Senate Select Committee on Superannuation and Financial Services

Main Inquiry Reference (a)

Submission No. 227 (Supplementary to Submission No. 195)

Submittor:

Mr S P Dwyer

1 Nutgrove Avenue

SANDY BAY TAS 7005

1 Nutgrove Avenue, Sandy Bay. Tas. 7005

4th July,2001

Committe Secretary, Select Committee on Superannuation & Financial Services, Parliament House, Canberra, ACT, 2600.



Dear M/s. Morton

Senate Enquiry into Solicitors' Mortgage Schemes in Tasmania.

Thank you for your letter of 27th June.

I am grateful for the opportunity to refute some of the non-truths uttered by Mr. Jackson on the morning of 15th June.

Firstly, he is reported, at SFS1198, as having said "The second main point I want to make is that the prosecution substantially failed. It failed substantially because it was found that Mr. Dwyer had not understod the firm's accounting system and that his perception of what had happened was not correct. Those were specific findings in the disciplinary tribunal; of the judge at the first instance appeal, the then Chief Justice, Sir Guy Green; and the judges on appeal in the Full Court: Justice Nettlefold and, as he then was Mr. Justice Cox."

I have not had the opportunity to see the findings of the disciplinary tribunal, which would have been held in camera and no findings made public -as best I understand it. However, I have again re-read the judgements of the then Chief Justice Green, Justice Netlefold and the now Chief Justice Cox. Nowhere am I able to read that any, or all, made the comment that "Mr. Dwyer had not understood the firm's accounting system and that his perception of what had happened was not correct". I would emphasise that I did not prosecute the defendants -Clerk Walker & Stops, that was done by the late Mr. (laterJustice Zeeman). As far as I am able to remember no-one had challenged my evidence in any matters reported to the Law Society, and at the Court hearings in which I gave evidence. The reason being that I had irrefutable copies of the records of the firms involved. I would emphasise that in every case that I wanted to copy records. I was given the permission of the firm concerned. This applied to Clerk Walker & Stops as well as all the others, and to suggest that I did not understand their(Clerk Walker & Stops)accounting system is a complete nonsense! I did not try them! It was their peers and the learned judges. If they could not understand normal accountancy terms and practices, as set out by me, the fault must surely lay with the prosecuting counsel in being unable to make matters clear.

In my defence as an accountant, I would point out that I have been a qualified practising accountant since July 1963. I was a registered company auditor during most of my time as a Certified Practising Accountant, having relinquished my licence when I decided to wind down my practice some several years ago. I am still a registered tax agent. Added to this I was a lecturer in accounting at the then Hobart Technical College for more years than I care to remember. Later, I also lectured in solicitors' trust accounting at the Law Training School (if that is what it was called) conducted to train graduates in law in various facets of their chosen profession.

I was also briefed by the Law Society to write a manual on accounting for legal offices. This I did, and a publication, funded by the Law Society, named "An Accounting Manual For Legal Offices" was distributed to all legal practices in Tasmania as an authority on the matter of trust, as well office, accounting. It was also adopted by the Law Training School as its authority on legal accounting.

Later Mr. Jackson, at SFS1199 said "Mr. Dwyer subsequently I will hand that up to the Committee ".

The facts of the matter are that in my letter of resignation I set out clearly my reasons, and at the same time offered to help out with an inspection should an emergency arise prior to the Society appointing a successor. I said that I would raise my fees for any future work they wished me to do. At that time I also sat on the Accounting Rules Committee and continued to do so for quite some time after.

When the then President of the Society (now Justice A. Blow) returned from leave and was told of my resignation he arranged to meet me to discuss the matter, and tried to persuade me to reconsider my decission, but, Iwas unable to for reasons I have already stated. He said that he could appreciate my action and regretted that I could not see my way clear to carry on.

Finally, I am enclosing a copy of a letter written to me by Mr. G.W.Tremayne on 22nd May, 1990. At that time Mr. Tremayne was a member of the Council of the Society and a partner in the firm , Crisp Hudson & Mann. He is now, I believe, a partner of Mr. Jackson.

