

LAW SOCIETY OF NEW SOUTH WALES

HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION FOR NEW SOUTH WALES

UPDATED SEPTEMBER 2025



THE LAW SOCIETY
OF NEW SOUTH WALES

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. WHY SHOULD WE CARE ABOUT PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS?	3
III. HOW WELL DO WE CURRENTLY PROTECT RIGHTS IN NSW?	4
IV. HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION IN QUEENSLAND, VICTORIA AND THE ACT	7
V. REASONS TO CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION FOR HUMANS RIGHTS LEGISLATION IN NSW	11

I. INTRODUCTION

The Law Society has long supported the enactment of human rights legislation in NSW.

Australia is the only common law country with neither a constitutional nor federal legislative bill of rights. Given that Australian states have jurisdiction over matters that can have a significant impact on the rights of individuals, such as crime, health, education, housing and homelessness, it is, arguably, more important that a legislative human rights act exists at a state level.

The first print of this paper (available [here](#)) arose from the Law Society's Thought Leadership Series for 2022, during which the then President, Joanne van der Plaat, sought to continue the discussion on human rights legislation for NSW. At that time, the world was emerging from the COVID-19 pandemic, which raised legitimate questions in the minds of many citizens about what rights they, as individuals and as part of a community, enjoy, whether by virtue of the operation of rights founded in the Australian Constitution or otherwise.

Since that time, there has been increasing momentum for standalone human rights legislation at both the federal and state levels in Australia.¹ As a rule of law issue, the Law Society supports the enactment of standalone human rights legislation in Australia and NSW. Further, we believe human rights legislation will assist in fostering social cohesion and provide fairness and justice to the community.

We consider that if human rights legislation is implemented carefully and in consultation with the community, for example through a parliamentary or other inquiry, there will be many benefits for this State, from better decision-making in the public sector to a greater engagement with questions of human rights across our diverse and vibrant community. Ultimately, we believe that human rights legislation for NSW will create a fairer, more compassionate society.

¹ See, for example, Parliamentary Joint Committee on Human Rights, Parliament of Australia, *Inquiry into Australia's Human Rights Framework* (Report, May 2024) [9.11] and Social Development Committee, Parliament of South Australia, *Inquiry into the Potential for a Human Rights Act for South Australia* (Report, 29 April 2025) 11.

Where do my rights come from?

What are my constitutional rights?

Is freedom of religion a human right?

Can my employer require me to be vaccinated?

Does Australia have a Bill of Rights?

What are my rights if I am evicted from my rental accommodation?

Can I be compensated for a breach of my human rights?

Do we have a right to stop trial by media?

Are everyone's human rights the same?

Do Australians have a right to freedom of speech?

Do human rights change?

Can I be discriminated against for breastfeeding my child in a public place?

Does my child have a right to education?

QUESTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS FROM THE NSW COMMUNITY

The Law Society's Human Rights Committee asked members of the NSW community what they wanted to know about human rights.

What are my rights to protest?

What are my rights in relation to my data?

What are my rights if the police stop me?

Do I have the right to choose how I die?

Do children have the right to be treated differently to adults in criminal proceedings?

What are my rights as a victim of crime?

What happens if a new policy at work breaches my human rights?

Who is responsible for the protection of human rights?

Do I have a right to legal representation?

Does Australia recognise the right to a healthy environment?

II. WHY SHOULD WE CARE ABOUT PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS?

In *A Charter of Rights for Australia*, George Williams and Daniel Reynolds make the case for national human rights legislation for Australia.² The opening chapter of the work, ‘An Absence of Human Rights’, makes for sobering reading, as the authors detail media coverage of some of the egregious abuses of human rights that have occurred in Australia that, without appropriate human rights legislation, governments have been all too easily able to disregard.

