AUSTRALIAN BUSINESS LAW REVIEW

Volume 35, Number 4

Aug	ust	20	07

EDITORIAL	233
-----------	-----

ARTICLES

The Cartel Offence: Dishonesty? – Brent Fisse

The new cartel offence proposed by the Government would be defined partly in terms of the element of dishonesty. The intention is to limit the scope of the offence to serious cartel conduct. Relying on the concept of dishonesty in this context is problematic. The requirement of an "intention to dishonestly obtain a gain" is not a touchstone of serious harm or serious culpability. The "standards of ordinary people" limb of the element of dishonesty is an undefined and undefinable populist notion the practical application of which will create real difficulties for judges and juries as well as for people in business and their advisers. The requirement for dishonesty of "knowledge that the conduct was dishonest according to the standards of ordinary people" is a subjective test that will allow large and sophisticated corporations to deny liability and quite possibly obtain an acquittal on the basis of mistake of law or self-preferring subjectivised beliefs about the morality of their conduct. Dishonesty is an unnecessary element of the proposed cartel offence given that there are other possible ways of effectively limiting the scope of the offence so that it will apply only to serious cartel conduct. The Dawson Committee never recommended reliance on the concept of dishonesty. The subsequent report of the Working Party to the Government has never been published. No country other than the United Kingdom has made dishonesty an element of a cartel offence, for good reasons.

more efficient of efficiencies in merger determinations - Arlen Duke

This article considers the varying treatment of merger-related efficiencies in overseas jurisdictions and in Australian and New Zealand merger authorisation and clearance determinates. This analysis leads to the conclusion that the inclusion of an efficiency defence in the legislative regime that regulates the competitive effects of mergers tends to cause decision-makers to adopt a less sophisticated approach when assessing the competitive effects of merger activity. It is therefore argued that the Australian Competition Tribunal, the body now responsible for determining authorisation applications, should be alert to the fact that the effects of merger-related efficiencies are relevant to both the assessment of public benefits and public detriments. By considering the competition and resource saving effects of merger-related efficiencies separately, the tribunal will be better placed to assess the merger's effect on competition and perform a more meaningful trade-off between competition and efficiency as part of its analysis of merger authorisation applications. 278

COMPETITION LAW AND MARKET REGULATION – Stephen Corones	
Can the ACCC'S Leniency Policy survive the Geelong Petrol case?	293
OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH AND SAFETY – Barry Sherriff	
The concept of control in determining OHS responsibilities: A need for clarity	298
BOOK REVIEW – Peter Lithgow Annotated Trade Practices Act 1974 by Steinwall R	306

Guidelines for Contributors

Submission and licence agreement instructions

All contributions to the journal are welcome and should be sent, with a signed licence agreement, to the Production Editor, *Australian Business Law Review*, Lawbook Co., PO Box 3502, Rozelle, NSW 2039 (mail), 100 Harris St, Pyrmont, NSW 2009 (courier) or by email to ablr@thomson.com.au, for forwarding to the Editor. Licence agreements can be downloaded via the internet at http://www.lawbookco.com.au/authorsupport/d_authorJournals.asp. If you submit your contribution via email, please confirm that you have printed, signed and mailed the licence agreement to the attention of the Production Editor at the mailing address noted above.

Letters to the Editor

By submitting a letter to the editor of this journal for publication, you agree that Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited, trading as Lawbook Co., may edit and has the right to, and may license third parties to, reproduce in electronic form and communicate the letter.

Manuscript

- · Manuscript must be original, unpublished work that has not been submitted for publication elsewhere.
- Personal details (name, qualifications, position) for publication and a delivery address, email address and phone number must be included with the manuscript.
- · Manuscript must be submitted electronically via email or on disk in Microsoft Word format.
- Manuscript should not exceed 10,000 words for articles or 1,500-2,000 words for section commentary or book reviews.
 An abstract of 100-150 words is to be submitted with article manuscripts.
- Proof pages will be sent to contributors. Authors are responsible for the accuracy of case names, citations and other references. Excessive changes to the text cannot be accommodated.
- This journal complies with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) Specifications for peer review. Each article is, prior to publication, reviewed in its entirety by a suitably qualified expert who is independent of the author.

Style

1. Levels of headings should be clearly indicated (no more than four levels).

2 Cases

- Case citation follows case name. Where a case is cited in the text, the citation should follow immediately rather than as a footnote. Give at least two and preferably all available citations, the first listed being the authorised reference.
- Australian citations should appear in the following order: authorised series; Lawbook Co./ATP series; other company series (ie CCH, Butterworths); media neutral citation.
- "At" references should only refer to the best available citation, eg *Mabo v Queensland [No 2]* (1992) 175 CLR 1 at 34; 66 ALJR 408; 107 ALR 1.
- Where only a media neutral citation is available, "at" references should be to paragraph, eg YG v Minister for Community Services [2002] NSWCA 247 at [19].
- For international cases best references only should be included.

3. Legislation should be cited as follows:

Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth), s 51AC. The full citation should be repeated in footnotes.

4. Books should be cited as follows:

Macken JJ, O'Grady P, Sappideen C and Warburton G, The Law of Employment (5th ed, Lawbook Co., 2002) p 55.

- In footnotes do not use ibid or op cit. The following style is preferred:
- 4. Austin RP, "Constructive Trusts" in Finn PD (ed), Essays in Equity (Law Book Co, 1985).
- 5. Austin, n 4, p 56.

5. Journals should be cited as follows:

Odgers S, "Police Interrogation: A Decade of Legal Development" (1990) 14 Crim LJ 220.

Wherever possible use official abbreviations not the full name for journal titles.

- In footnotes do not use ibid or op cit. The following style is preferred:
 - 6. Sheehy EA, Stubbs J and Tolmie J, "Defending Battered Women on Trial: The Battered Woman Syndrome and its Limitations" (1992) 16 Crim LJ 220.
- 7. Sheehy et al, n 6 at 221.

6. Internet references should be cited as follows:

Ricketson S, *The Law of Intellectual Property: Copyright, Designs and Confidential Information* (Lawbook Co., subscription service) at [16.340], http://subscriber.lawbookco.com.au viewed 25 June 2002. Underline the URL and include the date the document was viewed.

For further information visit the Lawbook Co. website at http://www.lawbookco.com.au or contact the Production Editor.

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Australian Business Law Review comprises six parts a year.

Customer service and sales inquiries:
Tel: 1300 304 195 Fax: 1300 304 196
Web: www.thomson.com.au/legal/p index.asp
Email: LRA.Service@thomson.com

Editorial inquiries: Tel: (02) 8587 7000

HEAD OFFICE 100 Harris Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 Tel: (02) 8587 7000 Fax: (02) 8587 7100



© Thomson Legal & Regulatory Limited ABN 64 058 914 668 trading as Lawbook Co.

ISSN 0310-1053

Typeset by Lawbook Co., Pyrmont, NSW

Printed by Ligare Pty Ltd, Riverwood, NSW