

## **The Three Most Important Features of My Country's Legal System that Others Should Understand**

**ARIE FREIBERG  
DEAN**

**FACULTY OF LAW, MONASH UNIVERSITY, MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA**

Australia's legal system is based on the same foundations as other common law systems such as the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, New Zealand and others. It would therefore not be surprising to find that the three most important features of the Australian system are likely to be those that underpin most modern western liberal democracies: a commitment to the rule of law, the principle of the separation of powers and the independence of the judiciary. Trite as these principles may be, they are not be taken for granted nor are they unchallenged or immutable.

The **rule of law** provides that individuals are not subject to the arbitrary, capricious or personal exercise of power by state officials and that such officials must act in accordance with constitutional, statute and common law. It also provides that state officials, at whatever level of seniority, are themselves subject to the law. The struggle to place limits upon the exercise of state power is a long and continuing one, as is evidenced by post 9/11 battles between the executive branch of government and the courts.

The rule of law is not just a matter of formal procedures but must be embedded in a political and judicial culture which recognizes the principle that all citizens are equal before the law. This, in turn, requires a recognition that citizens must have the resources to be able to challenge state power which further requires a commitment to the provision of sufficient funding for courts and for the institutions that provide legal aid to those who cannot afford access to justice. It also requires an understanding that it will only be in the most exigent of circumstances that the rule of law can be suspended, and even then, for the most limited of periods.

Australia is a federation, which means that power is shared, albeit unequally, between the federal and state governments. At each of these levels of government, the second of the major features of the Australian legal system, the **separation of powers**, operates, though with different levels of constitutional force.

The separation of powers under the Australian system refers to the separation of the Executive, the legislature and judiciary so that none is able to exercise total power. It is a system of checks and balances founded on a philosophy of institutional distrust. The Australian system of parliamentary democracy is closer to the Westminster system than to the United States system in that the executive government is drawn from, and accountable to, the legislature. Power is also shared between lower and upper houses (at the federal level, the House of Representatives and the Senate).

The third branch of government, the judiciary, ensures the legality of government action. The High Court sits at the apex of judicial authority in Australia with the authority to rule on the constitutionality of laws. The third major feature of Australia's legal system, the

**independence of the judiciary** is integral to the effectiveness of the others. The *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* in Article 14.1 states that:

All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law.

Judges in Australia at all levels of courts are appointed, not elected. The Chief Justice of the High Court has written:

Under our Constitution, the responsibility of ruling upon the validity of laws enacted by democratically elected parliaments is cast upon a group of unelected lawyers. The fact that they are unelected means that they have no need to seek popularity, and should be uninfluenced by public or political opinion. The fact that they are lawyers reflects two considerations. The first is that the Constitution is itself a basic law, and constitutional disputes raise issues concerning the interpretation of a written legal document. The second is that the members of the High Court are expected to approach their task by the application of what Sir Owen Dixon [a previous Chief Justice] described as "a strict and complete legalism".

Although there is some concern about the nature of the appointment process, it is widely accepted that the Australian judiciary is fair and independent of the other two branches of government. Judicial independence is necessary for the maintenance of public confidence in the decision-making process and the ability of the courts to hold the other branches of government to account.

There are three basic aspects relating to the independence of the judiciary: security of tenure, financial security and administrative independence. Judges of the High Court of Australia are appointed to the age of 70. They once were, but are no longer, appointed for life. Their salaries cannot be decreased by the Executive during their tenure of office. The High Court controls its own budget and administration.

Judicial independence does not necessarily entail that the judiciary is not accountable. In some jurisdictions the courts must, as a body, report to Parliament, judges may be dismissed by Parliament for the commission of crimes or serious misconduct and judicial misconduct bodies may inquire into alleged judicial misbehaviour.

The three basic features of the Australian legal system described above with unconscionable brevity are, in fact, matters of infinite scope and complexity. They form the foundations for the study of constitutional, administrative and other aspects of public law which form part of the compulsory core of subjects required to be studied by all Australian law students. But what is more important than these formal requirements is the common understanding that what underpins the legal system as a whole is an adherence to democratic values and the commitment to human rights and freedoms.

## Three Things You Ought to Know about the Australian Legal System

**Professor Michael Weir**  
**Faculty of Law**  
**Bond University, Gold Coast, Queensland 4229**

### Introduction

Australia's legal system was derived from its origins as a colony of England. This meant that the common law applied from 1788. Since that time a number of significant initiatives have occurred or in one case has not occurred that may be interesting for an outsider. These initiatives or features are:

1. The torrens system
2. civil liability legislation
3. No bill of rights

### Torrens Title

A significant legal initiative derived from Australia is a form of land title registration often called 'the Torrens system'. This system of land title is derived from a state of Australia namely South Australia. The system was devised by Robert Richard Torrens who was the Registrar- General of Deeds in the mid 1800's. Torrens was well versed in the limitations of what was called the "Deeds Registration System."<sup>1</sup> This was a voluntary registration system derived from England that provided priority based on the date of registration of deeds.<sup>2</sup> This system did not deal with the problem of void or forged transfers that could result in innocent parties being left with few remedies when their interest was unenforceable as a result of a fraudulent third party.