The collective national conscience was seared by footage aired in 2016 on ABC’s *Four Corners* of the degrading and abusive treatment of then 14-year-old Jake Roper and then 13-year-old Dylan Voller in Don Dale Youth Detention Centre.³ As Williams and Reynolds emphasise, Don Dale was not an isolated incident. It is too often those most vulnerable or marginalised – whether they be children, the elderly, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people or people with disability and mental illness – whose rights are infringed or cast aside.⁴

In Australia, we often rely on the media to bring human rights incidents to light. And when we are made aware of such incidents, we are often confronted with the deficiencies of a legal system that does not fully protect human rights at the federal or state and territory levels. Some recent examples that raise very real questions around human rights in NSW and across Australia include:

- In August 2025, a report of the UN Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Slavery noted ‘alarming and sometimes severe patterns of exploitation (of migrant workers) by employers, labour hire companies and migration agents across various sectors’ in Australia.⁵
- In July 2025, the Annual Data Compilation Report for Closing the Gap showed worsening outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people in the areas of early childhood development, adult incarceration, children in out-of-home care and suicide.⁶
- In April 2025, the NSW Law Enforcement Conduct Commission recommended that curfew and residential compliance checks only be undertaken with the authorisation of a court, in light of reports that these intrusive practices are being used without enforcement conditions in place.⁷
- The UN Human Rights Committee found in January 2025 that Australia was responsible for the arbitrary detention of asylum seekers in offshore facilities.⁸

While the chance for individuals to defend their rights and access effective remedies is an important aspect of human rights legislation, the opportunity to create a human rights culture in NSW is just as significant. By requiring legislators, public entities and executive decision makers and judges to consider human rights in a systematic way when making and reviewing decisions, we consider there will be a greater consciousness about human rights overall and more transparent and accountable decision making in the first place.

² George Williams and Daniel Reynolds, *A Charter of Rights for Australia* (UNSW Press, 4th ed, 2017).

³ ‘Australia’s Shame’, *Four Corners* (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 2016) <<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-07-25/australias-shame-promo/7649462>>.

⁴ Williams and Reynolds (n 2) 25.

⁵ Tomoya Obokata, *Visit to Australia: Report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of slavery, including its causes and consequences*, UN GAOR, Human Rights Council, 60th sess, Agenda Item 3, UN Doc A/HRC/60/28/Add.1 (16 July 2025) [32].

⁶ Senator Malarndirri McCarthy, ‘Closing the Gap Data Report’ (Media Release, 31 July 2025) <<https://ministers.pmc.gov.au/mccarthy/2025/closing-gap-data-report>>.

⁷ Law Enforcement Conduct Commission, *Bail compliance checks in NSW* (Final Report, April 2025) 30.

⁸ United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner, ‘Australia responsible for arbitrary detention of asylum seekers in offshore facilities, UN Human Rights Committee finds’ (Press Release, 9 January 2025) <<https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/01/australia-responsible-arbitrary-detention-asylum-seekers-offshore-facilities>>. Further issues may also be raised in the context of Australia’s Fourth Universal Periodic Review. See Australian Government, Attorney General’s Department, ‘Australia’s Universal Periodic Review’ (Webpage): <<https://www.ag.gov.au/rights-and-protections/human-rights-and-anti-discrimination/united-nations-human-rights-reporting/australias-universal-periodic-review>>.

III. HOW WELL DO WE CURRENTLY PROTECT RIGHTS IN NSW?

Melissa Castan and Paula Gerber have described the landscape of human rights in Australia as a ‘patchwork quilt’, noting that there exists ‘regional variations in anti-discrimination legislation and general human rights legislation’.⁹ There is no federal Bill of Rights in Australia and NSW is not one of the three jurisdictions (the ACT, Victoria and Queensland) that have enacted specific human rights legislation. Therefore, the limited rights enjoyed by the people of NSW are derived from three main sources – the Constitution, statute (including Commonwealth and NSW anti-discrimination legislation) and the common law.

The Australian Constitution does contain several express rights, including compensation on just terms for the Commonwealth’s compulsory acquisition of property (s 51 (xxxi)); trial by jury on indictment (s 80); freedom of religion (s 116); and freedom from discrimination on the basis of interstate residence (s 117). As Julie Debeljak reminds us, however, ‘the judiciary has tended to interpret these rights narrowly, giving greater freedom to the representative arms of government in their creation and enforcement of Commonwealth law, without any significant rights-based constraints’.¹⁰

The High Court has also implied rights into the Constitution, for example the implied freedom of political communication or ‘the right not to be detained otherwise than by judicial order’.¹¹ However, these ‘implied’ rights have not been uncontroversial and, as noted by Matthew Groves, Janina Boughey and Dan Meagher, ‘properly understood (they) are not really ‘rights’ at all, but limits on the powers of legislatures and governments which are necessary to protect the structure of government established by the Constitution’.¹²

