## 1971-1972

THE

## COMMONWEALTH LAW REPORTS

CASES DETERMINED IN THE

## HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

EDITOR: J. D. MERRALLS, LL.B.

#### REPORTERS:

New South Wales G. K. DOWNES, B.A., LL.B. { I. C. F. SPRY, LL.D. R. A. SUNDBERG, B.C.L., LL.M. Victoria South Australia . B. M. DEBELLE, LL.B. Tasmania . R. M. WEBSTER, LL.B. Mestern Australia G. A. KENNEDY, B.C.L., LL.B.

Barristers-at-Law.

### VOL. 126

#### Australia:

#### THE LAW BOOK COMPANY LIMITED

301-305 KENT STREET. MELBOURNE - 389-393 Lonsdale Street. 27-35 TURBOT STREET. BRISBANE

- 0 455 03850 3 (C.L.R. Series)
- 0 455 05120 8 (C.L.R. Vol. 126)

© 1974 THE LAW BOOK COMPANY LIMITED

#### JUSTICES OF THE HIGH COURT

#### OF AUSTRALIA

#### DURING THE CURRENCY OF THIS VOLUME

- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR GARFIELD EDWARD JOHN BARWICK, G.C.M.G., CHIEF JUSTICE.
- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR EDWARD ALOYSIUS McTIERNAN, K.B.E.
- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR DOUGLAS IAN MENZIES, K.B.E.
- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM JOHN VICTOR WINDEYER, K.B.E., C.B., D.S.O. (retired 29th February 1972).
- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM FRANCIS LANGER OWEN, K.B.E. (died 31st March 1972).
- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR CYRIL AMBROSE WALSH, K.B.E.
- THE RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR HARRY TALBOT GIBBS, K.B.E.
- THE HONOURABLE SIR NINIAN MARTIN STEPHEN, K.B.E. (from 1st March 1972).

#### ATTORNEY-GENERAL:

SENATOR THE HONOURABLE IVOR JOHN GREENWOOD, Q.C.

#### MEMORANDA

1972

- February 4 —The Honourable Sir Harry Gibbs, K.B.E., was appointed a Member of Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council.
- February 29—Resignation of The RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILLIAM JOHN VICTOR WINDEYER, K.B.E., C.B., D.S.O. of the office of a Justice of the High Court of Australia.
- March 1 —Appointment of The Honourable Mr. Justice Ninian Martin Stephen, a Judge of the Supreme Court of Victoria, to the office of a Justice of the High Court of Australia.
- March 31 —Death of SIR WILLIAM FRANCIS LANGER OWEN, K.B.E., a Justice of the High Court of Australia.
- April 20 —The Honourable Ninian Martin Stephen, one of the Justices of the High Court of Australia, was appointed a Knight Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire.

#### THE LATE SIR OWEN DIXON

On 25th July 1972, at a sitting of the Full High Court at Melbourne, Barwick C.J. said:

We are assembled here in Melbourne this morning as the Court to pay our tribute to my great predecessor in the office of Chief Justice of Australia, the late SIR OWEN DIXON. We are very pleased that Sir Victor Windeyer has been able to be present and that Sir Henry Winneke, Chief Justice of Victoria, has paid Sir Owen's memory and us the compliment of sitting with us this morning. The Attorney-General of the Commonwealth is present. Judges of the Supreme Court of Victoria have attended. The Solicitor-General of Victoria, representing the Attorney-General who is unable to be present and who has sent his regrets, the President of the Law Council of Australia, the Chairman of the Australian Bar Association, the Chairman of the Bar Council of Victoria and the Chairman of the Law Society of Victoria are also present. We welcome their attendance and that of so many of both branches of the legal profession. We are also pleased that SIR OWEN'S family is represented here by his daughters, Mrs. Danby and Mrs. Reid. also mention that Mr. Gregory, who is acting as attendant in the Court this morning, was assistant to SIR OWEN for a number of years. presence of all these people adds great emphasis to the tribute which I shall make on behalf of the Court.

SIR OWEN DIXON was a Justice of this Court for some twenty-three years from 1929 to 1952 before being appointed, in the latter year, Chief Justice, which office he occupied for twelve years, retiring on 13th April 1964. That span of thirty-five years was notable in the history of Australia and in that time SIR OWEN played a remarkable part in that history, as judge, diplomat and administrator. But principally SIR OWEN devoted his life to the law and it is of his career as a lawyer that we chiefly think this morning.

SIR OWEN was born in Hawthorn, Victoria, on 28th April 1886. He was the son of J. W. Dixon, a solicitor of the Supreme Court of Victoria. He was educated at Hawthorn College and thereafter at the University of Melbourne. He first studied classical languages and literature under Professor Tucker taking his Bachelor's degree in Arts in 1906 and his Master's degree in 1909. This study of the classics had a profound effect upon him. All his work as a judge was marked by habits of scholarship in no small part derived from

these early studies, though undoubtedly the natural bent of his mind was scholarly. He habitually exhibited what he called "the scholar's instinct to verify". As well, his scholarship is seen in his mastery of prose and expression. In a paper entitled "The Teaching of Classics and the Law" delivered by him in 1963 to the Classical Association of Victoria, of which he was a foundation member, he said—"... whatever else may be the result of a classical training, it does implant what is a very useful thing in the law-a fear of error, a fear which leads a man to verify his references and his recollection". Throughout his life he retained his interest in the classics, and their influence upon him continued. tribute to Sir Wilfred Fullagar upon Sir Wilfred's death in 1961, recorded in volume 103 of the Commonwealth Law Reports, will be found SIR OWEN'S own view of the enrichment of the mind which he regarded as coming from classical scholarship. Our generation has radically changed educational curricula. It remains yet to be seen whether the changed methods, given equal intellectual capacity and inclination, will produce as rich a mind as that which SIR OWEN developed over the long years of his life and experience.

After taking his Bachelor's degree in Arts, Sir Owen turned to the study of the law. In 1908 he obtained his degree as Bachelor of He was called to the Victorian Bar on 13th June 1910. very soon developed a very considerable practice, rising rapidly in the estimation of solicitors, of his contemporaries at the Bar and of the Judiciary, both of the Supreme Court of Victoria and of the High Court of Australia, because of his evident skill and capacity. In his speech of farewell to SIR OWEN on his retirement from the office of Chief Justice, Sir Robert Menzies, who had been SIR OWEN'S first pupil and had practised with him over the years, addressing his Honour, said of SIR OWEN'S career at the Bar: "I had the great pleasure of knowing your Honour at the Bar and . . . those who are of a newer generation will, I think, never quite understand the absolute dominance that your Honour exercised at the Bar. at the Bar you were not only a point of reference but also a voice of authority. To appear with you was a liberal education; to appear against you was calculated to reduce any normal human being like me to the depths of despair." SIR OWEN was a most skilful advocate, able to employ the art and skill of the advocate against the background of, and with the inestimable advantage of, a lawyer's knowledge of the relevant law. By 1922, a bare twelve years from his admission SIR Owen's practice had grown to the point where he

was ready for silk. Accordingly on 2nd March 1922 he was appointed King's Counsel. In the following two years, 1922-1923, and 1924, Sir Owen appeared before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London. For six months from 21st July 1926 he acted as a Judge of the Supreme Court of Victoria, returning to practice in the year of 1927. But he was not destined to practise at the Bar for much longer. On 4th February 1929 SIR OWEN was appointed a Justice of this Court upon the death of the Honourable Mr. Justice Henry Bournes Higgins. He had practised for a little more than eighteen years. In that time he had appeared with great frequency in all jurisdictions in Victoria, in the High Court of Australia and, as well, in the Privy Council. He was the acknowledged leader of the Bar, its outstanding lawyer and its greatest advocate. He enjoyed practice and was loath to leave it. responding to the farewell speech on his retirement Sir Owen said: "The work at the Bar I did for some years and enjoyed it. work which at all events to the young—and I was young—is extremely enjoyable. You think you are really doing some good in the world when you win a case, even when you are told you ought not to have won." When acknowledging the Victorian Bar's welcome on his appointment as Chief Justice, SIR OWEN had said: "For my part, I have never wavered in the view that the honourable practice of the profession of advocacy affords the greatest opportunity of contributing to the administering of justice according to law." In this spirit he practised and succeeded. He was not anxious to leave practice to accept a permanent seat on the Bench. In Sir John Latham's presence he publicly recalled that Sir John as Attorney-General of the Commonwealth had had to plead with him to accept an appointment to this Court. When he retired SIR OWEN said that he came on the Bench because he was told he ought and that he was going off because he believed he ought.

He said of the work on the Bench that he found it "hard and unrewarding". But of his life at the Bar he said that it was the most enjoyable time of his life. Perhaps this is small wonder when one reflects on his great competence in the work and his dominance of the profession of his day.

It is difficult adequately to express an appreciation of Sir Owen's work on the Court during the thirty-five years he occupied a seat on this Bench. Before his appointment as Chief Justice in 1952 he sat in turn with each Chief Justice other than Sir Samuel Griffith, that is to say, with Sir Adrian Knox, Sir Isaac Isaacs, Sir Frank Gavan

Duffy and Sir John Latham. Of his impressions of each of those but the last he has left us brief sketches in his farewell speech from the Bench. To recount the names of those Chief Justices is to underline both the length and the influence of Sir Owen's service as a member of this Court.

