

Centre for Comparative Constitutional Studies Newsletter

Number 7 / June 2009

Welcome to the seventh issue of the Centre for Comparative Constitutional Studies Newsletter, a guide to news and events at the centre and a spotlight on issues in constitutional law nationally and globally.

****CCCS CONFERENCE REGISTRATION NOW OPEN: EARLY BIRD RATES AVAILABLE****

Please note that registration is now open for the *International and Comparative Perspectives on Constitutional Law Conference*, the Centre for Comparative Constitutional Studies' major national conference to be held on **Friday 27 November 2009** at Melbourne Law School marking the Centre's 21st Birthday Anniversary. The program will feature the following speakers:

- The Hon Robert French, Chief Justice of Australia
- Professor Sujit Choudhry, Scholl Professor of Law, University of Toronto
- Professor Cheryl Saunders AO, Laureate Professor, Melbourne Law School
- Stephen Gageler SC, Solicitor-General for the Commonwealth of Australia

The Conference will be followed by a dinner at which The Hon Sir Anthony Mason AC will be the guest speaker.

To view the full program and register please click [here](#).

Centre Update

On 19 May, **Professor Adrienne Stone**, CCCS Director, was interviewed on the 'Law Report', Radio National (Canberra). She was interviewed in relation to the Federal Court trial of holocaust denier Frederic Tobin, who has been sentenced to three months' jail for contempt of court, the first such case to arise from breaches of federal anti-vilification laws. To listen to Professor Stone's interview please click on the following link: <http://www.abc.net.au/rn/lawreport/stories/2009/2573443.htm>

On 5 June, as part of the Australian Society of Legal Philosophy's Annual Conference (held at Melbourne Law School), Professor Stone chaired a *Public Conversation on Judicial Reasoning* between the Hon Michael Kirby (former Justice of the High Court) and Professor James Allan (Garrick Professor of Law the University of Queensland). The following day,

Professor Stone presented a paper as part of the Australian Society of Legal Philosophy's Conference entitled "Democracy, Rights and Structural Judicial Review."

In late June, Professor Stone will travel to Glasgow to give the same paper as a participant in an international workshop on "The Role of the Judge in Constitutional Law" at the University of Glasgow.

Associate Professor Carolyn Evans, CCCS Deputy Director, together with **Associate Professor Simon Evans**, spoke at a panel discussion on 'Whether Australia needs a Bill of Rights' on Wednesday 13 May at an Amnesty International meeting in Eltham.

Professor Cheryl Saunders, CCCS Foundation Director, is spending 6 months carrying out research in Oxford, United Kingdom.

Associate Professor Kris Walker participated in the joint CCCS and Australian Human Rights Commission Public Seminar: "The Constitution and a Human Rights Act" held at Melbourne Law School on 28 April 2009. For a copy of her presentation "A Federal Human Rights Act and the Constitution" please click [here](#). A/Prof Walker also participated in a roundtable organised by the Australian Human Rights Commission in Sydney at which a group of constitutional experts agreed that the Constitution poses no obstacle to the enactment of a federal Human Rights Act: see http://www.hreoc.gov.au/about/media/media_releases/2009/32_09.html

In June Associate Professor Walker is travelling to Nauru for two weeks to advise the Nauruan Parliament on constitutional reform.

Associate Professor Pip Nicholson travelled to Vietnam in May. She was working as the facilitator with the Judicial Reform Steering Committee looking to commission comparative research on the organization and activities of agencies within the justice system. This was the first time this party committee entrusted with direct legal reform in Vietnam has worked with a foreigner and consulted with the Vietnamese legal community and the profession. In Hanoi, A/Prof Nicholson continued work on a UNDP Project looking at the right to counsel in Vietnam. She also undertook sample interviews for ARC funded research on comparative judicial reform in Vietnam and Cambodia.

