

# TRADE PRACTICES LAW JOURNAL

Volume 13, Number 2

June 2005

|                 |    |
|-----------------|----|
| EDITORIAL ..... | 69 |
|-----------------|----|

## ARTICLES

### **Dealing with unfair terms in consumer contracts: Is Australia falling behind? – Frank Zumbo**

As the modern corporation has grown in size and power so has its use of standard form contracts in consumer transactions. While defended by the modern corporation on economic efficiency grounds such as reducing transaction costs, these standard form contracts are not drafted for the ultimate benefit of the consumer. While standard form contracts may spare the parties the cost and time of drafting contracts for each and every consumer purchase or borrowing, that saving comes at a price. For the consumer it means a loss of control over the contents of the contract. Given that a standard form contract is drafted on the corporation's behalf, there can be little doubt that its contents will always tend to favour the corporation. Equally certain is that in the absence of any check on the corporation there is nothing stopping it from having the contract drafted in a way that goes beyond what is reasonably necessary to protect its legitimate commercial interests. Indeed, without an effective mechanism for dealing with unfair terms, consumers have no choice but to sign standard form contracts no matter how one-sided or unfair they may be in their operation. Statutory prohibitions against unconscionable conduct are of little use, as they are difficult to enforce and deal only with individual examples of offending conduct. Significantly, a finding of unconscionable conduct in one relationship may not necessarily promote better conduct in another relationship. What is needed is a new statutory framework giving the relevant government consumer protection agency broader powers to proactively deal with unfair terms in consumer contracts. With such a statutory framework having been implemented in the United Kingdom several years ago, and more recently adopted in Victoria, the article addresses both the operation of the relevant legislation and the clear benefits to consumers from having such new legislation. In doing so, the article argues that by refraining from enacting such new legislation other Australian jurisdictions are falling behind in this increasingly important area of consumer protection. .... 70

### **Quantitative analysis again up in lights – Alexandra Merrett**

*AGL v ACCC* was an intriguing case for many reasons, not least due to its focus upon quantitative analysis. While initially many were sceptical as to its utility (and admissibility), quantitative analysis has increasingly been accepted as a critical tool for competition investigations. In Australia, however, courts have demonstrated a lack of willingness to engage with detailed and often complex economic evidence. In *AGL v ACCC*, the ACCC presented extremely sophisticated quantitative analysis to the Federal

Court, but while this evidence was more thoroughly considered than has previously been the case, it was resoundingly rejected in favour of “commercial reality”. The value of quantitative analysis was accordingly called into question again. Nonetheless, the ACCC’s reliance on such evidence creates an interesting precedent for those seeking to parley with the regulator. It also provides further basis for the view that the ACCC and the courts are increasingly diverging in their approach to competition law. .... 90

## ACCESS TO SERVICES

**Accessible economics: A guide to the economics of pricing the mobile terminating access service** – *Dylan Matthews and Kate Cust* ..... 98

## CONSUMER PROTECTION

**Ad-agent provocateur: Can misleading agencies be liable as principals for creating misleading ads?** – *Damien Millen* ..... 102

## COUNCIL CONSIDERATIONS

*John Feil* ..... 107

## TRIBUNAL TABLEAUX

**Practice and procedure – Application for disqualification of a member of the Tribunal – Seven Network Ltd (No 1) (2004) 182 FLR 169; [2004] ACompT 5; Seven Network Ltd (No 2) [2004] ATPR 41-987; ACompT 6** – *Dr Lici Inge* ..... 110

## REPORT FROM NORTH AMERICA

**In God we trust – all others must pay cash: The extension of the per se rule to mergers involving asset swaps** – *Dr Chetan Sanghvi* ..... 114

## REPORT FROM SOUTH AMERICA

**Consumer protection in MERCOSUR** – *Durval de Noronha Goyos Jr* ..... 120

WORTH REPEATING ..... 123

# 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, *Trade Practices Law Journal*, Lawbook Co., PO Box 3502, Rozelle, NSW 2039 (mail), 100 Harris St, Pyrmont, NSW 2009 (courier) or by email to [tplj@thomson.com.au](mailto:tplj@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](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 7,000 words for articles or 3,000 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.
- Contributors of articles receive 25 free offprints of their article and a copy of the part in which the article is published. Other contributors receive a copy of the part to which they have contributed.
- All material published in this journal is refereed. Every manuscript submitted is subject to peer review for the purpose of maintaining the standards of the journal.

## 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 *Trade Practices Law Journal* comprises four parts a year.

Customer Service and sales inquiries:

**Tel: 1300 304 195**

**Fax: 1300 304 196**

**Web:** [www.lawbookco.com.au](http://www.lawbookco.com.au)

**Email:** [LRA.Service@thomson.com](mailto: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 1039-3277

Typeset by Lawbook Co., Pyrmont, NSW

Printed by Ligare Pty Ltd, Riverwood, NSW