

NFIB submission



**Subject:** NFIB submission  
**From:** John Farrell [redacted]  
**Date:** Tue, 18 Jan 2011 09:46:25 +1100  
**To:** laeisc@parliament.wa.gov.au

[redacted]

Dear Brenda; this email responds to your earlier one to me.

The NFIB has spent a lot of time in protecting small business owners from rogue franchisors and landlords. The ONLY change that is required for simple/effective Franchisee protection is the rediscovery of "Harsh and Oppressive Conduct" in the TPA; this somehow disappeared a few years ago, no doubt due to "lobbying" by the FCA, the nasty Council that represents FRANCHISORS, not both parties. I have attached the relevant sheet of the relevant Act in the ACT; we have used it to get justice by Political and Media action, NOT by stuffing around in useless litigation and Contract law. The "stronger" party in this case is the landlord, the "weaker" party is the tenant; it applies equally to the Franchisor and Franchisee. WA Federal MP Don Randall is fully aware of the above and is copied on this email.

Thank you  
*John Farrell*  
 John Farrell B.E.E  
 Federal President - NFIB

[redacted]

H&O0001.pdf	Content-Type: application/pdf
	Content-Encoding: base64