Associate Professor Nicholson, together with Monash University Professor John Gillespie, co-convened an invitational symposium "Interpreting Legal Transfers: A Comparative Analysis" to be held in Prato, Italy, in October. Conference Speakers from Melbourne Law School include A/Prof Nicholson and A/Prof Sarah Biddulph and also feature a range of international speakers.

Dr Michelle Foster, Senior Lecturer, Director of the International Refugee Law Research Program in the Institute for International Law and the Humanities and CCCS Member, has been interviewed regarding the Federal Government's refugee policy. Dr Foster was interviewed by The World Today program, ABC 702 Sydney on Wednesday 22 April 2009 regarding the legality and consequences of the excision of parts of Australian territory from Australia's migration zone.

Dr Foster also appeared on the 'David and Kim' program on Friday 24 April 2009 and spoke about Australia's international obligations towards refugees and how Australia's refugee program compares with other countries.

Dr Foster's teaching and research interests are in the areas of public law, international refugee law, and international human rights law. She has published widely in the field of international refugee law, including her well-received book entitled International Refugee Law and Socio-Economic Rights: Refuge from Deprivation (CUP, 2007). She is regularly invited to speak at international refugee law conferences, most recently at the International Association of Refugee Law Judges' 8th World Conference in Cape Town in January 2009.

Dr Foster had an article published in *The Age* on Monday 1 June 2009 "An unjust burden on the traumatised" arguing that the Opposition is wrong to oppose moves to waive detainees' debt. To view this article please click on the following link: <http://www.mediaportal.com/app/temp/z5sunzeoqf3441q0dtws1555/52196801.pdf>

Dr Margaret Young is organising an international conference to be held at the University of Cambridge's Lauterpacht Centre for International Law on 26-27 June. Sponsored by the [Lauterpacht Centre for International Law](#) and Melbourne Law School's [Institute for International Law and the Humanities \(IILAH\)](#), the conference will be of particular interest for those interested in the fragmentation of international law, and includes legal pluralist, critical, new-governance, constitutionalist and practice-based perspectives from trade law, environmental law, investment law, humanitarian law, human rights and constitutional law. It will feature addresses by Georges Abi-Saab (formerly Appellate Body Member, World Trade Organisation), James Crawford (University of Cambridge), Jeff Dunoff (Temple University), James Flett (European Commission), Francoise Hampson (University of Essex), Stephen Humphreys (International Council on Human Rights Policy), David Kennedy (Brown University), Martti Koskeniemi (University of Helsinki), Andrew Lang (London School of Economics), Nele Matz-Luck (Max-Planck-Institute, Heidelberg), Sol Picciotto (Lancaster University Law School), Cheryl Saunders (University of Melbourne), Joanne Scott (University College London), Eleanor Sharpston (European Court of Justice), Gunther Teubner (University of Frankfurt/Main) and Margaret Young. For information about the conference program and how to register, please visit the [Lauterpacht Centre's dedicated webpage](#) or [IILAH's dedicated webpage](#).

Dr Young, a first class honours graduate of Melbourne Law School who returned as a member of Faculty in January this year, was previously William Charnley Research Fellow in Public International Law at Pembroke College and the Lauterpacht Centre. She holds a PhD and an LLM (First class) from the University of Cambridge, and is currently finishing a book on "Regime Interaction in International Law: Trade-Related Aspects of Fisheries" to be published by Cambridge University Press next year. In first semester she taught in the JD course "Principles of Public Law". Next semester she will teach international law in the LLB and Masters program.

Dr Madeline Grey's book *Challenging Women* was reviewed in the *Age* newspaper on 25 April 2009.

Forthcoming events

Further details of forthcoming events will be available shortly. Please check the CCCS [website](#).

