

Index

- Acts Interpretation Act 1901* (Cth)
administrative instruments, 117
amendment, 89–90
invalidity of part of Act, 102
- Administration Appeals Tribunal (AAT)
appeals from decision of, 179–81
taxation decisions, 230
- Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977* (Cth) (ADJR Act)
application of, 36
ARC report Recommendations, 165–93 *see also* Administrative Review Council (ARC)
costs, ARC report Recommendation 15, 190–1
grounds for review, 36, 150, 165
ARC report Recommendation 8, 183–4
no evidence, 148–50
“Judicial Review: A Jurisdictional Limits Model”, 165, 166, 191–2
Minister for Immigration and Citizenship v SZMDS (SZMDS), 50, 60
minority proposal, 165, 166, 191–2
severance in relation to administrative decisions, 122–3
standing for representative organisations, 185
- Administrative instruments
construction, 116–22
- Administrative law
migration cases, 48–9, 166
state of satisfaction provisions, 50
- Administrative Review Council (ARC)
Federal Judicial Review in Australia
recommendations, 165–93
Administrative Appeals Tribunal decisions, 179–81
application of ADJR Act, 175–8
decisions of the Governor-General, 178–9
decisions to commence civil penalty proceedings, 177–8
reports and recommendations as decisions, 175–7
assessment, 193
avenues of judicial review, divergence, 165–6, 174
costs, 190–1
grounds for review in ADJR Act, 183–4
guidance for policy makers by ARC, 184–5
impact of migration law, 166
new avenues for judicial review, 181–3
Recommendation 1, 167–75
commercial decisions
by government, 171
non-statutory decisions, 172
schemes providing government grants, 171
recording of reasons, 186–7
standing for representative organisations, 185
statements of reasons, 187
categories of information, 189–90
failure to provide, 188–9
taxation decisions, 179
United Kingdom reform proposals, comparison, 166–7
- APLA* case, 112–13
- Appeal
error of law, 25–8
questions of law, 179–81
right of, 7
- Arbitrariness, 75–6
- Australia
court powers, 9
judicial integrity, 9–10
Australian Government Solicitor, 87
Bank Nationalisation Case, 10
Barwick, Sir Garfield, 10
Bias, 147
Blake, John, 8
Brown v Board of Education, 4
Cardozo, Benjamin, 6–7
CDDA Scheme (Scheme for Compensation for Detriment Caused by Defective Administration), 170–1
- Certiorari
jurisdictional error, 11, 13, 21–2, 32
- Chrimes, Professor SB, 8
- Coke, Sir Edward, 4–5
- Common law
judicial power, 7
- Commonwealth Constitution
jurisdiction of High Court, 21
separation of powers, 203–5
taxation powers, 216
- Communist Party Case*, 10

- Cost orders, 1
- Counsel
 - duties, 1
- Courts
 - powers, 9
 - role, 1–10
 - advisory opinions, 9
 - superior courts, 7
- Decision-making
 - authority for, 12–13
 - breach of process, 12 *see also* Jurisdictional error
 - constructive failure to exercise power, 38
 - fact-finding process, logicity, 62–3
 - government branches, comparison, 1–9
 - integrity, 1
 - judicial, 1, 7–9
 - judicial review
 - Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977* (Cth), 36
 - labels, application of, 36–7
 - mandatory considerations
 - see* Relevancy grounds
 - proportionality, 40, 45, 46
 - rationality, 38, 46
 - analysis of reasoning, 38
 - principle, 39–40
 - reasons and reasoning, 40–1
 - contemporaneous recording
 - recommendation, 186–7
 - rules of evidence, 154
 - separation of powers, 38
 - state of satisfaction *see* State of satisfaction
 - unreasonableness *see* Unreasonableness; *Wednesbury* unreasonableness
 - Xiujuan Li* case, 42–8
- Denning, Lord, 5–6
- Dingjan, Re*, 108–10
- Drafting *see also* Office of Parliamentary Counsel (OPC); Statutory construction
 - complexity of legislation, 85–6, 95
