FOREWORD

It is with both pleasure and pride that I introduce the tenth volume of *The University of Notre Dame Australia Law Review*. Reflecting back on ten years of publication sees the development of this Law School and its Law Review through their infancy and into maturity.

A dedicated group of student editors, under the excellent guidance of Associate Editor Ava Sidhu, have collected a range of articles from an impressive field of submitted pieces. Their commitment, attention to detail and professionalism have created an impressive volume. The diversity of topics and authors allows for an interesting and stimulating read.

In the first article, Andrew Hemming argues that the defence of diminished responsibility should be abolished. He presents an interesting and engaging account of why it should not be reformulated.

In timely fashion after celebrating 60 years of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the second article by Julie Cassidy looks at the enforcement of international human rights and the role of domestic forums in that enforcement. It is a fitting introduction to the impending federal debate in 2009 over the need for a Charter or Bill of Rights in Australia.

The third article by Andrew Dahdal reflects upon the analysis of renowned scholar Professor Julius Stone, of international law and its application to the Middle East. The author challenges Stone's conclusions and also seeks to understand how and why he arrived at them.

Tyrone Kirchengast provides a comprehensive look at *Gray v Motor Accidents Commission* (1998) 196 CLR 1 and the consequences ten years on of that judgment. This fourth article considers the relationship between tort and crime from the victim's perspective.

The fifth article by Margaret Hyland evaluates the Australian Securities and Investment Commission's statutory power to issue infringement notices under Part 9.4AA of the *Corporations Act 2001* (Cth) and its constitutional validity.

The final piece, a case note by Brooke Hobson, Law Honours student, draws upon the significance of the joint judgment of Gleeson CJ, Gummow, Heydon and Crennan JJ and the differing view of Kirby J in

the High Court case of *Koompahtoo Local Aboriginal Land Council v Sanpine Pty Limited* (2007) 233 CLR 115 in relation to the classification of contractual terms.

I commend this volume of the Law Review to our readers in celebration of ten years of publication and shared scholarship.

Associate Professor Jane Power
The Editor, The University of Notre Dame Australia Law Review,
Executive Dean, College of Law
The University of Notre Dame Australia