SIR OWEN'S influence in and through this Court was present throughout his judicial life and was not confined to his period as Chief Justice. His judicial work in co-operation with those who sat with him was always stimulating and enlightening. He illustrated his own remark that a man's influence on the Court did not depend upon where he sat. But his influence as Chief Justice was marked by quite subtle but yet noticeable changes in the atmosphere in which cases were argued. Also, as Chief Justice, he endeavoured to achieve a coherence in the Court which would comprehend the differences of approach likely to exist in an appellate Court of five or seven members, without diminishing the desirable strong individuality of those members. SIR OWEN'S influence on the law and the direction of its development as a Justice and as Chief Justice was profound and will I am sure be lasting.

SIR OWEN was a man of very exceptional talents and of superb intellectual capacity and attainment. He had a deep, penetrating and precise knowledge of the law throughout its entire gamut. had great mastery of legal principle as well as an extensive and accurate recollection of the literature of the law, including the reported decisions of the United Kingdom, those of the United States of America and of this country. He read widely in the legal journals. His ready recall of material from this literature germane to a case on hand was indeed remarkable. To this knowledge, he added great industry and unsparing effort in the pursuit of truth. The formation of a definite opinion later to be expressed in judgment was deferred until exhaustive inquiries and careful consideration were complete. He preferred not to work towards a conclusion during the argument of an appeal, but to use that period as but a phase of his inquiry for the right conclusion. In speaking of his appearances in this Court as counsel SIR OWEN said in the Syme Oration of 1957, of his elevation to this Bench: "Next followed some years on the Bench with little 'rest from long debate of wrong and right'. It was in a Court which I had watched even as a student and with which I had grown familiar. No very profound study of the Court, as I first saw it, was necessary to teach the lesson that the real weakness of powerful and confident minds strengthened by dialectical gifts, and at the same time accustomed to the responsibility of decision, lies in the tendency to work their way to a conclusion rather than to stop to inquire." This revealing passage explains much of his own approach to decision-making in the appellate work of a court placed at the head of the judicial system of each of the states of a federation, such as this Court, having as well its task of constitutional interpretation. Patient and scholarly inquiry was the path he preferred.

Notwithstanding his great talents, his knowledge of and experience in the practice of the law, SIR OWEN, as he himself said, did not find the work of the Court easy. He said it was the most difficult, least satisfying of any work he had had to attempt. This was said after his administrative work and his mediation for the United Nations to which I shall later make brief reference. However, these expressions, it seems to me, stemmed from the standard of excellence which he set himself and the standard of scholarship which he desired in the decisions and judgments of the Court. But if the work was as he said "hard, unrewarding work" he invariably performed it with extreme care resulting in judgments of great quality, the consequence of the application of his clear and penetrating mind to the law and the facts of the case.

By this course he won for himself universal acclaim throughout the English-speaking world as a great master of the common law and as a leading jurist in the British Commonwealth. In his lifetime he was described by highly placed lawyers on either side of the Atlantic as the greatest judicial lawyer of his time in the English-speaking world. This eminence, recognized and acclaimed wherever the common law holds sway or influence, was instrumental in the High Court of Australia being regarded as one of the greatest and most authoritative courts of the western world. His lustre was shed upon this Court. As a result, the reports of its judgments are to be found in legal libraries through the British Commonwealth and the United States of America, and are referred to in argument and judgment with increasing frequency. This, as I have said, we so largely owe to the international reputation which Sir Owen earned for himself.

As I have mentioned, the thirty-five years of his judicial career were important years in the history of Australia. We suffered a serious economic depression and a major war, each of which raised

many problems to be solved by the judgment of this Court. OWEN participated in the resolution of practically all the constitutional cases brought to the Court in that time. His judgments in these cases, illustrating his profound knowledge and understanding of the Australian Constitution, had a notable and far reaching influence on the development of Australian constitutional law. more than seventy volumes of the Commonwealth Law Reports which were published during his term of office form in themselves a tremendous reservoir of his contribution towards the growth of the law of the Constitution as well as of the growth of the general law. For it must be remembered that the largest part of the work of this Court is in the field of the general law. Over the whole field of the law, criminal as well as civil, SIR OWEN exercised his mastery and made most significant contributions to its clarification and growth. It yet remains for a biographer to gather together the advancing threads of his judgments as they progressively expose both his mastery of the records of the past and his willingness and ability to step forward projecting in new decisions developing concepts and applications of the common law.

Of his work in the field of constitutional law, I ought to say that he insisted upon and maintained the approach of the lawyer to the construction and application of the Constitution, applying to it with judicial impartiality and objectivity legal principles appropriate to the interpretation of an organic instrument intended to function in a developing nation and in changing circumstances. His legalism in this field was not narrow but in the tradition of the common law, the law of the Constitution thus serving the present and Australia's nationhood though built on the foundations of the past. Amongst SIR OWEN'S judgments in constitutional cases are many which are beacons in the navigation of what are mostly stormy waters.

I should at this point diverge briefly to mention SIR OWEN'S service in the diplomatic field and in the administrative field. It will be for others in other places to detail these activities and their particular significance in the life of this country. Here I mention them as indicative of the width of his mind and of his adaptability, springing no doubt from his intellectual stature and his capacity for application to a task. Between 1942 and 1944 SIR OWEN was Australian Minister to Washington. During that time events occurred critical in the country's history. He earned the respect of those with whom he had to deal for his sagacity in the handling of affairs.

In 1940 he had been appointed Chairman of the Central Wool Committee which had charge of the implementation of the Wool Agreement between Australia and the United Kingdom, and he was appointed as well between 1940 and 1942 to the Australian Shipping Control Board and Marine War Risks Insurance Board, the Commonwealth Marine Salvage Board and Allied Consultative Shipping Council in Australia.

To each of these tasks he brought the same immense capacity for work, the same integrity and conspicuous ability that he brought to all his legal work. In his activities on these committees he showed himself and became widely recognized as a very practical administrator. Later in 1950 Sir Owen was chosen by the United Nations Organization to mediate in the dispute between India and Pakistan over Kashmir and spent some months in an endeavour to find an answer for a problem that still eludes solution. His service in all these areas, national and international, brought credit to himself and through him to Australia.

SIR OWEN believed profoundly that it is our duty as lawyers to maintain the authority of the courts and to administer justice according to law in the tradition which has come down to us. He believed in the fundamental importance of the courts of justice in sustaining the whole edifice of civilized life in a society. He had a highly developed sense of the dignity of judicial office and jealously guarded the reputation of this Court as an independent organ of constitutional government. He believed in the essential contribution which the profession makes to the maintenance of the courts of justice. He believed in the supremacy of the law.

In responding to the welcome given him on first presiding as Chief Justice at Melbourne, Sir Owen said: "... the prestige which the proud tradition of English law gives to the Bench combines with the professional challenge which judicial work lays down to make it possible to recruit the Bench from those leading at the Bar. That is a consideration which in itself is enough to show the importance of maintaining the status and prestige of the courts of law. They are the essential foundations of society, whatever form a free society may take. What greater safeguard can there be for our judicial system than the combined strength of the whole legal profession behind it. And the strength of the legal profession is great and could be made greater. But it is a strength which must be sustained by a sufficient standard of learning, of general education,

of legal equipment and of useful and efficient service to the community. It must arise, too, from a pride in the profession as one that has a great part to play in this torn world. It is essentially the part of those who are concerned with the stability of the social system and the social structures, rather than the contentions which arise amongst dwellers within it." This and other quotations I have made from his own utterances speak more eloquently than I can of the standards by which Sir Owen lived and worked throughout his occupancy of this Bench.

He was most honoured in his time. He became a Knight Commander of the Most Distinguished Order of St. Michael and St. George in 1941, and Knight Grand Cross of that Order in 1954, a Member of Her Majesty's Privy Council in 1951 and in 1963 Her Majesty of her own motion conferred upon him the rare distinction of the Order of Merit. Oxford admitted him to the Degree of Civil Law, honoris causa, and Harvard to the Degree of Doctor of Laws, honoris causa, and Yale awarded him the singular distinction of the Howland Prize in 1955.

From his retirement in 1964 till his death on Friday, 7th July, SIR OWEN had been in indifferent health, confined for almost the whole of that time to his home in Hawthorn, and for some considerable part of that time to his chair. He greatly enjoyed and was immensely supported by the presence and company of his wife whom, as Alice Brooksbank, he had married in 1920. Throughout their married life she was a great support for him in all his activities as well as sharing with him the responsibilities and the happiness of family life. He bore her death in September 1971 with great fortitude. After so active and useful life, these years of retirement, so confined, with loss of access to literature by reading himself, must have been hard to bear. Yet, to those who visited him he had no complaint nor showed any loss of capacity to participate in discussion of matters in which he retained interest.