 - consistency levels, 86–7
 - history of drafting, 98
 - instructors and, relationship, 79
 - legislative problem solving, 80–1
 - legal issues, 80
 - logical issues, 80
 - policy and implementation issues, 81, 95
 - process of drafting, 78–9
 - role, 79–80, 81, 95
 - statutory interpretation perspective, 87–8
- Dworkin, Professor Ronald, 3
- Environmental law
 - identity of decision-maker, 256
 - relevancy grounds, 241
 - active intellectual process, 246
 - considerations, 242, 243, 247, 248
 - evidence, 252
 - foreshore building lines, 253
 - fundamental element in decision, 247
 - immateriality, 257–8
 - irrelevant, 255–6
 - noise impacts, 253
 - ‘proper, genuine and realistic’, 249
 - standard, 244
- Error of law
 - admissibility of evidence, 136–7, 150–1
 - Azzopardi v Tasman UEB*, 37
 - determination of facts, 37
 - invalidity through, 13
 - jurisdictional *see also* Jurisdictional error
 - non-jurisdictional, distinction, 25–8
 - non-jurisdictional, 11, 13
 - scope for review, 196
- Evidence
 - admissibility in judicial review proceedings
 - apprehension of bias allegation, 147
 - challenge to standing, 161–2
 - constitutional facts, 132–3
 - error of law, 136–7, 150–1
 - improper exercise of power, 136
 - unreasonableness, 138–41
 - material before primary decision-maker, 154–5
 - overview, 131, 164
 - Prasad* exception, 138–41
 - preliminary evidence gathering, 133
 - procedural considerations, 162–4
 - procedural fairness, 146–7
 - relevance to grounds of challenge, 134–8
 - statements of reasons, 158–61
 - unreasonableness, 138–41
 - constitutional facts, 132–3
 - error of law, 136–7, 150–1
 - expert evidence, 141–2, 143, 162–4
 - failure to make inquiry, 140
 - jurisdictional facts, 151–5
 - Enfield* decision, 152, 153, 154–5
 - identification of, 152–3
 - mandatory and prohibited considerations, 144–6
 - no evidence ground of review, 147–50
 - ADJR Act, 148–50
 - cumulative interpretation, 149–50
 - common law, 148
 - requirement, 148
 - preliminary evidence gathering, 133
 - primary rule of, 134

- procedural considerations, 162–4
 expert evidence, 162–4
- procedural fairness, denial of, 146–7
 bias allegation, 147
 obligation of procedural fairness, 147
 relevance issues, 134
 Australia, 135–8
 Federal Court early decisions, 135–8
 Enfield decision, 152, 153, 154–5
 error of law, 136–7, 150–1
 fresh evidence, 141–3
 general principle, 134–5
 improper exercise of power, 136
 jurisdictional facts, 151–5
 mandatory and prohibited
 considerations, 144–6
 Prasad exception, 138–41
 United Kingdom, 134–5
 statements of reasons, 158–61
 hearsay rule, 160
 production of, 159
 requirement for, 158
 time of delivery, 159
 unverified, 160
- statutory construction, 144
 jurisdictional facts, 152
- technical statutory terms, 155–8
 cases, 156
 identification as ‘technical’, 157–8
 principles and exceptions to rule, 156
- ultimate issue rule, abolition, 142
- unreasonableness claim, 137–8
 constructive knowledge
 of decision-maker, 139
 expert evidence, 141–2, 143
 failure to obtain material, 139, 140
 fresh evidence, 141–3
 irrationality, 142–3
 outcomes and process, distinction, 142
Prasad, 138–41
 challenge to, 140
 procedures employed in
 decision-making, 139
- Frankfurter, Justice Felix, 4
- Free speech
 financial interests and, 3
- Futuris* case
 alternative relief, 34
 validity of tax assessment, 19, 226–7, 229
- Gettier counter-examples, 63, 64
- Gore, Senator Thomas, 6
- Government
 branches, 1, 2
 disputes, 6–7
 relationship, 6–7, 9, 35–6
- Governor-General
 decisions of, ARC recommendations, 178–9
Groenvelt v Burwell, 7
- Hand, Judge Learned, 6
- Heads of power
 constitutional
 corporations, 108–10