Speaker: Professor Larissa Behrendt, University of Technology, Sydney
Topic: Human Rights and Indigenous Peoples
Date: tbc 5-11 August 2009
Time: 1.00 pm – 2.00 pm
Venue: Melbourne Law School

Speaker: Professor Claude Klein, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Topic: Backlash to Judicial Activism: The Case of the Supreme Court of Israel
Date: Friday 4 September 2009
Time: 1.00 pm – 2.00 pm
Venue: Melbourne Law School

Speaker: Professor Hugh Corder, Dean of Law, University of Cape Town
Topic: tbc Commonwealth administrative law and issues of judicial independence and ethics
Date: tbc Monday 21 September 2009
Time: 1.00 pm – 2.00 pm
Venue: Melbourne Law School

Event: 2009 Protecting Human Rights Conference (co-hosted by the CCCS)
Date: Friday 2 October 2009
Time: 9.00 am – 5.00 pm
Venue: Art Gallery of New South Wales, Art Gallery Road, The Domain, Sydney DBD
Registration: Please click [here](#) for a conference registration brochure.

Speaker: Professor Stephen Gardbaum, Professor of Law, University of California, Los Angeles
Topic: tbc
Date: Monday 5 October 2009
Time: 1.00 pm – 2.00 pm
Venue: Melbourne Law School

Speaker: Ms Kylie Evans, Victorian Department of Justice
Topic: Australian Charters of Rights
Date: tbc 21-27 October 2009
Time: 1.00 pm – 2.00 pm
Venue: Melbourne Law School

Speaker: The Hon Catherine Branson QC, President, Australian Human Rights Commission
Topic: Outcomes from the National Human Rights Consultation
Date: Wednesday 21 October 2009
Time: 6.00 pm
Venue: Theatre G08, Melbourne Law School

Speaker: Dr Alison Young, Faculty of Law, Oxford University
Topic: Practical aspects of the democratic dialogue theory
Date: tbc November 2009
Time: 1.00 pm – 2.00 pm
Venue: Melbourne Law School

Event: International and Comparative Perspectives on Constitutional Law: A 21st Anniversary Celebration for the CCCS
Date: Friday 27 November 2009
Time: 9.00 am – 5.00 pm
Venue: Melbourne Law School
Registration: Please click [here](#) for a conference registration brochure.

Recent CCCS Events



Politicians' Influence over Regulatory Decisions Ostensibly Based on Sound Science.

Speaker: Professor Peter Strauss, Columbia Law School, New York

Date: Tuesday 7 April 2009

In the seminar Professor Strauss argued that common to all developed legal systems is the frequency with which agencies (ministries, departments, independent commissions) are legislatively authorized to adopt subsidiary legislation that, if valid, enjoys statutory force. In areas such as health, safety and environmental regulation, these authorizations typically imagine that decisions using this authority will be based on sound scientific judgment, and judicial inquiry into their validity will be considerably more exacting than any inquiry that might be made for legislation. The political responsibility of legislators, their "will", answers for their decisions, but for subsidiary legislation political responsibility is more attenuated and "judgment" is expected - and its exercise may be enforced on judicial review.

In the United States, one may observe an increasing pattern of presidential control over these matters, whose premises and procedures are now being closely considered by the new Obama administration. The Bush administration, accused of waging a "Republican War on Science", exercised tight political controls over regulatory judgments and in at least one well-publicized incident directed the Environmental Protection Agency to adopt standards different than its science-bureaucrats had determined were best supported by good science; the White House judgment was widely thought to rest on economic considerations outside the agency's legal authority to consider. President Obama has repeatedly promised to restore integrity to governmental science, but how, concretely, should this be reflected in his oversight of activities as significant for the nation's economy as contemporary rulemaking?

The seminar paper laid out the American dilemma, and invite discussion from an Australian (and parliamentary) perspective. There are notable differences between presidential and parliamentary systems to be explored, but it is submitted that the accommodation of the problem of political will and scientific judgment is a common one. The acceptability of rulemaking practice, that is, inheres in its demonstrable legality as well as considerations of political answerability.