George Williams and Daniel Reynolds summarise the protections offered by the Constitution as follows:

The protection the Constitution gives to human rights is often weak. Constitutional freedoms are few, and many basic rights receive no protection. A quick comparison between the Australian Constitution and any charter of rights in a like nation makes this clear. Where, for example, is our freedom from discrimination on the basis of race or sex or freedom from cruel and unusual punishment or torture?¹³

In addition to the limited express and implied constitutional rights, there are some statutory rights protections at the Commonwealth and State levels that partially implement Australia’s international human rights obligations into domestic law: see, for example, anti-discrimination laws including the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* (Cth); the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth); the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992* (Cth), the *Age Discrimination Act 2004* (Cth) and relevant labour and workplace laws under the *Fair Work Act 2009* (Cth).

In NSW, the main piece of human rights legislation is the *Anti-Discrimination Act 1977* (NSW) which makes it unlawful to discriminate against a person on the basis of a number of attributes (e.g., race, sex, transgender status, marital or domestic status, disability, carer responsibilities, homosexuality and age).¹⁴

⁹ Melissa Castan and Paula Gerber, ‘Taking the Temperature of Human Rights in Australia’ in Paula Gerber and Melissa Castan (eds), *Critical Perspectives on Human Rights Law in Australia* (Thomson Reuters, 2021) vol 1, 1.

¹⁰ Julie Debeljak, ‘The Fragile Foundations of the Human Rights Protections: Why Australia Needs a Human Rights Instrument’ in Paula Gerber and Melissa Castan (eds), *Critical Perspectives on Human Rights Law in Australia* (Thomson Reuters, 2021) vol 1, 41.

¹¹ See *Chu Kheng Lim v Minister for Immigration, Local Government and Ethnic Affairs* [1992] HCA 64; 176 CLR 1, cited in Williams and Reynolds (n 2) 64-65.

¹² Matthew Groves, Janina Boughey and Dan Meagher, ‘Rights, Rhetoric and Reality: An Overview of Rights Protection in Australia’ in Matthew Groves, Janina Boughey and Dan Meagher (eds), *The Legal Protection of Rights in Australia* (Hart Publishing, 2019) 2.

¹³ Williams and Reynolds (n 2) 65.

¹⁴ As at September 2025, the NSW Anti-Discrimination Act is being reviewed by the NSW Law Reform Commission.

In addition to the human rights protection provided by statute, the common law protects some rights, including protection against self-incrimination, access to the courts, legal professional privilege and procedural fairness. Further, the principle of legality supports a rights-based approach to statutory interpretation. As Brennan J noted in *Re Bolton; Ex parte Beane*: ‘Unless the Parliament makes unmistakably clear its intention to abrogate or suspend a fundamental freedom, the courts will not construe a statute as having that operation’.¹⁵

A further layer of protection in NSW comes from the role played by the Legislation Review Committee that, pursuant to s 8A of the *Legislation Review Act 1987* (NSW), must report to Parliament on bills that:

- trespass on personal rights and liberties;
- do not properly define administrative powers that may affect personal rights;
- do not allow for the review of decisions that may affect personal rights;
- inappropriately delegate legislative power;
- do not sufficiently allow the Parliament to scrutinise legislative power.

The establishment of this kind of reviewing body was one of the recommendations of the 2001 Standing Committee on Law and Justice inquiry into a NSW Bill of Rights, which ultimately recommended against the introduction of a bill of rights in NSW.¹⁶ It is the view of the Law Society, however, that the existing legislative scrutiny mechanisms do not provide sufficiently strong safeguards against legislative encroachment. Studies about the effectiveness of the NSW Legislation Review Committee have identified a culture of ‘ignoring and deflecting the Committee’s advice’,¹⁷ and it is not uncommon for legislation to pass quickly, with no possibility of thorough scrutiny.

¹⁵ (1987) 162 CLR 514, 523. See also *Coco v The Queen* (2003) 211 CLR 476, 492.

¹⁶ Standing Committee on Law and Justice, Parliament of NSW, *A NSW Bill of Rights* (Report No 17, October 2001).

¹⁷ Luke McNamara and Julia Quilter, ‘Institutional Influences on the Parameters of Criminalisation: Parliamentary Scrutiny of Criminal Law Bills in New South Wales’ (2015) 27(1) *Current Issues in Criminal Justice* 21.