 disciplinary system, 106–8
Pochi v Macphee, 105–6
 taxation, 114–15 *see also* Taxation laws
- Hickman* provisos, 19, 23–5
- High Court
 jurisdiction, 21
 privative clauses, 23
Xiujuan Li case, 42–8
- Holt Sir John, 7
- Hoover, Herbert, 6
- Illogicality/irrationality
 rationality and arbitrariness, 75–6
 rationality principle, 39–40
 reasons and reasoning, 40–1
 stand-alone ground of
 judicial review, 66, 68–9
- SZMDS, 62, 66–72, 202
 Federal Court finding, 67
 legal issues, 67–71
 illogicality as jurisdictional error, 68, 71
 satisfaction as jurisdic-
 tional fact, 67–8, 71
 test for, 68–71
- test for, 68–71
 application to jurisdictional fact, 70
 critical inferences not supported, 70–1
 development as ground of review, 68–9
 scope, 69–70, 71
Wednesbury unreasonableness and, 69, 70
- The Industrial Relations Act Case*, 110–11
- Invalidity
Acts Interpretation Act 1901 (Cth), 102
 administrative decisions
 administrative instru-
 ments, intersection, 126–8
 severance, 122–6
 administrative instruments
 administrative decisions, intersection, 126–8
 construction, 117–22
 application of *Acts Interpretation Act*, 117
 decisions and, 118
 grants in excess of power, 117–18
 severance, availability of, 118–22
 errors of law, 13
 partial invalidity, 100
Acts Interpretation Act 1901 (Cth), 102

- Invalidity (*cont*)
- partial invalidity (*cont*)
 - construction, related principles of, 115–16
 - meaning, 100–1
 - principles, 101
 - Project Blue Sky*, 101
 - reading down principles, 101–15
 - severance, 102
 - reading down principles
 - basic, 101–3
 - Defence Force Discipline Act 1982* (Cth), 106–8
 - distributive, cases, 105–15
 - APLA*, 112–13
 - Dingjan, Re*, 108–10
 - The Industrial Relations Act Case*, 110–11
 - Nolan, Re*, 106–8
 - Pape v Commonwealth*, 114–15
 - Pochi v Macphee*, 105–6
 - R v Hughes*, 111–12
 - Work Choices Case*, 113–14
 - Industrial Relations Act 1988* (Cth), 108–10
 - Migration Act 1958* (Cth), 105–6
 - overly broad application
 - of words, 103–5, 115
 - summary, 115
 - tests of validity, 106
 - severance, 102–3, 118
 - administrative decisions, 122–6
 - availability, 118–22
 - common law doctrine of severability, 121
 - heads of power, 103–4
 - The Industrial Relations Act Case*, 110–11
 - overly broad application of words, 103–5
 - possibility, 102
 - theory of, 128–30
 - United Kingdom, 197
 - Xiujuan Li case*, 42–8
- Irrationality *see* Illogicality/irrationality
- Jay, Chief Justice, 9
- Jefferson, Thomas, 2, 9
- Judicial review
 - Administrative Review Council (ARC) recommendations, 165–93
 - approach, 35–6
 - labels, 36–7
 - availability, 36, 194–5
 - divergence, ARC report recommendations, 165–93
 - costs, ARC report Recommendation 15, 190–1
 - development of, 7, 35–6
 - executive action, of
 - constitutional implications, 36
 - focus of inquiry, 36
 - judicial role, expansion of, 35
 - overview, 35–6
 - relationship between judicial and legislative arms of government, 35–6
 - federal system
 - ADJR Act, ARC recommendation 1, 168–75
 - flexibility element, 47–8
 - grounds, labels for, 36
 - Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977* (Cth), 36
 - history, 36–7
 - limitations, 36
 - illogicality as ground *see* Illogicality/irrationality
 - judgments, 37–8
 - jurisdictional error, 11–12 *see also* Jurisdictional error
 - Kirk v Industrial Court (NSW)*, 20–2, 210
 - migration decisions, 36, 37
 - Xiujuan Li case*, 42–8
 - ‘no evidence’ ground of, 26–7, 38, 47
 - extrinsic evidence, 147–50
 - privative clauses, 22–5
 - process, 38–9
 - reasoning process, of, 40–1
 - relevancy grounds *see* Relevancy grounds
 - relief through *see* Relief
 - rule of law, 38., 198–200
 - procedural fairness, 41–2