Peter Strauss is Betts Professor of Law at Columbia Law School, teaching courses in Administrative Law, Legal Methods, and Legislation. He joined the faculty in 1971. After graduating Harvard College (1961) and Yale Law School (1964), he had spent two years clerking for federal judges in Washington, D.C., two years lecturing on criminal law in the national university of Ethiopia, and three years as an attorney in the Office of the Solicitor General, briefing and arguing cases before the United States Supreme Court. During 1975-77, Professor Strauss was on leave from Columbia as the first General Counsel of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission. His published works include *Administrative Justice in the United States* (1989 and 2002); *Gellhorn's & Byse's Administrative Law: Cases and Comments* (most recently, 2003, with Rakoff and Farina); *Legal Methods: Understanding and Using Cases and Statutes* (2005 and 2008); *Legislation, Understanding and Using Statutes* (2006), *Administrative Law Stories* (2006) and numerous law review articles, generally focusing on issues of rulemaking, separation of powers, and statutory interpretation.

In 1987 the Section of Administrative Law and Regulatory Practice of the American Bar Association presented to Professor Strauss its third annual award for distinguished scholarship in administrative law. In 1992-93, he served as Chair of the Section. He has been reporter for rulemaking on its APA and European Union Administrative Law projects, and was a member of

its E-Rulemaking task force. He has twice been Vice Dean at Columbia. Professor Strauss has visited at the European University Institute, Harvard and NYU, and lectured widely on American administrative law abroad, including programs in Argentina, Belarus, Brazil, China, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Mexico, Turkey and Venezuela. In 2008, the American Constitution Society awarded him the first Richard Cudahy prize for his essay "Overseer or 'The Decider'? The President in Administrative Law." During 2008-09 he is Fernand Braudel Senior Fellow at the European Law Institute and Parsons fellow at the University of Sydney Law School.



**Joint CCCS and Australian Human Rights Commission Public Seminar:
The Constitution and a Human Rights Act**

Chair: The Hon. Catherine Branson QC, President, Australian Human Rights Commission

Speakers: Mark Moshinsky SC, Professor Adrienne Stone, Associate Professor Kristen Walker

Date: Tuesday 28 April 2009

In late 2008, the Commonwealth Government established the National Human Rights Consultation to consider the following:

- Which human rights (including corresponding responsibilities) should be protected and promoted?
- Are these human rights currently sufficiently protected and promoted?
- How could Australia better protect and promote human rights?

Though the terms of reference rule out an entrenched constitutional bill of rights, the possibility of a National Human Rights Act remains open. This seminar considered how such an Act would relate to the existing Constitution, whether the Constitution provides any obstacles to the enactment of such an Act and how any potential constitutional problems might be overcome.

** For a copy of Mark Moshinsky SC's paper "The Constitution and a Human Rights Act - Are Declarations of Incompatibility Incompatible with Chapter III? please click [here](#).

** For a copy of Associate Professor Kristen Walker's presentation "A Federal Human Rights Act and the Constitution" please click [here](#).



Interrogating Birthright Citizenship.

Speaker: Professor Peter Spiro, Charles Weiner Professor of Law Temple University - Beasley School of Law, Philadelphia, USA

Date: Friday 15 May 2009

In the seminar Professor Spiro argued that in the United States absolute territorial birthright citizenship has been guarded as a matter of constitutional faith in the face of assaults relating to undocumented immigration. But considered outside that politicized context it is not clear that jus soli makes sense, even from a liberal perspective. Assuming a goal of mapping citizenship status onto organic community, birth location no longer supplies a reliable proxy for life trajectories. The existing rule risks the detachment of citizenship from community, which in turn could undermine the foundations of the liberal state. The paper suggested a case for modifying birthright

citizenship, but concludes that fixes are unlikely to reverse the declining salience of membership in the state.