A PATCHWORK QUILT OF MECHANISMS TO PROTECT HUMAN RIGHTS IN AUSTRALIA AND NSW

**Express
Constitutional
rights**

**Implied
Constitutional
rights**

**Commonwealth
and State
Anti-Discrimination
Legislation**

**Statutes enacting
rights from
international human
rights instruments**

**Common law
protections**

**Democratic
institutions**

**The media and
whistleblower
protection legislation**

Principle of legality

**Legislative scrutiny
processes**

IV. HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION IN QUEENSLAND, VICTORIA AND THE ACT

It is useful from a comparative perspective to look briefly at the three jurisdictions in Australia that have implemented human rights legislation, starting with the most recent legislation in Queensland and then considering Victoria and the ACT.

A) QUEENSLAND'S HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Following a grass-roots campaign, which attracted the support of over 40 human rights organisations and thousands of Queenslanders, the Queensland Labor Party committed to the introduction of human rights legislation in its election campaign of November 2017.¹⁸ The Human Rights Bill 2018 was introduced on 31 October 2018 and passed on 27 February 2019. The Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld) (**Queensland Act**) commenced on 1 January 2020, making Queensland the third Australian jurisdiction to enact stand-alone human rights legislation.

The main objects set out in s 3 of the Queensland Act are:

- i. to protect and promote human rights; and
- ii. to help build a culture in the Queensland public sector that respects and promotes human rights; and
- iii. to help promote a dialogue about the nature, meaning and scope of human rights.

The rights that are protected are mostly rights drawn from the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (**ICCPR**) (see, for example, ss 15-35), but there are also two economic, social and cultural rights that are protected, namely the right to education services (s 36) and the right to health services (s 37).

The Queensland Act, like the human rights legislation in Victoria and the ACT, is what is sometimes described as a 'dialogue' or 'parliamentary' model. This means that the Queensland Act is a regular piece of legislation (i.e. not constitutionally entrenched) but where the three arms of government are in dialogue with each other.

As described in the Explanatory Memorandum to the Queensland Act, 'each of the three arms of government will have an important role to play: the judiciary through interpretation of laws and adjudicating rights; the legislature through scrutinising legislation and making laws; and the executive through developing policy and administrative decision-making'.¹⁹

Under this model, the role and obligations of the Parliament include the following:

- a statement of compatibility must be prepared for all bills introduced to Parliament and tabled when a bill is introduced (s 38);
- a statement of compatibility should state whether, in the opinion of the member who introduces a bill, the bill is compatible with human rights and the nature and extent of any incompatibility (s 38);
- the Minister responsible for subordinate legislation must prepare a human rights certificate to accompany the legislation (s 41);
- the portfolio committee responsible for examining a bill must report to Parliament about any incompatibility with human rights (s 39);
- in exceptional circumstances, Parliament is able to expressly declare via an 'override declaration' that an Act or a provision of an Act has effect despite being incompatible with one or more human rights or despite anything else in the Queensland Act (s 43-44).

The role and obligations of the courts are:

- to interpret all statutory provisions, to the extent possible consistent with their purpose, in a way that is compatible with human rights (s 48(1)) and, if a statutory provision cannot be interpreted in a way that is compatible with human rights, the provision must, to the extent possible consistent with its purpose, be interpreted in a way that is most compatible with human rights (s 48(2))
- if the provision cannot be interpreted consistently with human rights, the Supreme Court may make a declaration of incompatibility to the effect that the Court is of the opinion that a statutory provision cannot be interpreted compatibly with human rights (s 53)

¹⁸ Emma Phillips and Aimee McVeigh, 'The grassroots campaign for a Human Rights Act in Queensland: A case study of modern Australian law reform' (2020) 45(1) *Alternative Law Journal* 12.

¹⁹ Explanatory Memorandum, *Human Rights Act 2019* (Qld) 6.