Of those who sat with SIR OWEN only Sir Edward McTiernan and Sir Douglas Menzies remain members of the Court. Sir Victor Windeyer, but recently retired, is with us this morning. Those of us who did sit with Sir Owen practised before him and felt the impact of his mind and knowledge. All join in paying tribute this day to him as the most outstanding lawyer this country has produced, and one of the greatest judges to sit upon a bench in Australia. As scholar, lawyer, judge, administrator and diplomat, he must rank

with Australia's greatest sons. By unremitting pursuit of excellence he brought fame to himself, authority to this Court and distinction to Australia.

The Court expresses its deepest sympathy to Sir Owen's four children, Mr. Franklin Dixon, Mr. Edward Dixon, Mrs. Danby, Mrs. Reid and their respective families.

The mode of citation of this volume of the Commonwealth Law Reports will be as follows:—

126 C.L.R.

#### A TABLE

OF THE

## NAMES OF THE CASES REPORTED

#### IN THIS VOLUME.

<b>A.</b>	Commonwealth, The v. Sterling
ATC Towns It I would of	Nicholas Duty Free Pty. Ltd. – 297
A.F.G. Insurances Ltd. v. City of	Commonwealth Trading Bank of
Brighton 655	
Andrews v. The Queen - 198	
Atwill (P.C.); Commissioner of	Co-operated Dried Fruit Sales Pty.
Stamp Duties (N.S.W.) $v$ 665	
News Control of the C	Maru '' v 170
<b>B.</b>	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
	Crane (G. E.) Sales Pty. Ltd. v.
Balcombe v. De Simoni – 576	Federal Commissioner of Taxa-
	tion 177
Bottomer; Ferrier v 597	Crowley; Sydney Turf Club $v$ . – 420
Brambles Holdings Ltd. $v$ .	
Pilkington – – 524	D.
Breskvar v. Wall – – 376	
Bridger; Faderson $v$ 271	De Simoni; Balcombe v 576
Brighton, City of; A.F.G. Insur-	Downs v. Williams 61
ances Ltd. $v$ . $  -$ 655	Dunn; North West County
	Council $v$ . $    247$
mercial Banking Co. of Sydney	
Ltd. v 337	F.
C.	Faderson v. Bridger 271
	Ferrier v. Bottomer 597
Campbell v. Commissioner for	Forbes v. Traders' Finance Cor-
	poration Ltd 429
City of Keilor v. O'Donohue – 353	
Commercial Banking Co. of Sydney	NLv = 507
Ltd v R H Brown & Co = 337	Fryer; Plucius $v$ . $ -$ 17
Dod. v. Iv. II. Diowii & Co.	riyor, rimonus v.

G.	М.
G. E. Crane Sales Pty. Ltd. v.  Federal Commissioner of Taxation 177  Gosling v. McCombie 487	Mahony; Wren $v$ . $ -$ 212 McCombie; Gosling $v$ . $-$ 487 Merchant $v$ . The Queen $-$ 414 Milk Board; River Sand & Gravel
Green v. The Queen 28	Pty. Ltd. v 471
H.	N.
Hahn v. Conley 276 Heron; Lamont v 239	Nelson; J. & H. Timbers Pty. Ltd.  v 625
Holmes; Reg $v$ .; $Ex p$ . Altona Petrochemical Co. Ltd. $ -$ 529 Hornsby Shire Council $v$ . Salmar	North West County Council v.  Dunn 247
Holdings Pty. Ltd. $ -$ 52 Howard F. Hudson Pty. Ltd. $v$ .	0.
Ronayne $   -$ 449 Hudson (Howard F.) Pty. Ltd. $v$ .	O'Donohue ; City of Keilor $v$ . – 353
Ronayne 449 Humphrey; I.A.C. (Leasing) Ltd.	P.
v 131 I.	Patents, Commissioner of; Joos v. 611 Pilkington; Brambles Holdings
I.A.C. (Leasing) Ltd. v. Humphrey 131 Immigration, Minister for; Znaty	Ltd. v 524 Plucius v. Fryer 17
v 1 Inglis $v.$ Commonwealth Trading	R.
Bank of Australia 161 Ireland; Reg. v 321	R. H. Brown & Co.; Commercial Banking Co. of Sydney Ltd. v. – 337 Railways (N.S.W.), Commissioner
J.	
J. & H. Timbers Pty. Ltd. $v$ . Nelson 625 Joos $v$ . Commissioner of Patents $-$ 611	for; Campbell $v$ 36 Reg.; Andrews $v$ 198 
К.	Petrochemical Co. Ltd 529 v. Ireland 321
Keilor, City of $v$ . O'Donohue $-353$	
L.	Milk Board 471 Ronayne; Howard F. Hudson
Lamont a Haron 930	Ptv Ttd a 440

S.	$   ext{ Theseus }  ext{ Exploration }  ext{ N.L. }  ext{ } v.$
	Foyster 507
Salmar Holdings Pty. Ltd.;	Tomat; Cox $v$ 105
Hornsby Shire Council v 52	Traders' Finance Corporation
Stamp Duties (N.S.W.), Commis-	Ltd.; Forbes v 429
sioner of $v$ . Atwill (P.C.) – 665	
Sterling Nicholas Duty Free Pty.	W.
Ltd.; The Commonwealth $v297$	
Sydney Turf Club v. Crowley - 420	Wall; Breskvar $v$ . – – 376
	Williams (Bill) Pty. Ltd. $v$ .
	Williams
Т.	Williams; Bill Williams Pty. Ltd.
	v 146
Taxation, Federal Commissioner	; Downs $v$ . $ -$ 61
of; G. E. Crane Sales Pty. Ltd.	Wren $v$ . Mahony $   212$
v 177	
The Ship "Terukawa Maru" v.	<b>Z.</b>
Co-operated Dried Fruit Sales	
Pty. Ltd 170	Znaty v. Minister for Immigration 1

# TABLE OF CASES AFFIRMED, REVERSED, OVERRULED, APPLIED OR JUDICIALLY COMMENTED ON IN CASES REPORTED IN THIS VOLUME.

Abigail v. Lapin, [1934] A.C. 491; (1934) 51 C.L.R. 58.

Applied 126 C.L.R. 376.

- Armstrong v. Wellington-Manawatu Railway Co. Ltd. (1885), 3 N.Z.L.R. 441. Not followed 126 C.L.R. 239.
- Asiatic Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. v. The Commonwealth (1956), 96 C.L.R. 397.
  Considered 126 C.L.R. 61.
- Attorney-General v. Hunter, [1949] 2 K.B. 111. Considered 126 C.L.R. 429.
- Atwill v. Commissioner of Stamp Duties (N.S.W.) (1971), 125 C.L.R. 203. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 665.
- Breskvar v. Wall, [1972] Qd. R. 28. Affirmed 126 C.L.R. 376.
- Brown v. The King (1913), 17 C.L.R. 570, at p. 584.

Referred to 126 C.L.R. 28.

- Brown (R. H.) & Co. v. Bank of New South Wales, [1971] W.A.R. 201. Affirmed 126 C.L.R. 337.
- Bryer v. Metropolitan Water Sewerage and Drainage Board (1939), 39 S.R. (N.S.W.) 321. Not followed 126 C.L.R. 625.
- Campbell v. Commissioner for Railways (N.S.W.), [1971] J. N.S.W.L.R. 130. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 36.
- Casey, Ex p.; Re Sydney County Council (1952), 53 S.R. (N.S.W.) 350. Considered 126 C.L.R. 247.
- Clements v. Ellis (1934), 51 C.L.R. 217. Considered 126 C.L.R. 376.
- Commonwealth, The v. Anderson (1960), 105 C.L.R. 303.

Considered 126 C.L.R. 61.

- Cooney v. Ku-ring-gai Corporation (1963), 114 C.L.R. 582; 9 L.G.R.A. 290. Considered 126 C.L.R. 52.
- Cooper v. Stuart (1889), 14 App. Cas. 286; 10
   L.R. (N.S.W.) Eq. 172.
   Applied 126 C.L.R. 353.
- Corney v. Brien (1951), 84 C.L.R. 343. Considered 126 C.L.R. 212.
- Cox v. Tomat, [1972] W.A.R. 17. Affirmed 126 C.L.R. 105.
- Dawson v. The Queen (1961), 106 C.L.R. 1, at p. 18.

  Referred to 126 C.L.R. 28.

