Aboriginal Persons* (2008) available at http://assets.justice.vic.gov.au/justice/resources/2ee04722-240f-4e08-a0a9-73f6de06b0ef/charteractguidelinespart1.pdf p 126 & 127.

[8] Ibid, p 125.

[9] *Mahuika v. New Zealand*, Human Rights Committee, Communication No. 547/1993, UN Doc. CCPR/C/70/ D/547/1993 (15 November 2000) available at http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/undocs/547-1993.html

[10] Michael Davis, *Indigenous Peoples and Intellectual Property Rights (1996) Parliamentary Library*, Research Paper 20 1996-97.

The recognition of cultural rights as drafted will not lead to the recognition of new types of intellectual property.

Will the right to protection of cultural heritage be a basis to argue that a rule or practice warranted by customary law should be recognised not withstanding its incompatibility with the general law applicable to all persons?

I note the Committee's concern that introducing these cultural rights might give rise to arguments of 'cultural relativism' being used as a potential defence against criminal charges.

There is no intention that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples be able to use cultural rights to justify specific criminal conduct on the basis that the act or practice is part of their culture.

As the Human Rights Committee has stated, none of the cultural rights protected under article 27 [cultural rights of minorities] of the international Covenant may be legitimately exercised in a manner or to an extent inconsistent with the other provisions of the Covenant".[11] That statement would equally inform the application of the rights under proposed section 27(2) as set out in the Bill.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon said in June 2012 that "no custom or tradition, no cultural values or religious beliefs, can justify depriving a human being of his or her rights."

Cultural rights are not unlimited and are necessarily curtailed at the point where they might infringe on other rights, such as the right to security of person – the right to be safe.

This limitation is achieved via legislative provisions that create offences in a whole range of statutes, applicably across the whole community, regardless of culture.

What does subsection 40B (1) add to the effect of HRA section 30?

Section 30 (1) of the HRA introduces a rule of statutory construction. The purpose of this section is to recognise, to the maximum extent possible, the human rights set out in part 3 in the application and implementation of all other Territory statutes and statutory instruments.

This rule requires that legislation be interpreted in a manner consistent with human rights set out in the HRA, subject to the general rule set out in section 139 (1) of the *Legislation Act 2001* that Territory laws must be interpreted in a way that best achieves the purpose of the Act.

Section 30 (2) clarifies that if an interpretation that is consistent with human rights would have the affect of defeating the obvious purpose of the statute or statutory instrument, the interpretation that is consistent with human rights will not prevail.

The intention of the interpretation provisions in section 30 is that the courts, tribunals, decision makers and others authorised to act by a Territory statute or statutory instrument must take account of human rights when interpreting the law.

A statutory discretion must be exercised consistently with human rights unless legislation clearly and expressly authorises administrative action regardless of the application of human rights.

---

[11] UN Human Rights Committee (CCPR), *General comment No. 23: Article 27(Rights of cultural minorities)*, Fiftieth session (1994), available at http://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=CCPR%2fC%2f21%2fRev.1%2fAdd.5&Lang=en at para [8].

Section 40B(1) extends this interpretational rule and imposes a binding obligation on public authorities to act compatibly with, and make decisions that properly consider the human rights in part 3.

This provision and section 40(C) open an avenue for an individual to start proceedings in the Supreme Court against a public authority if the person claims that they are a victim of a contravention of this obligation (under s 40B) to act in a way that is compatible with the right to education, or make a decision that takes the right to education into consideration.

This avenue is currently not open with respect to the right to education. The Human Rights Amendment Bill will remove this restriction by omitting the qualifier in section 40B (3) that "*human rights* do not include the economic social and cultural rights in part 3A".

As with section 30(2) there are provisions that would disapply the obligations on public authorities if the act or decision is made under a law in force in the Territory and the law expressly requires an act or decisions to the made in a way that is inconsistent with a human right or if the law cannot be interpreted in a way that is consistent with a human right.

Section 30(2) and s 40B(2) of the HRA preserve the ability of the legislature to make laws that are contrary to human rights with clear and express provisions that constrain the discretion of a public authority by requiring actions or decisions to be made regardless of whether those actions or decisions are compatible with human rights. In such a circumstance, the Supreme Court may make a declaration that the law is not consistent with a human right (s 32 HRA).

The potential consequences of the adoption of a clause so far as concerns the availability of Supreme Court relief under subsection 40C(4).

As outlined above, extending the obligations on public authorities to the right to education will mean that where a person is able to prove in proceedings in the Supreme Court that they are a victim of an action or decision made which is incompatible with their right to education, the Supreme Court may grant the relief it considers appropriate (except damages).

Remedies might include an injunction to stop or prevent conduct from occurring, or a declaration that the decision was unlawful, requiring the original decision to be reconsidered in a human rights consistent manner.

Section 40C(5) provides that existing rights under other legislation or the common law are not removed or curtailed by a claim for relief under the HRA. Arguments that a person's rights have been contravened by a public authority could enhance a concurrent claim for damages for on the basis of tort law or discrimination.

I thank the Committee for its consideration of this Bill.

Yours sincerely

Simon Corbell MLA
Attorney-General