Public entities (i.e. the executive) are required to act and make decisions in a way that is compatible with human rights. The Bill provides that it is unlawful for a public entity:

- to act or make a decision in a way that is not compatible with human rights (s 58(1)(a)); or
- in making a decision, to fail to give proper consideration to a human right relevant to the decision (s 58(1)(b))

It should be noted that the Queensland Act does not provide the right to a stand-alone cause of action for a contravention of any of the named rights (s 59). Instead, a human rights argument must be attached or ‘piggybacked’ to a separate independent cause of action (for example, judicial review proceedings or discrimination complaints) which is separate from a claim under s 58 of the Act. This is similar to the requirements of s 39 of the *Victorian Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006* (Vic) (**Victorian Charter**).

One unique feature in Queensland is the availability of an accessible complaints mechanism. Section 64(1) provides for an individual who has been the subject of an alleged contravention to make a complaint to the Queensland Human Rights Commission. If the matter does not resolve at conciliation, however, there is no standing to proceed to a court. Nevertheless, in the case of an unresolved complaint, the Commission does have the ability to publish information about the steps it believes the public entity should take in the future to ensure that its actions are compatible with human rights (s 90).

The use of the override provision in the Queensland Act, particularly in relation to youth justice and children’s rights in detention, has been criticised as rendering the Act a ‘toothless tiger’. A recent independent review has recommended that the override provision be repealed.²⁰

²⁰ S Harris Rimmer, *Placing People at the Heart of Policy: First independent review of the Human Rights Act 2019 (Qld)* (Final Report, 30 September 2024), Recommendation 37: https://www.humanrightsreview.qld.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0020/830018/final-report-placing-people-at-the-heart-of-policy.pdf.

B) VICTORIA'S CHARTER OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The enactment of human rights legislation in Victoria was led by state Attorney-General, Rob Hulls, who appointed a small Human Rights Consultation Committee that consulted with a broad range of Victorians, including those that may have been alienated from the legal and justice system, as well as young people.²¹

The Victorian Charter came into force on 1 January 2007 and was fully operational by 1 January 2008. Its purpose is to protect and promote human rights by:

- setting out the human rights that Parliament specifically seeks to protect and promote; and
- ensuring that all statutory provisions, whenever enacted, are interpreted so far as is possible in a way that is compatible with human rights; and
- imposing an obligation on all public authorities to act in a way that is compatible with human rights; and
- requiring statements of compatibility with human rights to be prepared in respect of all Bills introduced into Parliament and enabling the Scrutiny of Acts and Regulations Committee to report on such compatibility; and
- conferring jurisdiction on the Supreme Court to declare that a statutory provision cannot be interpreted consistently with a human right and requiring the relevant Minister to respond to that declaration.²²

As noted by Julie Debeljak, like the Queensland Act, the Victorian Charter is an ordinary Act of Parliament (rather than a constitutionally entrenched model) and the judiciary's power is limited to the interpretation of legislation in a way that is compatible with human rights and the making of declarations of inconsistency (as opposed to declarations of invalidity), two features which are said to ensure 'Parliamentary sovereignty'.²³

The twenty rights guaranteed in the Victorian Charter are set out in sections 8-27 and are based on civil and political rights identified in the ICCPR. The rights in the Charter are not absolute as they can be subject to reasonable limitations that are 'justified in a free and democratic society based on human dignity, equality and freedom'. Section 7(2) of the Charter sets out a list of factors for determining whether a limitation on a right is justified, namely:

- the nature of the right
- the importance of the purpose of the limitation
- the nature and extent of the limitation
- the relationship between the limitation and its purpose
- any less restrictive means reasonably available to achieve the purpose

The Victorian Charter requires people and public institutions, including the courts, to interpret and apply all laws in a way that is compatible with human rights. As Julie Debeljak explains, this 'imposes a presumption in favour of rights-compatible interpretation of legislation; rebutted only when Parliament includes clear legislative words, or necessary intention, that legislation be interpreted to the contrary'.²⁴ Where the Supreme Court is unable to find a rights-compatible interpretation to a provision, it can issue a declaration of inconsistent interpretation, which does not invalidate the provision but rather initiates a review of the legislation, with the responsible Minister given six months to prepare a written response to the declaration and to table it in Parliament (s 37).

As in Queensland, there is no stand-alone remedy under the Charter. It could be argued that the need to 'attach' or 'piggyback' a claim under the Charter to another claim reduces the capacity for an individual to obtain effective relief.

The Victorian Equal Opportunity and Human Rights Commission is an independent statutory agency. It has functions in the area of reporting, human rights education and intervening in proceedings where a question of law arises about the Charter's application or the human rights compatible interpretation of a law (s 40). Unlike in Queensland, however, there is no accessible complaints mechanism in Victoria.