- De Simoni v. Balcombe, [1971] W.A.R. 147. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 576.
- Edwards v. Culcairn Shire Council (1963), 64 S.R. (N.S.W.) 62; 81 W.N. (Pt 2) 31; 9. L.G.R.A. 316. Approved 126 C.L.R. 247.
- Farnell v. Bowman (1887), 12 App. Cas. 643. Distinguished 126 C.L.R. 61.
- Ferrier v. Bottomer, [1970] Qd. R. 245. Affirmed 126 C.L.R. 597.
- Flateau, In re; Ex p. Scotch Whisky Distillers Ltd. (1888), 22 Q.B.D. 83. Considered 126 C.L.R. 212.
- Franklin's Selfserve Pty. Ltd. v. Federal Commissioner of Taxation (1970), 125 C.L.R. 52. Considered 126 C.L.R. 177.
- Fraser, In re; Ex p. Central Bank of London, [1892] 2 Q.B. 633.
  Considered 126 C.L.R. 212.
- Frazer v. Walker, [1967] 1 A.C. 569. Considered 126 C.L.R. 376.
- Fryer v. Plucius, [1967] W.A.R. 161. Refused 126 C.L.R. 17.
- Furneaux v. Sydney County Council (1956), 73 W.N. (N.S.W.) 667. Distinguished 126 C.L.R. 36.
- Grant (John) & Sons Ltd. v. Trocadero Building & Investment Co. Ltd. (1938), 60 C.L.R. 1. Considered 126 C.L.R. 17.
- Hawkins, In re; Ex p. Troup, [1895] 1 Q.B. 404. Considered 126 C.L.R. 212.
- Hedley Byrne & Co. Ltd. v. Heller & Partners Ltd., [1964] A.C. 465. Distinguished 126 C.L.R. 337.
- Heron v. Lamont, [1970] 1 N.S.W.R. 261.
  Affirmed on a different ground 126 C.L.R. 239.
- Hosegood v. Bull (1876), 36 L.T. 617. Distinguished 126 C.L.R. 337.
- Jenkyns v. Elsdon (1864), 1 W.W. & a'B. (L.) 145. Doubted 126 C.L.R. 353.
- Judd v. McKeon (1928), 38 C.L.R. 280.
  Applied 126 C.L.R. 271.
- Keilor, City of v. O'Donohue (1970), 27 L.G.R.A. 13; [1972] V.R. 238. Affirmed 126 C.L.R. 353.

- Keller (Samuel) (Holdings) Ltd. v. Martins Bank | Ltd.; Henry W. Lawton Ltd. (claimant), [1971] 1 W.L.R. 43; [1970] 3 All E.R. 950. Approved 126 C.L.R. 161.
- Kuchel v. Conley; Kahn (Third Party) (1971), 1 S.A.S.R. 73. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 271.
- Lennox, Ex p.; In re Lennox (1885), 16 Q.B.D.

Considered 126 C.L.R. 212.

Little's Victory Cab Co. Pty. Ltd. v. Carroll, [1948] V.L.R. 249.

Approved 126 C.L.R. 429.

- Lord v. Commissioner for the City of Sydney (1859), 12 Moo. P.C. 473 [14 E.R. 991]. Applied 126 C.L.R. 353.
- Lord Advocate v. Crookshanks (1888), 15 Rettie 995; 25 Sc. L.R. 705. Applied 126 C.L.R. 429.
- Lubcke v. Little, [1970] V.R. 807. Approved 126 C.L.R. 271.
- Maeder v. Busch (1938) 59 C.L.R. 684. Considered 126 C.L.R. 611.
- Morgan v. Rylands Bros. (Aust.) Ltd. (1927) 39 C.L.R. 517.

Considered 126 C.L.R. 247.

- National Research Development Corporation v. Commissioner of Patents (1959), 102 C.L.R. Considered and applied 126 C.L.R. 611.
- Nelson v. J. &. H. Timbers Pty. Ltd. (1970), 92 W.N. (N.S.W.) 629.

Reversed 126 C.L.R. 625.

- New Good Hope Consolidated Gold Mines N.L. v. Stutterd, [1916] V.L.R. 580. Applied 126 C.L.R. 507.
- North West County Council, Ex p.; Re Manuel (1968), 70 S.R. (N.S.W.) 378; 88 W.N. (Pt 2) 279; 16 L.G.R.A. 306. Overruled 126 C.L.R. 247.
- Owens v. Collector of Customs (N.S.W.) (1940), 40 S.R. (N.S.W.) 605. Applied 126 C.L.R. 429.
- Parsons v. Barclay & Co. Ltd. (1910), 103 L.T.

Considered 126 C.L.R. 337.

- Peek v. Gurney (1873), L.R. 6 H.L. 377. Applied 126 C.L.R. 337.
- Permanent Nominees Ltd. v. Australian Factors Ltd. (Receiver Appointed), Unreported; Supreme Court of N.S.W. (McLelland C.J. in Eq.), 19th December 1966. Disapproved 126 C.L.R. 597.
- Phillips v. The Commonwealth (1964), 110 C.L.R. 347.

Applied 126 C.L.R. 625.

- Point v. Federal Commissioner of Taxation (1970), 119 C.L.R. 453.
  - Considered 126 C.L.R. 177.
- Rankin v. Palmer (1912), 16 C.L.R. 285, at p. 289. Applied 126 C.L.R. 212.
- Reg. v. Findlay; Ex p. Victorian Chamber of Manufactures, (1950), 81 C.L.R. 537. Considered 126 C.L.R. 529.
- v. *Merchant* (1970), 92 W.N. (N.S.W.) 816. Affirmed 126 C.L.R. 414.
- R. v. Murray; Ex p. Proctor (1949), 77 C.L.R. 387, at p. 398. Applied 126 C.L.R. 247.
- v. Wallis; Ex p. H. V. McKay Massey
   Harris Pty. Ltd., (1949) 78 C.L.R. 529.
   Considered 126 C.L.R. 529.
- River Sand & Gravel Pty. Ltd. v. Milk Board, [1971] 1 N.S.W.L.R. 58. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 471.
- Robbie (N. W.) & Co. Ltd. v. Witney Warehouse Co. Ltd., [1963] 1 W.L.R. 1324; [1963] 3 All E.R. 613. Applied 126 C.L.R. 597.
- Ronayne v. Howard F. Hudson Pty. Ltd. (1970), 92 W.N. (N.S.W.) 734. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 449.
- Salmar Holdings Pty. Ltd. v. Hornsby Shire Council (1971), 23 L.G.R.A. 14; [1971] 1 N.S.W.L.R. 192. Affirmed 126 C.L.R. 52.
- Sandness v. The King, [1933] Ex. C.R. (Canada)

Applied 126 C.L.R. 429.

- Shoebridge v. Commissioner for Railways (1961), 78 W.N. (N.S.W.) 643. Overruled 126 C.L.R. 36.
- Sterling Nicholas Duty Free Pty. Ltd. v. The Commonwealth, [1971] 1 N.S.W.L.R. 353. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 297.
- Sutherland Shire Council, Ex p.; (1969), 91 W.N. (N.S.W.) 378; 19 L.G.R.A. 197.

Disapproved 126 C.L.R. 247.

- Sutherland Shire Council v. Finch (1970), 123 C.L.R. 657; 20 L.G.R.A. 350. Considered 126 C.L.R. 247.
- Swift v. Winterbotham (1873), L.R. 8 Q.B. 244. Considered and applied 126 C.L.R. 337.
- Sydney TurfClubv. Crowley, [1971]1 N.S.W.L.R. 724. Affirmed 126 C.L.R. 420.
- Thomas v. The Queen (1960), 102 C.L.R. 584. Referred to 126 C.L.R. 28.

- Welker v. Hewett (1969), 120 C.L.R. 503. Applied 126 C.L.R. 105.
- Weston v. Great Boulder Gold Mines Ltd. (1964), 112 C.L.R. 30. Distinguished 126 C.L.R. 146.
- Williams v. Bill Williams Pty. Ltd., [1971] 1 N.S.W.L.R. 547. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 146.
- Williams v. Downs (1970), 92 W.N. (N.S.W.) 601. Reversed 126 C.L.R. 61.
- Wilson v. Chambers & Co. Pty. Ltd. (1926), 38 C.L.R. 131. Distinguished 126 C.L.R. 429.
- Wyatt v Kreglinger and Fernau, [1933] 1 K.B. 793.
  Applied 126 C.L.R. 449.