Yours sincerely,

Mayer)

CRIMP LITTERN 2 REALIS (Freshlinder 1980)

BARRISTERS, SQUICITORS & NOVARIUS

PEPER SUPERIOR Forter Police
Controller of the parties of the part GEOFFREY W. TREMETANT TO Hatana

DAVID SCHIER DAM . . A

pi i.

1;

Albert M. Seuden II. 3 Albert M. Seuden Dr. 11 3 Albert Medder Frank Production of 19 8 Supremier Tours All Septem

CURRACHMORE HOUSE 73 MOUNT STREET, SURME fine 521, 02/80/9, Tec. 7020 (Alex et 35 Codde Orane, Myrward)

AUSDING DX TOOL SURNIE Attornation (C. Mario Color) Centres and Perguin

OF THE GWINC

Marie Company 1 Milgroye Avenus SANDI BAY 7003

23nd May, 1900

Dear Sir.

Re. Clock Walker and Stops

I am presently a member of the Council of the Law Society of Tasmania. Whilst we have never met, I feel that I must write to you concerning a recent decision of the Council to sek an alternative auditor to sadit Clerk Walker and Stops.

I have only been a member of Law Council for about two and a half years, but I can say that over that relatively short period of time, the Semision concerning the audit of Clerk Walker and Stope is the Most distriction matter in which I have been involved. As you are probably aware, Council was split over the matter and those of us who thought you should audit Clerk Walker and Stope took the unusual step, for Council meetings that is, of having our discount of the semisual step. having our dissent recorded to the motion that alternative auditor inspect their accounts.

In my opinion, the role of an auditor is, in a relatively un-tegulated profession like ours, excremely important and one that should not be tampered with. I take the view that the society's random inspector should by apert from and not subject to the specific direction of the Council. Urless we, as a self regulating profession, have an independent inspection system that is not subject to an over-riding power of direction by the governing body, then much of the value of the random inspector is lost.

I believe that the decision made by the Council will ultimately be one that will cause problems for the random inspection system and may be one that leads to a situation where more government control is forthcoming. If that situation arises then those members who were instrumental in seeking the appointment of an alternative random inspector will have a great deal to auswer for.

As I indicated earlier, I have not met you, but I have heard numerous reports of your work and without exception the reports were highly complimentary, saving things such as you were fearless in the execution of your duties but yet someone who was sympathetic and prepared to help those who genuinely sought your assistance to rectify problems that you discovered. For such a valuable service to the profession to be terminated in a way that this

CRISP, HUDSON & MANN

Barristers, solicitors u notaries

Nervice Pathlets Control Pathlets Control Pathlets Suprement Court All States MICHAEL J. WELLTER LL. &. LL. B. TOMOTHY G. BURG, B. A., LL. B. DECEMBLE ORWAN, LL.M. asscciate:

BAVE GUIER, DAW, GUG.

1: .

 $\{ i \}$

CCHOULTANTS: JOHN W. H. B. C. B

CURFACHMORE HOUSE 75 MOUNT STREET, BURMLE Ec. 321, BURME, TAS. 7320 Miss or 30 Galdie Street, Vigovoret

THE PRINT OF STAND OF BUILDING AUSDOC: DX 70001 QUANIE PACE NOW INSTANT ATTENDED ALL WEST THEIR CONTROL AND PENGUIN

YOUR REF

GUR ACES GIVT:MC

Mr. S. Dwet

22mi May, 1990

Ż.,

Re: Clerk Walker and Stops

matter has been is a matter of great regret, not only to myself but to a number of other Council members.

In light of the decision made by the Council concerning your appointment, it probably would have been a somewhat hollow gesture for Council to have passed a vote of thanks when the majority of Council members were instrumental in the decision that caused your resignation. However, I could not let the situation pass without expressing my gracitute to you for the work you have done and assuring you that there will be a great number of members in the legal profession who will very much regret your decision to resign as random inspector.

> Yours Eaitheally, CRISP HURSON & MANIN