 - scope, 41
 - sources
 - judgments, 37–8
 - statutes, 37
 - superior courts of record, 28–31
 - unreasonableness *see* Unreasonable-ness; *Wednesbury* unreasonableness
- “Judicial Review: A Jurisdictional Limits Model”, 165, 166, 191–2
- Judicial review proceedings
 - admissibility of extrinsic evidence *see* Evidence
 - role of court in United Kingdom, 212–14
- Judiciary
 - activism, 4
 - advice to executive, 8–9
 - assessment, 1, 2–10
 - political judgment, 2–5, 9
 - United Kingdom, 4–6, 7
 - United States, 2–4, 6–7
 - fitness for duties, 4
 - political activism, 2, 5
 - role, 1

- social background, 5
- sovereignty and, 7
- Judiciary Act*
 - avenue of judicial review, 165
 - ARC report Recommendation 1, 167–75
- Jurisdiction
 - ambit of Ch III Court, 194
 - Commonwealth Constitution, 21
- Jurisdictional error
 - administrative law, in, 11–14
 - concept, 11
 - error of law, distinction, 25–8
 - significance, utility and future of, 31–4
 - decision-making process, 12–13
 - decisions of superior courts of record, 28–31
 - judicial review availability, 29–30
 - definition, 12, 13
 - error of law and, 25–8
 - failure to make inquiry, 140
 - grounds of, 14–20
 - categories, 14
 - Futuris*, 19, 20, 34
 - illogicality, 68
 - mandatory compliance, 16–19
 - case law, 16
 - Project Blue Sky* test, 16–17, 19, 33, 33
 - privative clauses, 19–20, 22–5
 - relevancy *see* Relevancy grounds
 - requirements, types, 15
 - statutes, 15
 - grounds of review, 32
 - statutory construction, 15–17
 - broad provisions, 19
 - mandatory and directory requirements, 16
 - parliamentary intent, 17, 19
 - validation clauses, 19
 - Hickman* reconciliation approach, 19, 23–5
 - identification of, 11–14
 - assessment of reviewing courts, 13
 - incorrect exercise of power, 12, 15, 17, 23
 - invalidity and, 18–19, 24
 - label of conclusion, 13–14, 30, 31–2, 41–2, 173
 - parliamentary intent, 17
 - Project Blue Sky* test, 16–17, 19, 33
 - illogicality, 68
 - Kirk v Industrial Court*, 11, 13–14, 20–2, 210
 - arguments, 20–1
 - effect, 29–30
 - State restriction of judicial review, 20–2, 28
 - non-jurisdictional error, distinction, 13, 43
 - prerequisite to relief, whether, 32–3
 - privative clauses, 19–20, 22–5
 - Hickman* provisos, 19, 23–5
 - High Court, 23–4
 - invalidity claims, 24
 - post-*Kirk*, 22–3
 - Project Blue Sky* test, 16–17, 19, 33
 - validation clauses, 19–20
- Jurisdictional fact doctrine
 - background of concept, 57
 - conclusory term, 57
 - definition, 57, 60
 - identification of, 58
 - non-objectivist approach, 58
 - objectivist approach, 57–8
 - state of satisfaction, relationship, 50, 59–60
 - implications, 60–1, 65
 - statutory construction, 57
- Justice
 - access to, 1, 86
 - administration of, 1
 - Kirk v Industrial Court*, 11, 13–14, 20–2, 28, 182–3, 210 *see also* Jurisdictional error
- Latham, Sir John, 9–10
- Legislation *see* Drafting
- Legislative instruments
 - invalid *see* Invalidity
 - reading down principles, 101, 104–5
 - general law approach, 101–3
- Lyons, Joseph, 9
- McCluskey, Lord, 2
- Mandamus, 13, 32, 33
- Marshall, Chief Justice John, 2
- Merciless Parliament, 8
- Migration decisions, 36, 37, 48–9
 - impact on administrative law, 166, 169
 - materiality of error, 210
 - Minister for Immigration and Citizenship v SZMDS*, 50, 60, 64–5, 66–72
 - Wednesbury* unreasonableness, 68–9
 - Xiujuan Li* case, 42–8, 72–7
- Migration Review Tribunal, 42, 72
- Minister for Immigration and Citizenship v SZMDS (SZMDS)*, 50, 60, 64–5
 - facts, 66–7
 - legal issues, 67–71
 - summary, 71–2
- Nolan, Re*, 106–8
- Office of Parliamentary Counsel (OPC)
 - see also* Drafting; Statutory construction
 - access to justice, 86