## STATUTES JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED.

IMPERIAL	NEW SOUTH WALES
Admiralty Court Act, 1861 (24 & 25 Vict. c. 10). The Ship "Terukawa Maru" v. Co-operated Dried Fruit Sales Pty. Ltd 170	Claims against the Government and Crowns Suits Act, 1912, ss. 3 (1), 4.  Downs v. Williams 6
Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act, 1890	Crimes Act, 1900, s. 178A. Andrews v.  The Queen 190
(53 & 54 Vict. c. 27), s. 2 (2). The Ship "Terukawa Maru" v. Co- operated Dried Fruit Sales Pty. Ltd. – 170	Criminal Appeal Act, 1912, s. 6 (1).  Andrews v. The Queen 198
Constitution, The (63 & 64 Vict. c. 12), s. 92. Brambles Holdings Ltd. v. Pilkington – – – 524	Dairy Industry Authority Act, 1970, ss. 16, 26. River Sand & Gravel Pty. Ltd. v. Milk Board 47
for Immigration – – 1	Factories, Shops and Industries Act, 1962, s. 27. Downs v. Williams - 6.
County Court Admiralty Jurisdiction Act, 1868 (31 & 32 Vict. c. 71). The Ship "Terukawa Maru" v. Co-operated Dried Fruit Sales Pty. Ltd. – 170	Government Railways Act, 1912, ss. 70, 78. Campbell v. Commissioner for Railways (N.S.W.)— — — 30
— 1869 (32 & 33 Vict. c. 51). The Ship "Terukawa Maru" v. Co- operated Dried Fruit Sales Pty. Ltd. – 170	Industrial Arbitration Act, 1940-1969, ss. 5, 20, 24 (11), 25, 74. North West County Council v. Dunn – 24
COMMONWEALTH	Local Government Act, 1919, as amended, s. 309 (1) (c). Hornsby Shire Council v. Salmar Holdings Pty. Ltd. – 5:
Airports (Business Concessions) Act 1959, s. 7. The Commonwealth v. Sterling Nicholas Duty Free Pty. Ltd. – 297	County Council v. Dunn — — 24'  Milk Act, 1931, ss. 28 (2A), 28A. River Sand & Gravel Pty. Ltd. v. Milk Board 47
Bankruptcy Act 1966-1970, s. 111.  Gosling v. McCombie 487	Milk (Amendment) Act, 1969. River Sand & Gravel Pty. Ltd. v. Milk Board 47.
——————————————————————————————————————	Motor Traffic Act, 1909-1968, s. 4E.  Merchant v. The Queen 414
1970, s. 47 (1). Reg. v. Holmes; Ex p. Altona Petrochemical Co. Ltd 529 Customs Act 1901-1968, s. 229 (j).	Stamp Duties Act, 1920-1964, s. 102 (2) (a). Commissioner of Stamp Duties (N.S.W.) v. Atwill 668
Forbes v. Traders' Finance Corporation Ltd 429	Sydney Turf Club Act, 1943-1955, s. 11 (1) (c). Sydney Turf Club v.
Electoral Act 1918-1966, ss. 123, 128A (12). Faderson v. Bridger - 271	Crowley 420 Workers' Compensation Act, 1926, as
Income Tax Assessment Act 1936-1967, s. 63. G. E. Crane Sales Pty. Ltd. v.	amended, s. 6 (1). Bill Williams Pty. Ltd. v. Williams 14
Federal Commissioner of Taxation - 177  Migration Act 1958-1966, ss. 18, 20, 22,	sioner for Railways (N.S.W.) - 36
<b>39.</b> Znaty v. Minister for Ímmigration – – 1	
Patents Act 1952-1966, ss. 6, 35, 52.  Joos v. Commissioner of Patents - 611	

SOUTH AUSTRALIA
Criminal Law Consolidation Act, 1935- 1969, s. 349. Reg. v. Ireland - 321 Police Offences Act, 1953-1967, s. 81. Reg. v. Ireland - 321
TASMANIA
Traffic Act 1925, s. 24 (1) (a). Brambles Holdings Ltd. v. Pilkington - 524
WESTERN AUSTRALIA
Criminal Code, 1913-1969, s. 409 (1).  Balcombe v. De Simoni 576
Road Maintenance (Contribution) Act, 1965, ss. 8, 14, 15. Cox v. Tomat - 105

## RULES, REGULATIONS, ORDINANCES AND ORDERS IN COUNCIL JUDICIALLY CONSIDERED.

#### NEW SOUTH WALES

Government Railways Act Regulations, 1892, reg. 78. Campbell v. Commissioner for Railways (N.S.W.) - 36

#### **QUEENSLAND**

Rules of the Supreme Court, O. 18 r. 1.

Theseus Exploration N.L. v. Foyster - 507

## TABLE OF CASES CITED IN JUDGMENTS.

Note.—The page numbers are those of the pages where the case is cited in each report. The numbers in brackets show the first footnote on each page containing the references to the cases.

Α.	Bank Officers (State) Board, In re
A1: 1 T : (1094) 900 (F) 800 (I)	(1921) 260 (1)
Abigail v. Lapin (1934) - 388 (5), 389 (1),	Bank Officials' Association (South
393 (3), 398 (4), 400 (2),	Australian Branch) v. Savings Bank
409 (3), 410 (1), 413 (5)	of South Australia (1923) 90 (1)
Aitkin v. Goodyear Tyre & Rubber Co.	Barrett and Women's Hospital, Crown
(Aust.) Ltd. (1945) 633 (2) Allen v. Foskett (1876) - 369 (9), 370 (1)	Street, In re (1947) 262 (5)  Barry v. Croskey (1861) 347 (2)
Allen v. Foskett (1876) - 369 (9), 370 (1)	Barry v. Croskey (1861) $-347$ (2)
Andaloro v. Wyong Co-operative Dairy	v. Heider (1914) - 387 (5), 393 (1)
Society Ltd. (1965) 304 (1), 314 (1), 477 (1)	
Anderson v. Condon (1951) $-$ 59 (2)	Basto v. The Queen (1954) $-$ 333 (4)
Anglo-Italian Bank $v$ . Wells (1878) – 514 (2)	Baume v. The Commonwealth (1906) - 98 (2)
Armstrong v. Wellington-Manawatu	Bayview Properties Pty. Ltd. v.
Railway C. Ltd. (1885) 242 (1) Ash v. Ash (1696) 283 (1) Ashdown v. Ingamells (1880) 228 (6)	Attorney-General (Vict.) (1960) - 367 (1)
Ash v. Ash (1696) $-$ 283 (1)	Beauchamp, In re; Ex p. Beauchamp
Ashdown v. Ingamells (1880) 228 (6)	(1904) -
Asiatic Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. v.	Bennett v. Bennett (1952) 463 (2)
The Commonwealth (1956) 66 (2), 69 (1),	Beregi v. Sydney City Council (1961) - 58 (3)
82 (2), 98 (4), 100 (4), 101 (3),	Biggerstaff v. Rowatt's Wharf Ltd.
102 (1)	(1896) 608 (3)
Assets Co. Ltd. v. Mere Roihi (1905) - 384 (1),	(1896) 608 (3) Bishop v. Kitchin (1868) 458 (5) Blewitt v. Hill (1810) 440 (1)
385 (1) 386 (3) 391 (4) 396 (7)	Blewitt v. Hill (1810) 440 (1)
Associated Beauty Aids Pty. Ltd. v.	Bloch v. Smith; Welden v. Smith
Federal Commissioner of Taxation	(1922) 78 (2)
(1965) 244(1)	Bolt & Nut Co. (Tipton) Ltd. v.
Attorney-General v. Austed (1844) $-443$ (4)	Rowlands Nicholls & Co. Ltd. (1964) 165 (4)
(Canada) v. Cain (1906) - 8 (1), 12 (3)	Bonsor v. Musicians' Union (1956) - 574 (1)
v. De Keyser's Royal Hotel Ltd.	Bonsor v. Musicians' Union (1956)   - 574 (1)   Bowman v. Farnell (1886)   - 80 (2)
(1920) 86 (1)	Boyd v. Mayor, &c., of Wellington
(1920) 86 (1) 	(1924) – 386 (2), 391 (3), 395 (3), 396 (5)
v. Donaldson (1842) 86 (2)  v. Hancock (1940) 88 (6)  v. Hunter (1949) 445 (3)  v. Pougett (1816) 445 (1)	405 (4), 406 (2), 412 (1)
v Hancock (1940) 88 (6)	Boys v. Bradley (1853) $ -$ 566 (1)
v. Hunter (1949) $$	Breen, $Ex p$ .; $Re \text{ Sneddon (1968)} - 112 (2)$
v Pougett (1816) 445 (1)	113 (4), 124 (2), 125 (1), 128 (3)
Atwill v. Commissioner of Stamp Duties	Breskvar v. Wall (1972) - 382 (1), 389 (4)
(N.S.W.) (1971) - 666 (1), 667 (3), 668 (1)	Breskvar v. Wall (1972) - 382 (1), 389 (4) 390 (1), 394 (1)
Australian Can Co. Pty. Ltd. v. Levin	Bridge v. Campbell Discount Co. Ltd.
& Co. Pty. Ltd. (1947) 523 (1)	(1962) 143 (1)
Australian Gas Light Co. v. Steele	British Traders' Insurance Co. Ltd. v.
(1963) 48 (1)	Monson (1964) 660 (1)
Australian Iron and Steel Pty. Ltd.	Broken Hill South Ltd. v. Commis-
v. Elliott (1966) 630 (3), 638 (2).	sioner of Taxation (N.S.W.) (1937) - 109 (1)
v. Elliott (1966) - 630 (3), 638 (2), 651 (3), 652 (2)	110 (3), 111 (4), 113 (3), 114 (1), 127 (2)
Autoterms Ltd. v. Candy (1943) $-$ 522 (2)	Brooks v. Burns Philp Trustee Co.
Travotorimo Bran er camaj (1010)	Ltd. (1969) 463 (3), 464 (1), 469 (2)
	Brown v. The King (1913) $-$ 31 (3)
В.	Brown (R. H.) & Co. v. Bank of New
	South Wales (1971) 340 (2) 341 (1)
Railey v. Jamieson (1876)	South Wales (1971) - 340 (2), 341 (1) 342 (1), 343 (1)
" The Queen (1058) 232 (2)	Brunswick Corporation v. Baker (1916) 368 (5)
Bailey v. Jamieson (1876) 363 (1)	Bryant, $Ex p. (1813)$ 222 (6)
Bank of New South Wales v. O'Connor	Bryer v. Metropolitan Water Sewerage
(1889) 165 (3)	and Drainage Board (1939) 630 (2), 631 (1)
v. United Bank Officers'	
	633 (1), 634 (3), 635 (1), 636 (1)
Association and Court of Industrial	637 (4), 638 (1), 644 (1), 645 (3)
Arbitration (1921) - 260 (2), 268 (2)	648 (2), 649 (1), 651 (1), 653 (1)

