Australian Law Journal

GENERAL EDITOR

Mr Justice PW Young AO

ASSISTANT GENERAL EDITORS

Angelina Gomez Jennifer Single Barrister-at-Law Barrister-at-Law

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Cheryle King

The mode of citation of this volume is (2007) 81 ALJ [page]

The Australian Law Journal is a refereed journal.

Australian Law Journal Reports

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Carolyn May

CASE REPORTERS

John Carroll

Philip Claxtn

Clare D'Arcy

Cathie Dickinson

Alan Luchetti

James McGregor

Colleen Tognetti

The mode of citation of this volume is 81 ALJR [page]

THE AUSTRALIAN LAW JOURNAL

Volume 81, Number 3

March 2007

CURRENT ISSUES – Editor: Mr Justice PW Young AO	
Rest and recreation	143
Community outrage	143
Why be a judge in the 21st century?	143
On the independency of the judiciary	144
Why courts are unpopular	145
Judges' retirement	146
Child care cases	146
Winning on a technicality	147
Ownership of a colour	147
Do directors of charities have "enhanced" duties?	147
Cronies	148
LETTERS TO THE EDITOR	149
CONVEYANCING AND PROPERTY – Editor: Peter Butt	
Is a right of pre-emption a caveatable interest?	152
No extension of caveat where no money secured by charge	153
Compliance with formal requirements	153
FOURTY AND TRIVETS	
EQUITY AND TRUSTS Interlocutory injunctions in defamation cases	155
Interloculory infunctions in defamation cases	1.5.7

RECENT CASES – Editor: Mr Justice PW Young AO	
Freezing orders	158
Are clergy employees?	158
What is "public worship"?	159
What is torture?	159
Caveats against dealings	159
Unjust enrichment	160
Insurance: What is an accident?	160
Ownership of livestock: Commixture of goods	161
Computer pornography	161
ARTICLES	
COMPANIES ACT 2006 (UK): A NEW APPROACH TO DIRECTORS' DUTIES	
Rt Hon Lady Justice Arden DBE	
The United Kingdom has enacted its first codified statement of the duties of directors in the Companies Act 2006 (UK). This article explains the thinking behind this statutory statement and points out that it reflects the "enlightened shareholder" model of directors' duties. This means that directors must promote to the success of the company for the benefit of its members, rather than for the benefit of different interest groups, but at the same time they must have regard to the interests of other parties which contribute to the company's success. This article contains a commentary on the new provisions and an evaluation. It also refers to the recent reports of the Australian Joint Parliamentary Committee on Corporations and the Corporations and Markets Advisory Committee which both considered whether there should be an equivalent provision in Australia to the new codified statement of directors' duties in the UK.	162
CHOOSING YOUR LIFE RAFT: A REVIEW OF LAW REFORM (MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS) ACT 1946 (NSW), s 6, AND ITS ANALOGUES	
N G Rein SC	
Legislative schemes exist both at the State and Commonwealth level to deal with the inability of an insured to make, or continue with, a claim on an insurance policy arranged by that insured and covering liabiliites to third parties. The article summarises the current law in relation to s 6 of the Law Reform (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1946, discusses some of the remaining difficulties and compares s 6 with the Commonwealth legislative provisions providing relief to those asserting such claims against insureds.	180

THE COMMONWEALTH: A MULTITUDE OF MANIFESTATIONS – FEDERAL JURISDICTION UNDER s 75(III) OF THE CONSTITUTION

Darrell Barnett

It is important for practitioners and judges alike to know when, and on what basis, legal	
proceedings involve the exercise of federal jurisdiction. This article is concerned with the	
attraction of federal jurisdiction under s75(iii) of the Constitution, on the basis that the	
Commonwealth, or a person suing or being sued on behalf of the Commonwealth, is a	
party to the proceedings. The article deals with the meaning of the constitutional	
expression "the Commonwealth" as the central or national government of Australia and	
encompassing its "agencies and instrumentalities". The article examines the legislative	
regime governing Commonwealth authorities and other statutory bodies with a view to	
showing that those bodies generally are "agencies and instrumentalities" of the	
Commonwealth and hence are themselves "the Commonwealth" for the purposes of	
875(iii). This has the result that litigation by or against such a statutory body involves the	
exercise of federal jurisdiction under s 75(iii) of the Constitution. Finally, the article	
considers the meaning of the phrase "person suing or being sued on behalf of the	
Commonwealth" in s 75(iii) and identifies some situations in which a person may fall	
within the scope of that phrase notwithstanding that the person is not itself "the	
Commonwealth".	195
ODUTE LA DAZ	215

The Australian Law Journal Reports

HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Lawbook Co

DECISIONS	RECEIVED	IN DECEMBER	2006/ FEBRU	ARY 2007

Clayton v The Queen (Criminal Law) ([2006] HCA 58)	439
Gordon v Tolcher (Corporations; High Court and Federal Court) ([2006] HCA 62)	507
Hartwick v The Queen (Criminal Law) ([2006] HCA 58)	439
Houghton v Arms (Trade Practices) ([2006] HCA 59)	466
ING Investment Management LLC v Margaretic (Corporations) ([2007] HCA 1)	525
Klein v Minister for Education (Workers' Compensation) ([2007] HCA 2)	582
Leach v The Queen (Criminal Law) ([2007] HCA 3)	598
New South Wales v Ibbett (Damages; Police; Torts) ([2006] HCA 57)	427
Sons of Gwalia Ltd v Margaretic (Corporations) ([2007] HCA 1)	525
STCB v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (<i>Citizenship and Migration</i>) ([2006] HCA 61)	485
SZBEL v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (<i>Citizenship and Migration</i>) ([2006] HCA 63)	515
VBAO v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs (<i>Citizenship and Migration</i>) ([2006] HCA 60)	475