THE AUSTRALIAN LAW JOURNAL

Volume 93, Number 7

July 2019

Corrigendum

Please refer to Volume 90 of the *Australian Law Journal*. An error appears in the article by Daniel Reynolds, "Construction of Contracts after *Mount Bruce Mining v Wright Prospecting*" (2016) 90 *Australian Law Journal* 190, page 204. The list of High Court Justices appearing in the first full sentence on that page should have included Justice Crennan. The author apologises for the omission.

CURRENT ISSUES – Guest Editor: Dr Nuncio D'Angelo

Climate Change and the Law	519		
ASIC's and APRA's Changed Attitudes to Enforcement	520		
Review of Franchising Law	521		
Politics and the Rule of Law	524		
Arbitration Clauses and the High Court	524		
The Ongoing Saga of an Implied Duty of Good Faith in Contracts	524		
Religious Freedom: A Follow-up	525		
A New International Law Editor for the Journal	525		
The Curated Page	526		
AROUND THE NATION: VICTORIA – Editor: Justice Clyde Croft AM			
Amendments to the International Arbitration Act 1974 (Cth)	527		
FAMILY LAW – Editor: Richard Ingleby			
What if Mrs Jennings or Mr Stanford were worth \$20,000,000?	530		
INTERNATIONAL FOCUS – Editor: Professor Stuart Kaye			
Australia and Timor-Leste Conciliation and Maritime Boundary Treaty	532		
ADMIRALTY AND MARITIME – Editor: Dr Damien J Cremean			
Pollution of the Seas and Admiralty	538		

514 (2019) 93 ALJ 514

COMPETITION AND CONSUMER LAW – Editor: John Kettle	
Competitive Neutrality, State Aid and Australia – Worth Reconsidering?	543
PERSONALIA – Editor: Emily Vale	
New South Wales Justice Lea Armstrong Justice Andrew Bell Justice Patricia Henry	547
Queensland Justice Elizabeth Wilson	548
RECENT CASES – Editor: Ruth C A Higgins SC	
Representative Proceedings – Part IVA of the Federal Court of Australia Act 1976 (Cth) – Constitutional Law – Judicial Power – Whether Power to Make Common Fund Order Part of or Incidental to Exercise of Judicial Power by the Court – Constitutional Law – Acquisition on Just Terms	549
Constitutional Law – Separation of Powers – Acquisition of Property – Whether Common Fund Order Contrary to Separation of Powers – Whether Common Fund Order Acquisition of Property Other Than on just terms – Representative Proceedings – Common Fund Order	549
ARTICLES	
ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN JUDGMENTS: DOES AN ISSUE ESTOPPEL ARISE FROM A FOREIGN COURT'S DETERMINATION OF ITS OWN JURISDICTION?	
Dan Butler	
Australian Courts, from time to time, are asked to enforce foreign judgments. A fundamental requirement for enforcement of a foreign judgment is that the foreign Court has exercised a jurisdiction which is recognised by Australian law. However, on an enforcement application in Australia, what is the effect, if any, of the foreign Court's determination of its own jurisdiction? That is, if a foreign Court is asked by a defendant to rule on its own jurisdiction, and decides it does have jurisdiction, does an issue estoppel arise in local enforcement proceedings, preventing the judgment debtor from contending that the foreign Court did not have jurisdiction? This article considers the limited, and differing, authorities on this issue. It contends that an issue estoppel should not be permitted in those circumstances.	558
"SEEKING EQUAL DIGNITY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION" – THE AUSTRALIAN HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION AND THE HANDLING OF COMPLAINTS	
Emeritus Professor Rosalind Croucher AM	
The complaint handling role of the Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) is one of the key ways of protecting human rights in Australia, but it is not well understood. This article seeks to fill that gap. There are actually three distinct streams of complaints, a fact that reflects the history of the Commission itself. There is the set of complaints that may be brought under the four federal Discrimination Acts, but there are also two other streams of complaints, based on the international instruments that are scheduled to the AHRC Act, rather than through domestic legislation. As is the story in most legal histories	

(2019) 93 ALJ 514 515

	of the development of legislation, it is not a linear narrative. Contemporary criticism or questioning also needs to be placed in the context of that history. An understanding of the role played by the Commission since its foundation also provides essential background for a consideration of improving human rights protections in Australia.	571
	ALTERNATIVE FACTS IN THE COURTS	
	The Hon Justice Stephen Gageler AC	
	This article reflects on how our legal system deals with the phenomenon of the assertion of alternative versions of a fact. When a party in litigation asserts the existence of a fact which another party disputes, the question for the tribunal of fact is not the abstract question of whether the fact exists. The question for the tribunal is whether it is satisfied that the fact has been proved to the requisite standard. The tribunal's judgment is made inevitably under conditions of uncertainty and involves the formation of a subjective belief. That subjective belief is an "actual persuasion" that the asserted fact exists. And it is the subjectivity of fact-finding that allows us to understand why a different, probabilistic approach to fact-finding cannot be the measure or the goal of what our courts do.	585
	EXPLORING NEW AND OLD IDEAS ABOUT ESTOPPEL AND ELECTION	
	The Hon K R Handley QC	
	The author explores the interaction between old and new ideas in the test of unconscionability, statements about the future, agreements subject to contract, promissory estoppel, testamentary promises, the relevance of Hohfeld's analysis of the nature of legal rights, and election between rights.	594
	OBITUARY	
	Emeritus Professor Michael Coper AO, FAAL	603
Αu	Istralian Law Journal Reports HIGH COURT REPORTS - Staff of Thomson Reuters	
	DECISIONS RECEIVED IN MAY 2019	
	Frugtniet v Australian Securities and Investments Commission (Administrative Law; Consumer Credit) ([2019] HCA 16)	629
	Parkes Shire Council v South West Helicopters Pty Ltd (Aviation; Torts) ([2019] HCA 14)	607
	Rinehart v Hancock Prospecting Pty Ltd (Arbitration; Deeds; High Court and Federal Court; Interpretation) ([2019] HCA 13)	582
	Rinehart v Rinehart (Arbitration; Deeds; High Court and Federal Court; Interpretation) ([2019] HCA 13)	582

516 (2019) 93 ALJ 514