Buckley v. Tutty (1971) - 453 (2), 462 (2),	Cronmire, In re; Ex p. Cronmire
467 (2), 468 (2)	(1901) 490 (3), 502 (3), 505 (1) Crown, The v. Dalgety and Co. Ltd.
Bull v. Pitney-Bowes Ltd. (1967) - 466 (3), 469 (4)	(1044) - 81 (4)
Bundock Bros. v. Bergl and Co. (1897) $-515$ (1)	(1944) 81 (4) Crump v. Cavendish (1880) 514 (1)
Burns v. Allen (1889) 369 (1)	Cuming, In re; Nicholls v. Public
Burns v. Allen (1889) 369 (1) Butler v. Fairclough (1917) 398 (3), 409 (2)	Trustee (S.A.) (1945) 463 (1)
2 40101 01 2 421010 4811 (2011)	Trustee (S.A.) (1945) 463 (1) Customs, A Case of (1582) 444 (2)
	Cutler v. Wandsworth Stadium Ltd.
С.	(1949) 77 (4)
C. and W.'s Application (1914) 620 (1), 621 (1)	
Cain v. Doyle (1946) - 77 (1), 81 (6)	
Caldwell v. Rural Bank of New South	D.
Wales (1951) - 396 (2), 405 (5), 406 (4)	Davios a Prop (1051) 206 (2) 405 (6)
Wales (1951) - 396 (2), 405 (5), 406 (4) Calico Printers Association Ltd. v.	Davies v. Ryan (1951) - 396 (3), 405 (6) Davis v. Mackerras (1930) 490 (1), 502 (1),
Higham (1912) 631 (2)	505 (4)
Cameron v. Federal Commissioner of	v. Western Suburbs Hospital
Taxation (1941) $  -$ 522 (1)	(1941) $540(1)$ , $568(1)$ , $569(1)$
Campbell v. Commissioner for Rail-	Dawson v. The Queen (1961) $-$ 31 (1)
ways (N.S.W.) (1971) 39 (1), 44 (1), 49 (1)	De Keyser v. British Railway Traffic
v. Dent (1864) 366 (1) Cardiff Corporation v. Hall (1911) 637 (11),	and Electric Co. (1936) 433 (1)
Cardiff Corporation v. Hall (1911) 637 (11),	De Simoni v. Balcombe (1971) 580 (1), 587 (3),
644 (3), 648 (8), 649 (3)	589 (1), 591 (1), 592 (1)
Cargo ex " Argos "; The " Hewsons " (1873) 174 (2)	Derry v. Peek (1889) 343 (2)
Carmarthenshire County Council $v$ .	Dickson v. Pharmaceutical Society of
Lewis (1955) 284 (3)	Great Britain (1970) 468 (1)
Carney v. Excelsior Spring Co. Pty.	Director of Public Prosecutions v. Carey $(1970)$ – – – – – $(1970)$ – – – 419 $(1)$
Ltd. (1958) 154 (3)	(1970) $419(1)$ Director of Public Prosecutions $v$ .
Ltd. (1958) 154 (3) Carr v. Roberts (1833) 228 (2)	Smith (1961) 595 (7)
Casey, $Ex p.$ ; Re Sydney County	Smith (1961) 595 (7) Donaldson, In re (1902) 504 (1)
Council (1952) $  -$ 268 (1) Castellain $v$ . Preston (1883) $-$ 663 (1)	Droga v. Waverley Municipal Council
Castellain v. Preston (1883) $ -$ 663 (1)	
Chadwick v. Municipality of St. Mary's	(1952) 58 (2)   Dumaresq v. Robertson (1858) 79 (1)
(1948) 261 (1) Chamberlain's Application (1942) - 616 (2),	Durham Brothers v. Robertson (1898) 608 (2)
Chamberlain's Application (1942) $-616$ (2),	
619 (2), 621 (2) Chapman v. Lamb (1732) 444 (5)	
City Taylors Ltd. v. Evans (1921) - 662 (1)	<b>E.</b>
City Taylors Ltd. v. Evans (1921) — 662 (1) Clark v. Flanagan (1934) — — 148 (2) Clements v. Ellis (1934) — 386 (4), 387 (2),	
Clements v. Ellis (1934) = $386 (4) 387 (2)$	Earl (Humphrey) Ltd. v. Speechley
391 (5), 392 (1), 395 (1),	(1951) 159 (3) Edwards v. Culcairn Shire Council
396 (1), 397 (2), 404 (2),	(1963) – 252 (1), 253 (2), 261 (2), 262 (1),
405 (1), 406 (3), 412 (2)	263 (7)
Cole v. Kelly (1920) 520 (3) Commonwealth v. Anderson (1960) - 65 (1),	Electric and General Contract Cor-
Commonwealth v. Anderson (1960) $-$ 65 (1),	poration v. Thompson-Houston
69 (2), 70 (1), 82 (3), 101 (4)	Electric Co. (1893) 515 (4)
v. Bogle (1953) 69 (7)	Electric Power Transmission Pty. Ltd.
v. Bogle (1953) 69 (7)  v. Oliver (1962) 154 (5)  v. Rhind (1966) - 88 (1), 93 (1)	v. D'Urso (1970) 48 (2)
Commonwealth Dairy Produce Found	Electricity Commission (N.S.W.) v.  Lapthorne (1971) 296 (1)  Enever v. The King (1906) 70 (2)
Commonwealth Dairy Produce Equalisation Committee Ltd. v. Hansen	Lapthorne (1971) 296 (1)
(1944) 515 (3)	Enever v. The King (1906) 70 (2)
Cooden Engineering Co Ltd v	Esso Petroleum Co. Ltd. v. Harper's
Cooden Engineering Co. Ltd. v. Stanford (1953) 143 (2)	Garage (Stourport) Ltd. (1968) - 453 (1), 456 (1), 457 (3)
Cooney v. Ku-ring-gai Municipal	
Council (1963) 56 (1), 59 (3)	Evans v. Australian Gas Light Co. (1958) 154 (2)
Council (1963) 56 (1), 59 (3) Cooper v. Stuart (1889) - 367 (4), 369 (2)	(1000) 104 (2)
Corney v. Brien (1951) 223 (4), 224 (2), 233 (6),	
234 (1), 235 (1), 237 (1)	F.
Cox v. Tomat (1972) $-$ 117 (1), 120 (1)	
Coy v. City of Sandringham (1952) $-372$ (1)	Falkiner and Perpetual Trustee Co.
Crofter Hand Woven Harris Tweed	Ltd. v. Commissioner of Stamp
Co. Ltd. v. Veitch (1942) 573 (3)	Duties (N.S.W.) (1973) 667 (1)