 - complexity flag system, 86
 - constitutionality, ensuring, 87
 - Drafting positions in the Office of Parliamentary Counsel*, 78
 - instructing agencies, 78

- Office of Parliamentary Counsel (OPC) (*cont*)
 policy levels, influence on, 81–7
 role of drafters, 79–80, 81, 95
 usability of legislation survey, 84–5, 94
- Pape v Commonwealth*, 114–15
- Partial invalidity *see* Invalidity
- Peko-Wallsend* case
 mandatory relevant considerations, 15, 17, 43–4, 243, 244
- Penfold, Hilary, 95
- Pochi v Macphee*, 105–6
- Political interests
 competing, 1
 financial interests, 3
- Posner, Judge Richard, 3–4
- Power, exercise of
 abuse of statutory power, 197
 constraint by statute, 37
 partial invalidity, 101 *see also* Invalidity
 improper
 admissibility of evidence, 136
 relevancy grounds *see* Relevancy grounds
 unreasonableness, 138–41
 procedural fairness principles, 202–3
 validity of power
Pochi v Macphee, 105–6
- Prasad* decision, 138–41
- Prerogative writs, 7, 33
- Privative clauses
 restriction of judicial review, 22–5
- Procedural fairness, 13
 admissibility of evidence,
 146–7 *see also* Evidence
 duty of, 41–2, 147
Migration Act, 72, 74
 principles of, 202–3
- Prohibition 13, 32
- Project Blue Sky Inc v Australian Broadcasting Authority*, 16–17, 19, 33, 41
 effect on drafting Bills, 90–1
 partial invalidity principle, 101
- Public interest
 issues, 1
 litigation, 1
 political questions, 1
- Public law
 English, use of, 43
 evidence in *see* Evidence
 principles implied into legislation, 206–7
 role of courts, 1–10
- Public policy
 drafting legislation, 81–7
- Questions of law
 appeals, 26
 from decision of AAT, 179–81
- Quin's case*
 State jurisdiction, 38
- R v Hughes*, 111–12
- Reasonableness *see also* Unreasonableness; *Wednesbury* unreasonableness
 objective test, 52–3
 standard of, 76–7
- Refugee Review Tribunal (RRT), 66
- Relevancy grounds
 decision-making record, 252–5
 inferences, 253–5
 statement of reasons, 252–3
 discretionary value judgments, 255–6
 evidence *see* Evidence
 immateriality, 257–60
 ambiguity, 258–9
 implied considerations, 258
 improper exercise of power, 241
 irrelevant considerations, 255, 259–60
 identity of decision-maker, 255–7
 environmental law, 256
 overlapping errors, 255
 judicial review, 241
 considerations, variety of, 242
 rationality framework, 241
 reasonableness, 242
 jurisdictional error identification, 241
 mandatory relevant considerations, 242, 243
 active intellectual process, 246–7
 consideration, meaning of, 245
 express, 258
 failure to take into account, 243, 248
 focal points, 247
 implied, 258
 legal standards, 244–7
 nature of requirement, 244–50
 'proper, genuine and realistic consideration', 248–50
 statutory and factual content, 250–2
 obligations of decision-maker
 mandatory considerations, 242, 243
 statutory and factual context, 250–2
 public interest considerations, 255–6
 statutory and factual context, 250–2
 taking matter into account
 decision-making record, 252–5
 failure to, 243, 248
 nature of requirement, 244–50
 negative formulations, 244–5
 statement of reasons, 252–3
 weighting of considerations, 244
 unreasonableness, 242
- Relief
 availability, 194–5
 alternative, 34

- court imposed thresholds, 211–12
 - deference to executive, 212–14
 - intent of parliament, 194–5, 206
 - jurisdiction, 194
 - materiality of error, 207–14
 - statutory interpretation, 194–5
 - substantive principles determining, 206
 - United Kingdom, 211–12
- degrees of error, 208
- grant through judicial review
 - English case law, comparison, 196–7, 198
 - control mechanisms in England, 196
 - errors of law, 196, 197
 - intent of parliament, 196
 - invalidity, 197