Professor Peter Spiro joined the Temple Law School faculty in 2006 as the inaugural holder of the Charles R. Weiner Professorship in international law. Before coming to Temple, Professor Spiro was the Rusk Professor of Law at the University of Georgia Law School, where he also served as Associate Dean for Faculty Development. A former law clerk to Justice David H. Souter of the U.S. Supreme Court, Spiro specializes in international law, the constitutional aspects of U.S. foreign relations, and immigration and nationality law. Spiro is the author of [BEYOND CITIZENSHIP: AMERICAN IDENTITY AFTER GLOBALIZATION](#) (Oxford University Press 2008).



Inglis Clark, Edmund Barton, Marbury v Madison, and the familiar story about the deletion and re-insertion of section 75(v) of the Commonwealth Constitution. A longer ending.

Speaker: Professor William G Buss, O.K. Patton Professor of Law, University of Iowa, College of Law, Iowa City, Iowa, USA

Date: Thursday 18 June 2009

In the seminar Professor Buss discussed the American influence on the making of the Australian Constitution, including Australian framers' detailed consideration of American Constitution and American constitutional law – what they knew, what they borrowed, what they avoided, and what they replaced. Focus of most finished work to date is Chapter III and Andrew Inglis Clark's American-based constitution submitted at the 1891 Constitutional Convention.

Professor Buss is the O.K. Patton Professor of Law at the University of Iowa. Prior to joining the law faculty in 1967, Professor Buss clerked for Judge Bailey Aldrich on the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, practiced law with Foley, Hoag & Eliot in Boston, and served as Lecturer on Education and Assistant to the Dean of Education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. Since coming to Iowa, Professor Buss has specialized in the fields of constitutional law and education law. He has written on the law of special education in England and Wales and, in 1982-83, taught a course on the Bill of Rights for the United Kingdom at Durham University in England. In 1994, he taught New Zealand Constitutional Law and Comparative Constitutional Law at Victoria University at Wellington in New Zealand. At Iowa, Professor Buss' research and teaching areas include Constitutional Law, Comparative Constitutional Law, Education Law. His article on Australia's Implied Freedom of Political Communication was published in 2007 in the Federal Law Review.

Centre Visitors

Professor Peter Strauss

Betts Professor of Law, Columbia Law School

5/04/2009 - 12/04/2009

During his stay, Professor Strauss will be researching the ways various legal systems, including Australia's, have attempted to keep politics and regulatory science apart.

Professor Axel Kaemmerer

Chair of Public Law, European Law and Public International Law, Bucerius Law School, Hamburg

22-23/4/2009

During his two day visit, Professor Kaemmerer met with Centre Members to discuss his research which focuses on the comparative aspects of constitutional law, which has been a predominantly European one so far, which means that he focuses on both the constitutionality of the EU legal framework as well as on the convergence of member States' constitutions as a consequence of "Europeanization". As for non-European States, he is interested in their respective approaches to human rights protection on the constitutional level and the role of constitutional courts.

Professor Peter Spiro

Charles Weiner Professor of Law Temple University - Beasley School of Law Philadelphia, USA

15/05/2009

During his one day visit, Professor Spiro met with Centre Members and gave a seminar on the subject of his research interest on the topic of in the United States, absolute territorial birthright citizenship has been guarded as a matter of constitutional faith in the face of assaults relating to undocumented immigration. But considered outside that politicized context it is not clear that jus soli makes sense, even from a liberal perspective. Assuming a goal of mapping citizenship status onto organic community, birth location no longer supplies a reliable proxy for life trajectories. The existing rule risks the detachment of citizenship from community, which in turn could undermine the foundations of the liberal state. The paper suggests a case for modifying birthright citizenship, but concludes that fixes are unlikely to reverse the declining salience of membership in the state.