Farnell v. Bowman (1887) 66 (1), 68 (1), 79 (4), 80 (1), 81 (1), 83 (1), 84 (4), 90 (2), 95 (1), 96 (1), 97 (2), 98 (1)  Feather v. The Queen (1865) 77 (7), 96 (5), 97 (1)  Ferrando v. Pearce (1918) — 11 (3), 12 (2)  Ferrier v. Bottomer (1970) 603 (2), 605 (1)  Flatau, In re; Ex p. Scotch Whisky  Distillers Ltd. (1888) — 223 (1), 224 (1), 233 (2)	Helleman v. Collector of Customs (1966) 439 (4)   Hicks v. The King (1920) 34 (2)   Horden (Anthony) and Sons Ltd. v.   Amalgamated Clothing and Allied   Trades Union of Australia (1932) - 545 (1)   Hosegood v. Bull (1876) - 340 (1), 344 (3), 345 (2), 347 (8), 348 (1)   Howell, In re (1915) 233 (3)   Hoyle v. Walsh (1969) 419 (3)   Hutley's Legal Charge, In re (1941) - 88 (7)
Forrest v. John Mills Himself Pty. Ltd. (1970) 85 (5) Franklin's Selfserve Pty. Ltd. v. Federal Commissioner of Taxation (1970) - 187 (3), 191 (1), 196 (2), 197 (2) Fraser v. Beckett & Sterling Ltd. (1963) 439 (3), In re; Ex p. Central Bank of London (1892) 222 (1), 234 (4) Frazer v. Walker (1967) - 384 (3), 385 (2), 386 (1), 387 (1), 391 (1), 392 (2), 396 (4), 397 (1), 398 (2), 400 (1), 404 (1), 405 (2), 406 (1), 407 (1), 412 (4), 413 (1)	I.  Industrial Acceptance Corporation Ltd.  v. Lavoie (1965) 440 (5)  "Ironsides", The (1862) 175 (3) Islip, In re (1907) 504 (3)  J.
Fryer v. Plucius (1967) — 23 (2), 24 (3) Furneaux v. Sydney County Council (1956) — 39 (2), 40 (1), 46 (1), 47 (1)  G.  General Steel Industries Inc. v. Commissioner for Railways (N.S.W.) (1964) — — — — 514 (3) Gibbs v. Messer (1891) — — 398 (1) Glasgow Corporation v. Muir (1943) — 295 (1) Gorton Local Board v. Prison Commissioners (1887) — — — — 88 (3) Graham v. C. E. Heinke & Co. Ltd. (1958) — — — — — 75 (2) Grant (John) & Sons Ltd. v. Trocadero	J. & H. Just (Holdings) Pty. Ltd. v.  Bank of New South Wales (1971) — 389 (3)  Jamieson v. Downie (1923) — — 80 (6)  Jenkyns v. Elsdon (1864) — 360 (1), 368 (8),  372 (2)  Jennings v. Kelly (1940) — 668 (2), 669 (1)  Johnson v. Commissioner of Stamp  Duties (N.S.W.) (1956) — 110 (1), 114 (3)  Jones v. A. & E. Pettifer Ltd. (1929) — 637 (7),  648 (4)  ———— v. International Anthracite  Collieries Ltd. (1918) — — — 652 (1)  Joy v. Morton (1922) — 637 (6), 648 (3)  Judd v. McKeon (1926) — 273 (2), 274 (1),  275 (1)
Building and Investment Co. Ltd. (1938) 23 (3), 24 (1), 25 (1), 26 (1) Great West Permanent Loan Co. v. Friesen (1925) 387 (6), 410 (3) Griffiths v. Perry (1859) 351 (2) Groves v. Lord Wimborne (1898) - 77 (2) Gunnestad v. Price (1875) 174 (1)	K.  Kandos Coomber Colliery Co. Ltd. v.  Bromwich (1948) 650 (1)  Kavanagh v. The Commonwealth (1960) - 153 (3), 154 (4), 155 (1), 158 (2),  159 (1)
H.  Hacking, In re (1912) 504 (2)  Hall v. Bonnett (1956) 78 (4)  v. Yellow Cabs of Australia  Ltd. (1970) 156 (2)  Hamilton v. Shelton Co. Ltd. (1926) - 630 (1), 647 (1)  Hargrave v. Goldman (1963) - 294 (1)  Haw v. Official Assignee of Haw (1927) 500 (2), 505 (5)  Hawkins, In re; Ex p. Troup (1895) - 223 (2)  Hedley Byrne & Co. Ltd. v. Heller &  Partners Ltd. (1964) - 344 (1), 349 (3), 350 (1)	Keller (Samuel) (Holdings) Ltd. v.  Martins Bank Ltd. (1971) 165 (1), 167 (4)  Kemp v. Darling Island Stevedoring &  Lighterage Co. Ltd. (1959) 643 (1), 651 (2)  Kibble, Ex p.; In re Onslow (1875) — 221 (4), 232 (2)  King Gee Clothing Co. Pty. Ltd. v.  The Commonwealth (1945) — — 562 (1)  King's Birthday Quartz Gold Mining  Co. v. Jack (1885) — — — 520 (2)  Kratzmann v. Federal Commissioner  of Taxation (1970) — — — 187 (2)  Kuchel v. Conley; Hahn (Third Party)  (1971) — 280 (1), 281 (1), 282 (1), 293 (1)

L.	Moore (A. G.) & Co. v. Barkey (1923) - 634 (1), 637 (8), 648 (5)
Lamson Store Service Co. Ltd. v. Russell Wilkins & Sons Ltd. (1906) - 141 (1)	Morgan v. Rylands Bros. (Aust.) Ltd. (1927) 268 (3)
Langridge v. Levy (1837) - 345 (1), 347 (1)	Morgan & Son Ltd. v. S. Martin
Langridge v. Levy (1837) - 345 (1), 347 (1) Lapin v. Abigail (1930) - 388 (4), 409 (5)	Johnson & Co. Ltd. (1949) 166 (1), 167 (1)
Latec Investments Ltd. v. Hotel	Morris v. Woollahra Corporation (1966) 56 (2),
Terrigal Pty. Ltd. (1965) 394 (2), 409 (1),	58 (1), 59 (7)
413 (3)	Musgrave v. The Commonwealth (1937) 82 (1)
Leonard's Application, Re (1954) - 624 (3)	
Lennox, $Ex p$ .; In re Lennox (1885) – 221 (1),	
222 (3), 234 (5)	N.
Lenthall v. Curran (1933) 333 (2) Lethbridge v. Mytton (1831) 228 (7)	<del>- 1</del>
Lethbridge v. Mytton (1831) $ -$ 228 (7)	National Coal Board v. England (1954) 75 (1)
Little's Victory Cab Co. Pty. Ltd. v.	National Research Development Cor-
Carroll (1948) 433 (3), 439 (7)	poration $v$ . Commissioner of Patents
Lochgelly Iron and Coal Co. Ltd. v.	(1959) - 616(1), 617(1), 618(2), 619(1),
M'Mullan (1934) 74 (2)	623 (1), 624 (1)
Lombank Ltd. v. Excell (1964) - 143 (5)	National Revenue, Deputy Minister $v$ .
London and Globe Finance Corpora- tion Ltd., In re (1903) 592 (3)	Industrial Acceptance Corporation
London Passenger Transport Board $v$ .	Ltd. (1958) 440 (4) Neild v. Davidson (1890) - 367 (8), 368 (1)
Upson (1949) 74 (3)	Nella v. Davidson (1890) – 367 (8), 368 (1)
Loosemore v. Radford (1842) 226 (3)	Nelson v. J. & H. Timbers Pty. Ltd. (1970) 642 (1)
Lord v. Commissioners for the City of	Neville v. London "Evpress" News
Sydney (1859) 367 (2)	Neville v. London "Express" Newspaper Ltd. (1919) 351 (3)
Lord Advocate v. Crookshanks (1888) - 433 (2),	New Good Hope Consolidated Gold
439 (5)	Mines N.L. v. Stutterd (1916) - 517 (2),
Lovell v. Lovell (1950) 236 (1)	518 (1), 521 (1)
Lowden v. Sydney Harbour Trust	Nisbet Shipping Co. Ltd. v. The Queen
Commissioners (1920) 89 (3) Lubcke v. Little (1970) 273 (1)	(1955) $69(5)$ , $100(7)$ , $101(2)$
	North Sydney Municipal Council v.
Lynsar v Mammoth Molybdenite	Housing Commission (N.S.W.)
Mines (N.L.) (1918) 518 (4) Lyons v. Smart (1908) - 439 (1), 446 (1)	(1948) 72 (2), 89 (4)
250110 (1,110 (1)	North West County Council, Ex p.; Re Manuel (1968) - 250 (1), 252 (2), 253 (3),
· ·	258 (1), 262 (2), 263 (8), 264 (1),
M.	265 (1), 266 (2), 269 (2)
M.	Numba, Municipality of v. Lackey
Mackenzie Grant & Co., In re (1899) - 610 (1)	(1880) 80 (4)
Madras Electric Supply Corporation	
Ltd. v. Boarland (Inspector of Taxes)	
(1955) 86 (3) Maeder v. Busch (1938) - 617 (2), 618 (1)	0.
	O'C C D D I+4 (1097) 75 (9)
Magdalen College, Cambridge Case (1615) 86 (4)	O'Connor v. S. P. Bray Ltd. (1937) - 75 (3) Organon Laboratories Ltd.'s Applica-
Mahony v. Wren (1970) - 215 (4), 220 (1),	
227 (1), 231 (1)	tion (1970) 621 (3) O'Sullivan v. Dejneko (1964) 123 (3), 126 (1)
Mayer v. Coe (1968) $-$ - $ 387 (3)$	Owens v. Collector of Customs (N.S.W.)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(1940) 445 (2)
McCann v. Scottish Co-operative	
Laundry Association Ltd. (1936) - 634 (2),	T)
637 (9), 648 (6), 649 (4) McCormick v. The King (1940) 440 (3)	Р.
McGrath v. Williams (1912) - 368 (3)	Palette Shoes Pty. Ltd. (In Liq.) v.
McIntosh v. Shashoua (1931) $-$ 184 (2)	Krohn (1937) 607 (1)
McIntosh v. Shashoua (1931) 184 (2) McMaster v. Mackay (1937) 570 (1)	Parker v. The Commonwealth (1965) - 85 (1)
Metal Trade Employers' Association	v. The Queen (1963) 595 (8)
v. Amalgamated Engineering Union	Parsons v. Barclay & Co. Ltd. (1910) - 349 (1)
(1935) 574 (3)	Paterson v. A. G. Moore & Co. (1910) - 631 (3)
Metropolitan Bank Ltd. v. Camberwell	Pearson v. Fremantle Harbour Trust
Corporation (1909) 368 (4)	(1929) $-$ 159 (4)
Miller v. McKeon (1905) $  -$ 369 (7)	(1929) 159 (4) Peek v. Gurney (1873) - 343 (3), 347 (3)
Moore v. The Commonwealth (1958) $-100(2)$	Penny v. Foy (1828) $-$ 227 (2), 228 (1)

XXVI.