 - non-jurisdictional error of law, 196
 - overview, 194–5, 214–15
 - rationales, 198–206
- human rights, 213–14
- injunctive, 11, 32–4
- materiality of error, 207–14
 - Australia, 210
 - degrees of error, 208
 - United Kingdom, 208–10, 211
- parliamentary sovereignty model, 205–6
- public law principles implied
 - into legislation, 206–7
- rationales for grant through
 - judicial review, 198
 - administrative system, integrity of, 201–2
 - procedural fairness principles, 202–3
 - remedy for wrong, 200–1
 - rights of the subject, 202–3
 - rule of law, 198–200
 - United Kingdom, 199–200
 - separation of powers, 203–5
 - unreasonableness, 202, 207
 - will of parliament, giving effect to, 205–6
- relevance of error, 207–14
- role of court, subject-based
 - distinctions, 212–14
- rule of law principle, 198–200
- scrutiny of administrative decisions, 213–14
- State judicial reviews, 21
- Roosevelt, Franklin, 6–7
- Rule of law
 - judicial review purpose, 198–200
 - operation in Australian political system, 38
 - procedural fairness, 41–2
- Scheme for Compensation for
 - Detriment Caused by Defective Administration *see* CDDA Scheme
- Separation of powers
 - federal and State levels, 38
 - operation of, 38, 199–200
 - rationale for judicial review, 203–5
 - state of satisfaction standards, 55
 - United Kingdom, 8
 - United States, 6–7
- Severance *see* Invalidity
- State of satisfaction
 - George v Rockett* principle, 55–6
 - jurisdictional fact doctrine, 57–8, 71
 - relationship, 50, 59–60
 - contrast, 59
 - development, 59–60
 - implications, 60–1, 65
 - SZMDS*, 60, 67–8
 - justification, 64
 - knowledge of proposition
 - analytic philosophy, 63
 - satisfaction compared, 63–4
 - legislative intent, 55
 - ordinary fact, whether, 61
 - provisions, 50–2
 - construction, 52–5
 - examples, 51
 - good faith, 54
 - hypothetical, 55
 - justification of approach, 55
 - legislative power or duty, 51
 - mental state, 51–2, 55
 - reasonable cause for belief principle, 52–3, 55–6
 - Gettier counter-examples, 63
 - language analysis, 63
 - reasonableness of belief, 56
 - varieties, 55–6
 - minimum standards, 53–4
 - ‘right result/wrong reasoning’
 - distinction, 61–5
 - Gettier counter-examples, 63, 64
 - language analysis, 62–3
 - SZMDS*, 62
 - separation of powers, 55
 - standards of reasonableness
 - and rationality, 52–5
 - SZMDS*, 60
 - illogicality and, 62
 - joint judgments, 64–5
 - treatment as jurisdictional fact
 - implications, 60–1
 - ‘right result/wrong reasoning’ distinction, 61–5
 - utility of approach, 61
- Statutory construction *see also* Drafting;
 - Office of Parliamentary Counsel (OPC)
 - Acts of general application, 88
 - Acts Interpretation Act 1901*, amendment of, 89–90

- Statutory construction (*cont*)
- ambiguity, 88, 97, 98
 - approach, 87–8
 - coherence, fiction of, 97–8
 - complexity of legislation, 85–6, 95–6, 98–9
 - usability, 98
 - consistency of legislation, 86–7
 - constitutionality, 87
 - context of provisions, 88
 - decision-making powers when drafting, 82–4
 - decision-maker not stated, 83–4
 - default provision, 82–3
 - limitations, 83
 - non-compellable powers, 83
 - provisions, 92–3
 - drafters, 78–9
 - analysis by, 80–1
 - instructing agencies, 79
 - interpretation perspective, 87–8, 92
 - legislative problem solving, 80–1
 - outcomes sought by, 83
 - policy concerns, addressing, 79, 95
 - policy levels and OPC influence on, 81–7
 - role, 79–80, 81
 - intention of parliament, 88, 95–7, 194–5, 196, 206
 - interpretative device, 96
 - interpretative principles, 95
 - coherence, fiction of, 97–8
 - intention, 95–7
 - invalidity of instrument *see* Invalidity
 - modern legislation, 98, 99
 - problematic approach, 99