Professor William Buss

O.K. Patton Professor of Law, University of Iowa

23/05/2009 - 1/07/2009

Professor Buss' research project is a study of the influence of the American constitution on the Australian constitution. A series of articles will include a detailed analysis of what the Australian framers said at their conventions; how they understood and agreed about the meaning of the American constitution: how their choices of what to adapt for Australia have played out compared to developments in American law. Professor Buss' current focus is on the Judicature; during his time in Australia he expects to be working on interstate commerce and interstate freedom of movement.

Comparative Constitutional Law News Update

Australia – Review of the *Legislative Instruments Act 2003* (Cth) – Final Report

In 2008, the Commonwealth Attorney-General appointed a Review Committee as required under s 59(1) of the *Legislative Instruments Act 2003* (Cth) to consider the operation of the Act. In its Final Report, the Committee makes a number of recommendations that fine tune, rather than revolutionise, the operation of the Act. Examples include reform of the definition of 'legislative instrument' to avoid current circularity and uncertainty, repeal of the exemption of instruments reviewable under the *Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977* (Cth), and repeal of s 18(2) to avoid the perception that that subsection creates exemptions from consultation obligations.

See: [2008 Review of the Legislative Instruments Act 2003](#)

Fiji – Court of Appeal – *Qarase v Bainimarama* – Prerogative powers

In a military coup in December 2006, the Commander of the Fijian army assumed executive power of the State from Laisenia Qarase. The President subsequently dismissed Qarase as Prime Minister, dissolved Parliament and appointed a new Prime Minister and Ministers. These actions were declared valid by the Fiji High Court in 2008, broadly on the basis that the President's actions were supported by a prerogative power to protect the State during a national emergency.

The Fiji Court of Appeal has recently overturned that decision. According to the Court of Appeal, ss 96(2) and 109 of the *Fiji Constitution* prevented the President from dismissing the Prime Minister except as provided for under s 109. Moreover, there is no free-standing prerogative to protect the State during a national emergency; s 187 of the *Constitution* provides for such action by the President, crucially, 'on the advice of the Cabinet'. The Court of Appeal declared the President's action unlawful and that it would be lawful for the President to appoint an interim Prime Minister to issue writs for an election. Immediately following this judgment, leave to appeal to the Supreme Court was granted, but a stay pending that appeal was refused.

Following this judgment, all of Fiji's judges were dismissed, amongst other actions undertaken by the President, Josefa Iloilo. The status of an appeal to the Supreme Court is uncertain.

See: [Qarase v Bainimarama](#)

United Kingdom – House of Lords Reform – Update

Part 3 of the *Constitutional Reform Act 2005* (UK) establishes the UK Supreme Court. This Court is to be the final court of appeal in UK, and will replace the House of Lords in its judicial capacity. The current Lords of Appeal in Ordinary will sit as permanent Justices of the Court. The Court will officially open on 1 October 2009.

United States – Supreme Court of California – *Strauss v Horton* - Proposition 8 Challenge

Proposition 8 added to the Californian Constitution the following section: 'Only marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California.' Unanimously, the Supreme Court of California upheld the validity of Proposition 8, despite its earlier decision in *In re Marriage Cases* (2008) 43 Cal.4th 757 regarding the constitutional rights of same-sex couples.

The plurality judgment held that Proposition 8 constitutes a permissible 'amendment', rather than an impermissible 'revision' of the *Constitution*. It does not 'entirely repeal or abrogate' the constitutional rights recognised in *In re Marriage Cases* (at 7). Moreover, there was no violation of the separation of powers because the *Constitution* envisages popular amendment, which thus does not encroach upon either the judicial or legislative functions. Finally, the Court reiterated that rights such as those recognised in *In re Marriage Cases* are not inalienable – rights are always subject to permissible limitation.

See: [Strauss v Horton](#)

South Africa – Supreme Court of Appeal - *Langa v Hlophe* – High Court – *Hlophe v Judicial Service Commission* - Hlophe and Constitutional Court judges saga

Hlophe, Judge President of the Cape High Court had successfully claimed in the High Court that the judges of the Constitutional Court infringed certain of his rights, when those judges released a press statement claiming that Hlophe had tried to influence the Court in a pending case (For further details, see CCCS Newsletter Nos 4 and 6). The Supreme Court of Appeal unanimously overturned this decision.