— v. Evans (1962) –

[1971-1972.

-573(2)

-333(1)

(1924) -

Rhondda Urban District Council v. Taff	Sutherland Shire Council v. Finch
Vale Railway Co. (1909) 670 (1) Rice v. Rice (1854) 388 (2) Richardson v. Silvester (1873) 347 (4)	(1970) - 253(4), 254(1), 263(3), 267(1)
Rice v. Rice (1854) $  -$ 388 (2)	
Richardson v. Silvester (1873) $-$ 347 (4)	900 (1)
Richardson, In re; Ex p. Governors	Swift v. Jewsbury (1874) $ -$ 347 (7) $-$ v. Winterbotham (1873) $-$ 344 (2).
of St. Thomas's Hospital (1911) - 226 (1)	v. Winterbotham (1873) - $-344$ (2).
of St. Thomas's Hospital (1911) - 226 (1) Ricketson v. Smith (1895) - 90 (3)	346 (2), 347 (6), 348 (2)
River Sand & Gravel Pty. Ltd. v. Milk	Sydney Harbour Trust Commissioners
Board (1971) 485 (1)	v. Ryan (1911) 72 (1), 89 (2)
Robbie (N. W.) & Co. Ltd. v. Witney	Sydney Turf Club $v$ . Crowley (1971) $-424$ (1).
Warehouse Co. Ltd. (1963) 603 (1), 607 (3),	427 (1)
608 (1), 609 (1), 610 (4)	
Robinson v. National Bank of Scot-	т.
land (1916) 347 (5), 348 (3) Robtelmes v. Brenan (1906) 10 (2) Rogers v. Rawlings (1969) 283 (2)	
Possess as Possibles (1960) $ -$ 10 (2)	Taff Vale Railway Co. v. Cardiff Rail-
Ronayne v. Howard F. Hudson Pty.	way Co. (1917) 369 (4)
	Taxation, Federal Commissioner of $v$ .
Ltd. (1970) - 453 (4), 455 (1), 458 (1), 461 (1), 464 (2), 467 (1)	Squatting Investment Co. Ltd. (1954) 607 (2) Taylor (A Bankrupt), Re: Ex p.
Rookes v. Barnard (1964) 574 (2)	(1954) $607(2)$
Rookes v. Barnard (1964) 574 (2) Ross v. Rugge-Price (1876) 77 (5)	Taylor (A Bankrupt), $Re$ ; $Ex$ $p$ .
Rossi v. Edinburgh Corporation (1905) 311 (1)	Dalgety and Co. Ltd. (1934) 505 (7)
Ross Ireland v. Tour Finance Ltd.	Dalgety and Co. Ltd. (1934) - 505 (7) Thomas v. The Queen (1960) 31 (2), 32 (1), 33 (1), 34 (1)
(1965) $233$ (7), $235$ (2), $237$ (2)	33 (1), 34 (1)
( )	Thompson v. Armstrong and Royse
	Pty. Ltd. (1950) - 636 (3), 637 (1), 645 (1),
	650 (2)
S.	v. Commissioner of Stamp
	Duties (N.S.W.) (1969) - 110 (2), 114 (4) Tobin v. The Queen (1864) 77 (6), 96 (4)
Salmar Holdings Pty. Ltd. v. Hornsby	Tongkah Compound N.L. v. Meagher
Shire Council (1971) = 55 (1) 57 (2)	(1951) 517 (1), 518 (2)
Salmon v. Duncombe (1886) - 55 (1), 57 (2) - 562 (3)	Toussaint v. Martinnant (1787) $-$ 228 (4)
Sandeness v. The King (1933) 439 (6), 440 (2) Schering Aktiengesellschaft's Applica-	Tuff, In re; Ex p. Nottingham (1887) 500 (1)
Schering Aktiengesellschaft's Applica-	Turner v. Walsh (1881) 369 (6)
tion, $Re$ (1971) 622 (1) Scott $v$ . Baker (1969) 419 (2)	
Scott v. Baker (1969) $  -$ 419 (2)	
Seward v. The "Vera Cruz" (1884) - 84 (2),	<b>U.</b>
99 (4)	
Shaw v. Foster (1872) $  -$ 393 (2)	Underhill v. Calder (1951) 59 (1)
Shoebridge v. Commissioner for Rail-	United Dominions Trust (Commercial)
ways (1961) - 39 (3), 45 (1), 49 (2)	Ltd. v. Ennis (1968) 143 (4)
Shropshire Union Railways & Canal Co.	
v. The Queen (1875)       -       -       388 (3)         Slattery v. The King (1905)       -       -       199 (1)         Smith v. Jenkins (1970)       -       -       294 (3)	. 17
Stattery v. The King (1905) $-$ - 199 (1)	V.
Similar v. Jenkins (1970) $  -$ 294 (3)	Valpy v. Oakeley (1851) 351 (1)
Smyth v. Reynolds (1765) $-$ 444 (3)	Victorian Railways Commissioners $v$ .
Snushall v. Kaikoura County Council	Speed (1928) 84 (3)
(1923) 368 (6)	Virginia-Carolina Chemical Corpora-
South Australia v. The Commonwealth	tion's Application, Re (1958) - 624 (4)
(1962) 82(5)	
Sovar v. Henry Lane Ptv. Ltd. $(1967) - 85(4)$	
Spark v. Heslop (1859) $  -$ 228 (8)	W.
Stamp Duties (N.S.W.) Commissioner	
of v. Perpetual Trustee Co. Ltd.	Wakely v. Lackey (1880) 80 (3) Warwick v. Richardson (1842) 229 (1)
(Watt's Case) (1926) 671 (2) Steel Wing Co. Ltd., In re (1921) - 184 (3)	Warwick v. Richardson (1842) $-$ 229 (1)
Steel Wing Co. Ltd., $In \ re \ (1921) - 184 \ (3)$	Washington v. The Commonwealth
Sterling Nicholas Duty Free Pty. Ltd.	(1939) $82$ (4), $84$ (1), $99$ (5)
v. The Commonwealth (1971) - 301 (1),	Waterside Workers' Federation of
308 (1), 313 (1), 316 (1)	Australia v. Gilchrist, Watt and
Stocken's Case (1868) 520 (1)	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
Suehle v. The Commonwealth (1967) – 100 (3)	
Summers (John) & Sons Ltd. v. Frost	Webb v. Stenton (1883) $ -$ 184 (1)
(1955) $-$ 74 (4)	[ Weeks v. City of Knox (1969) $-$ 362 (1)

```
Welden v. Smith (1924) - 78 (3), 81 (2)
Welham v. Director of Public Prosecutions (1961) - 582 (2), 583 (1), 588 (6),
                                                           Williams v. Bill Williams Pty. Ltd.
                                                                              148 (1), 149 (1), 150 (1), 152 (1),
                                                              (1971) -
                                                                                                 156 (1), 158 (1)
                                                           Willon v. Berkley (1561) -
                                      593 (4), 594 (1)
                                                                                                            71 (1)
Welker v. Hewett (1969) -
                                                           Wilsen v. Chambers & Co. Pty. Ltd.
                                      112 (1), 113 (1),
                   114 (2), 115 (1), 116 (1), 117 (2),
                                                              (1926) -
                                                                              435 (1), 436 (1), 442 (1), 443 (1),
                   118 (1), 121 (1), 122 (1), 123 (1), 124 (1), 125 (3), 126 (2), 127 (1),
                                                                                                           444 (1)
                                                           Wyatt v. Kreglinger and Fernau (1933) 453 (3),
                                      128 (1), 129 (1)
                                                                                        457 (1), 458 (2), 459 (1),
                                                                                        466 (1), 468 (3), 469 (1)
Wellington City Corporation v. McRea
  (1936) -
                                             - 368 (7)
Wellington Woollen Manufacturing Co.
  Ltd. v. Patrick (1935) -
                                            - 610 (2)
                                                                                      Y.
Werrin v. The Commonwealth (1938) - 81 (8),
                             82 (6), 96 (3), 97 (4)
                                                           Young v. Taylor (1818)
                                                                                                        -228(5)
West Derby Union v. Metropolitan Life
  Assurance Society (1897)
                                            - 668 (3)
Western Suburbs District Ambulance
Committee v. Tipping (1957) – – Weston v. Great Boulder Gold Mines
                                                                                       \mathbf{Z}.
                                           - 263 (1)
Ltd. (1964) 153 (1), 154 (1), 155 (2), 159 (5)
Whittingham v. Commissioner of
Railways (W.A.) (1931) - - 159 (2)
                                                           Zabrovsky v. General Officer Com-
                                                              manding Palestine (1947)
                                                                                                            12 (4)
                                                           Zietsch, Ex p.; Re Craig (1944)
                                                                                                        -562(2)
```

#### CORRIGENDUM.

123 C.L.R. page xviii: line 11, for "is" substitute "will".