 - natural meaning of words, 88
 - ‘objects’ provisions, 81
 - privative clauses, 116
 - Project Blue Sky*, effect of, 90–1, 97
 - reading Act as a whole, 89
 - reading down principles, 101–15
 - severance *see* Invalidity
 - usability of legislation, 84–5, 98
- Taxation laws
- appealable objection decision, 231–2
 - burden of proof, 232–3
 - judicial review contrasted, 233
 - assessment of income tax, 224–5
 - ‘amount and all the particulars’, 228
 - centrality to taxpayer’s liability, 225
 - conscious maladministration, 227
 - ‘due making’, 228–9
 - ‘excessive’, 232–3
 - machinery for, 224
 - notice of, 225, 226, 227, 228–9
 - recovery of tax, 225–9
 - setting aside, forum for, 235–7
 - tentative or provisional, 226–7
 - validity, 226
 - conscious maladministration, 227
 - constitutional aspects, 224
 - arbitrary exactions, 222–4
 - Commonwealth legislative power, 216, 218
 - definition of tax, 217–18
 - incontestable tax, 218–22
 - limitations of contestability principle, 221
 - law with respect to taxation, 217
 - taxpayer rights, 220–2
 - objection, review and appeal
 - procedures under Part IVC, 229–40
 - Administrative Appeals Tribunal, 230
 - appeal to a federal court, 231–2
 - ARC report recommendation 5, 179
 - burden on taxpayer, 232–5
 - invalidity of assessment, 235–7
 - judicial power, nature of, 231
 - merits review, 230–2
 - review body, 230–1
 - reviewable objection decision, 230
 - scope and operation, 230
 - stay of recovery during, 237–40
 - taxation decision requirement, 230
 - overview, 216
 - policy of revenue protection, 237–8
 - reviewable objection decision, 230
 - tax
 - assessment, 224–5
 - definition, 217–18
 - recovery of assessed amount, 225–9
 - 1936 Act ss 175 and 177, 225–9
 - stay not negated by Part IVC proceedings, 237–40
 - taxpayer
 - burden of proof, 232–5
 - review and appeal procedures, 229–40
 - stay of recovery during, 237–40
 - rights, 220–2
- Tresilian, Sir Robert, 8
- Turner, Ralph
- The English Judiciary in the Age of Glanvill and Bracton*, 7
- United Kingdom
- administrative law cases, 196–7
 - admissibility of evidence, 134–5
 - court imposed thresholds for availability of review, 211–12
 - error of law, 13
 - materiality, 208–10, 211
 - judiciary
 - assessment, 4–6

INDEX

- Crown and, 5, 7–8
 - independence, 5
- Merciless Parliament, 8
- reform proposals, 166–7
- remedy for wrong, 200–1
- role of court in judicial review
 - proceedings, 212–14
- rule of law considerations, 198–200
- United States
 - Bill of Rights, 2
 - court packing, 6
 - election spending limits, 3
 - executive power, 6
 - financial interests, 3
 - free speech, 3
 - judges, political judgment of, 2–4, 6, 9
 - separation of powers, 6–7
- Unreasonableness, 39–40
 - admissibility of evidence, 137–8
 - fresh evidence, 141–3
 - Prasad* case, 138–41
 - disproportionality, 73
 - ground of judicial review, 66
 - irrationality and, 62
 - Wednesbury*, 43, 68–9, 70, 72–7 *see also* *Wednesbury* unreasonableness
- Xiujuan Li* case, 42–8, 72–7
- Values
 - competing, 1
- Vinson, Chief Justice Fred, 4
- Washington, George, 9
- Wednesbury* unreasonableness, 43, 70
 - degree of, 74–5
 - exclusion, 68
 - illogicality/irrationality, distinction, 76
 - scope in exercise of discretionary power, 72–7
 - Xiujuan Li*, 72–7
 - arbitrariness, 75–6
 - High Court judgments, 73–4
 - inference of unreasonableness, 74
 - removal of limits, 74–5
 - scope and purpose of statute, 76
 - specific errors in decision-making, 75
- Wheeler, Professor Fiona, 9
- The Work Choices* Case, 113–14
- Xiujuan Li* case, 42–8
 - facts, 72
 - legal issues, 72–4
 - significance, 46–7, 66, 76–7
 - Wednesbury* unreasonableness, 66, 72–7