²¹ Williams and Reynolds (n 2) 147-149.

²² Victorian Charter, s 1(2).

²³ Debeljak (n 11) 66.

²⁴ Ibid.

C) THE ACT'S HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

The ACT was the first jurisdiction in Australia to enact human rights legislation following a report prepared by the ACT Bill of Rights Consultative Committee in 2003, which noted the fragmented nature of human rights protections in the ACT. The *Human Rights Act 2004* (**ACT Act**) was intended to improve the protection of human rights in the ACT and provide people within the ACT with a 'clear and accessible statement of their fundamental human rights'²⁵

The ACT Act provides protection for civil and political rights (ss 8 to 27) and three economic, cultural and social rights that have been subsequently added following reviews of the ACT Act, namely the right to education (s 27A), the right to work (s 27B) and the right to a healthy environment (s 27C).

As with the Queensland Act and the Victorian Charter, the ACT Act is based on a dialogue model whereby obligations are set out for each arm of government. As regards the obligations on Parliament, the Attorney-General must prepare a statement of compatibility about a bill for presentation to the Legislative Assembly (s 37); and the relevant Assembly committee must report to the Legislative Assembly about human rights issues raised by bills presented to the Assembly (s 38).

Like in Victoria and Queensland, the judiciary is required to interpret legislation in a way that is compatible with human rights (s 30). The Supreme Court has the power to issue a declaration of incompatibility, but as with the other state jurisdictions, that declaration does not affect the validity of the legislation (s 32).

The ACT Act makes it unlawful for public authorities, including Tribunals, to act in a way that is incompatible with a human right or, in making a decision, to fail to give proper consideration to a relevant human right (s 40B).

Unlike the Queensland Act and the Victorian Charter, the ACT Act provides for a stand-alone cause of action for breaches of human rights (s 40C), a feature that was added after the 2009 Review of the Act.²⁶ The Supreme Court can provide 'relief it considers appropriate' if an action against a Public Authority succeeds, but there is no entitlement to damages.

²⁵ See Caxton Legal Centre, 'Submission to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee Human Rights Inquiry on the adoption of a Human Rights Act in Queensland' (18 April 2016), 36.

²⁶ See also Legislative Assembly for the Australian Capital Territory Standing Committee on Justice and Community Safety, 'Report into the Inquiry into Petition 32-21 (No Rights Without Remedy)' (Report 7, 10th Assembly, June 2022) 3.

V. REASONS TO CONTINUE THE DISCUSSION FOR HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION IN NSW

It was over twenty years ago, in 2001, that the Legislative Council Standing Committee on Law and Justice published a report on its inquiry into an NSW Bill of Rights, recommending against the introduction of such legislation. In our view, a new discussion on human rights legislation in NSW is timely and important.

It may be for some members of the community that it is reason enough to enact a charter of rights on the basis that it will provide statutory recognition for universal human rights that are not afforded protection under Australian law. Others may be persuaded by the educative force of human rights legislation, where a consciousness in the community of the meaning and balancing of human rights, contributes to a culture of tolerance and understanding that acknowledges and respects rights.

It is possible to look at rights at an individual level and be persuaded by the need for access to remedies for those whose rights are breached. This may include minorities, for example, or marginalised groups, particularly those that interact regularly with government services. Perhaps an equally powerful argument is to understand the collective benefits of human rights legislation, including potential improvements to housing, healthcare or education, if it encompasses the social, economic and cultural rights highly valued by the Australian community.

One of the strongest arguments in favour of state-based human rights legislation is that it has the potential to improve the quality of parliamentary, Executive and bureaucratic decision-making. It is important that human rights are not simply an afterthought when legislation is made, but a central consideration from the outset of the legislative process.

The Law Society has a long-standing position in support of human rights legislation for NSW. In the absence of a concrete commitment to a stand-alone human rights Act, we urge leaders across the political spectrum to commit to a broad and inclusive consultation on human rights with the community of NSW. We remain positive that NSW can become a leading jurisdiction nationally and internationally for the protection of human rights.

EXAMPLES OF RIGHTS THAT COULD BE PROTECTED UNDER NSW HUMAN RIGHTS LEGISLATION