The Torrens system was introduced into the South Australian Parliament in 1858 and passed under the name *Real Property Act 1858 (SA)*. Queensland was the first state to pass similar legislation in 1861 with the enactment of the *Real Property Act 1861(Qld)*.

The most important principle of the torrens system is outlined in a quote of Barwick CJ in *Breskvar v Wall*<sup>3</sup> where he states: "The Torrens system of registered title..... is not a system of registration of title but a system of title by registration." The crux of the Torrens system is that the act of registration provides title and does not rely on the validity of the transfer or interest effecting that registration. On registration a registered proprietor of an interest ie fee simple (ownership); a lease or mortgage is given what is referred to as 'indefeasible title.' Indefeasible title is generally free from attack. Although there are a number of significant exceptions to indefeasibility of title such as fraud a bona fide

---

<sup>1</sup> For a historical background refer to Torrens, *The South Australian System of Conveyancing by Registration of Title* (Adelaide, Register and Observer General Printing Offices, 1859).

<sup>2</sup> MacDonald, McCrimmon, Wallace and Weir, *Real Property Law in Queensland* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2005) 275.

<sup>3</sup> (1971) 126 CLR 376 at 385-386

registered owner has a considerable degree of security of title.

Another significant exception is the so called 'in personam' exception that means a registered owner cannot avoid contracts or trust relationships that party has entered into<sup>4</sup>. A registered owner is generally bound only by registered interests and not by unregistered interests. A purchaser is not bound to investigate the chain of title leading up to their vendor's title as the act of registration by a public official normally called a Registrar of Titles grants good title.

The other important pillar of the torrens system is the principle of compensation. If a party loses an interest by the registration of an indefeasible interest in another ie a forger transfers land to a bona fide registered purchaser the original owner may lose their interest. In that case the state should compensate for the loss of that interest. This deals with some of the injustices that can occur in these situations.<sup>5</sup> Under the old system or deeds registration system the owner deprived of an interest in land may have been left with a claim against the fraudulent wrongdoer, often a fruitless exercise.

The Torrens form of land title registration is significant as it is used in all states of Australia in relation to freehold land interests; it is also used in New Zealand; Malaysia; Canada; many states in the USA and Canada.<sup>6</sup> A significant body of evidence has now developed in relation to the Torrens system. Many jurisdictions draw upon the other in relation to significant case law.

### **Civil Liability Legislation**

Australia is a country which derives its legal background from English law and accordingly has a clear common law background though statutory regulation has always had played a significant role in the Australian legal system. In recent decades the Australian legal system has moved towards a more civil law approach to regulation involving statutory regulation of large areas of activity that what was previously dominated by common law concepts. This process has to some extent been hindered at a national level by constitutional limitations for the Commonwealth Government and its ability to pass laws binding throughout the nation. Nevertheless in recent years the states have passed almost identical legislation to permit the creation of a national scheme of statutory regulation in such areas as the law of defamation; corporations and consumer credit.

An example of this movement is provided by legislative responses to the apparent medical indemnity crisis in Australia in the early years of the 21 century. There was a perception at time that judges were being unduly generous in awards made in personal injury cases which was said to have contributed to the collapse of a major medical indemnity insurer. This along with changes in the insurance industry resulted in large increases in medical

---

<sup>4</sup> Eg s 185 (1) (a) *Land Title Act 1994* (Qld).

<sup>5</sup> MacDonald, McCrimmon, Wallace and Weir, *Real Property Law in Queensland* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2005) 426.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid 269

insurance premiums and a medical indemnity insurance crisis (or the perception of a crisis) which potentially left many doctors uninsured or with prohibitive insurance premiums. The Federal Government commissioned in 2000 the *Review of the Law of Negligence Report* (the Ipp Report). This report suggested statutory reforms to the law of negligence relevant to the liability of MD's and other professionals. The states have constitutional power in this regard and they passed similar (but not the same legislation) exemplified by the *Civil Liability Act 2002* (New South Wales), *Civil Liability Act 2003* (Queensland) and *Civil Liability Bill 2002* (Tasmania) that preserves in statutory form legal tests for legal liability in tort for personal injury including professionals. The intention is to limit the expansion of the frequency and size of personal injury claims. This legislation deals with many matters but it includes the following:

- It states that if 'professionals' follow procedures deemed acceptable by their profession (even if there may be different views on the matter and the activity is not universally accepted) then they will be deemed to be not in breach of their duty. This applies as long as those procedures are not 'irrational.' New test is a return to a varied *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee*<sup>7</sup> rule that relied to a substantial degree on approved professional practice in determining whether an act or omission was or was not negligent practice. It move away from the trend exemplified by the case of *Rogers v Whitaker*<sup>8</sup> which reserved for the court the decision of whether standard professional practice was or was not negligence. The exception for acts that are 'irrational' may be close to the common law exception identified in *Bolitho v City and Hackney Health Authority*<sup>9</sup> which acknowledged that in rare cases a court can reject a medical opinion if it is not reasonable or responsible.
- The statutes regulate apologies or statements of regret and indicate in some jurisdictions they are not admissible even if they contain admissions of guilt. For example in New South Wales s 69 of the *Civil Liability Act 2002* confirms an [apology](#) does not constitute an express or implied admission of fault or liability by the person in connection with that matter, and is not relevant to the determination of fault or liability in connection with that matter.
- If the issue in a case is what would a patient have done if the defendant was not negligent ie failure to warn cases - then statements by person after suffering harm are inadmissible unless it is against their interest eg s 11 (3) *Civil Liability Act 2003* (Qld).

### **Bill of Rights**

Australia is virtually alone in developed democratic countries in not having a

---

<sup>7</sup> [1957] 1 WLR 582

<sup>8</sup> (1992) 109 ALR 628

<sup>9</sup> [1998] AC 232

comprehensive Bill of Rights. Despite attempts on occasion to introduce legislation at a Federal level and the use of referenda to amend the Commonwealth Constitution these initiatives have been unsuccessful in entrenching of a Bill of Rights in Australia. In Australia the protection of human rights is through the following provisions:

- In Victoria the *Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006* provides protection for human rights that include the right to life (s9); freedom of movement (s12); expression (s 14) and property rights (s20). It should be noted these provisions can be overridden by parliament (s31) in exceptional circumstances and the legislation requires that legislation should be interpreted in a way consistent with this Charter (s32).
- Some state constitutions and the Commonwealth Constitution do include a provision against acquisition of property except on just terms.<sup>10</sup> In *Stephens v West Australian Newspapers Ltd*<sup>11</sup> the High Court found an implied freedom of political communication under the Australian Constitution based on our system of representative democracy. Some state constitutions enshrine certain rights such as voter equality or one vote on value eg s 77 *South Australian Constitution*.<sup>12</sup>
- Some statutes incorporate protection of human rights between individuals and governments. For example the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth) and the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth) deals with unlawful discrimination in these subjects areas.<sup>13</sup> This legislation relies on the Commonwealth government using the ‘external affairs’ power under s 51 (xxix) of the Constitution. This allows the Commonwealth to pass legislation to implement Australia’s obligations under international treaties and covenants. For example the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth) relies on the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.
- Common law<sup>14</sup> – although the protections of human rights under the common law may be subject to contrary legislation the common law does protect, for example, the right to counsel when facing a serious crime. *Dietrich v The Queen*.<sup>15</sup> The common law also requires very clear language before any fundamental freedom is restricted.
- International Law<sup>16</sup> – Australia is a signatory to many international instruments that foster human rights. It should be noted the ability to enforce these treaties is limited unless they are incorporated into duly enacted legislation - *Kiao v West*.<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> George Williams, *Human Rights under the Australian Constitution* Oxford University Press 1969, 8.

<sup>11</sup> (1994) 182 CLR 211

<sup>12</sup> Ibid 10

<sup>13</sup> Ibid 11

<sup>14</sup> Ibid 15

<sup>15</sup> (1992) 177 CLR 292

<sup>16</sup> Ibid 18

Arguments supporting a Bill of Rights in Australia suggest Australia inadequately protects human rights and it would be appropriate that Australia is brought into line with the international standard. It is said this will have the impact of assisting Australia to meet its international obligations to ensure the protection of less powerful members of the community. It is said a Bill of Rights would perform an important educative role and promote tolerance in the community.<sup>18</sup>

Contrary views suggest human rights are already well protected and the impact of a Bill of Rights would be to give unelected judges a political role in overturning the legislative process performed by elected representatives. It is argued a bill of rights would encourage expensive and wasteful litigation. To define a right is to limit a right.<sup>19</sup> There is currently limited agitation towards a Bill of Rights in Australia.

---

<sup>17</sup> (1985)159 CLR 550.

<sup>18</sup> Williams, above n 17,257

<sup>19</sup> Ibid 257