The Supreme Court of Appeal rejected the High Court's finding that the judges of the Constitutional Court infringed Hlophe's right to be heard. Most obviously, since the judges had not acted 'as a court' when they made their complaint, '[t]he finding that the appellants had not

acted institutionally meant ineluctably that the respondent's cause of action fell away. The duty to hear a person was at common law always limited to judicial or some administrative organs; and a person acting in a private capacity has never had such a duty' (at [34]). Thus, the fair trial protection also did not arise.

The Supreme Court of Appeal then went onto make further observations. Pointedly, 'it is not readily apparent to us on what legal grounds [the High Court's decision] were founded' (at [36]). This is because there is no legal rule, but only 'ethical duties' (at [44]), that judges acting in their private capacity should hear a judge about whom they intend to make a complaint before making that complaint. In any event, the appropriate remedy for a judge is not to 'stifl[e] the fact that a complaint has been made' but 'to insist that the body charged with investigating such a complaint does so with expedition so as to clear his name or her name' (at [55]).

See: [Langa v Hlophe](#)

In separate but related proceedings, a majority (2:1, Willis J dissenting) of the High Court of South Africa set aside the Judicial Service Commission's hearings on 7-8 April into Hlophe's conduct and ordered that those hearings be conducted de novo with Hlophe present. The Judicial Service Commission had refused to postpone the hearings on those dates despite Hlophe's inability to attend as a result of illness. The majority found that this 'unjustifiably violated the applicant's right to a fair hearing and to participate freely in the proceedings which affected him' (at [27]).

See: [Hlophe v Judicial Service Commission](#)

Finally, four members of the Constitutional Court are due to retire in October 2009. South African media reports indicate that Hlophe is very likely to be nominated to the Court.

See: [All Africa news report](#)

Centre People

CCCS members are active researchers and teachers across a broad range of public law issues. Many are available to give presentations or to consult on public law projects, particularly contributing a comparative perspective to domestic issues. They are also interested in discussing potential projects with prospective research students.

Director

Professor Adrienne Stone

Deputy Director

Associate Professor Carolyn Evans

Administrator

Dr Madeline Grey

Advisory Board Members

Ian Cunliffe

Dr Stephen Donaghue

Dr Gavan Griffith AO QC

Peter Hanks QC

Wendy Harris

Justice Chris Maxwell

Debbie Mortimer SC

Mark Moshinsky SC

Stephen McLeish SC
Professor Brian Opeskin
Jason Pizer
Justice Richard R S Tracey

Centre Members

Professor Saunders AO, Founding Director
Associate Professor Simon Evans
Associate Professor Beth Gaze
Associate Professor Kristen Walker
Associate Professor Jeremy Gans
Associate Professor Pip Nicholson
Associate Professor Alison Duxbury
Professor Michael Crommelin
Dr Joo-Cheong Tham
Dr Michelle Foster
Dr Kirsty Gover
Dr Margaret Young
Dr Fiona Hanlon
Mr Glenn Patmore
Ms Katy Le Roy
Mr John Waugh

You have received this newsletter by email as a member of the Centre for Comparative Constitutional Studies' mailing list. If you do not wish to receive future issues of the newsletter, please email law-cccs@unimelb.edu.au. (You can join or rejoin the mailing list by emailing the same address, law-cccs@unimelb.edu.au.)

Centre for Comparative Constitutional Studies, Melbourne Law School, The University of Melbourne Victoria 3010 Australia
Tel: (61 3) 8344 1011
Fax: (61 3) 8344 1013
E-mail: law-cccs@unimelb.edu.au
Web: <http://cccs.law.unimelb.edu.au>