

1984

**THE**  
**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN**  
**STATE REPORTS**

**VOL. 33**

**EDITOR**

**R. M. HAGUE, C.B.E., LL.B.**

*A Practitioner of the Supreme Court of South Australia*

**THE LAW BOOK COMPANY LIMITED**

1984

Published in Sydney by  
The Law Book Company Limited  
44-50 Waterloo Road, North Ryde, N.S.W.  
389-393 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne, Victoria  
6 Sherwood Court, Perth, W.A.

ISSN 0049-1470

© 1984 The Law Book Company Limited

Printed by K.B. Printing Services Pty. Ltd.  
Gumbowie Avenue, Edwardstown, S.A.

## JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT

The Honourable Leonard James King, Chief Justice.

\*The Honourable Dame Roma Flinders Mitchell, D.B.E

The Honourable George Henry Walters.

The Honourable Howard Edgar Zelling, C.B.E.

The Honourable William Andrew Noye Wells.

The Honourable Alexander Keith Sangster.

The Honourable Samuel Joshua Jacobs.

The Honourable James Mitchell White.

The Honourable Christopher John Legoe.

The Honourable Brian Rothwell Cox.

The Honourable Robert Finey Mohr, E.D.

The Honourable Roderick Grant Matheson.

The Honourable Derek Willoughby Bollen.

The Honourable Robin Rhodes Millhouse.

The Honourable Elliot Frank Johnston.

## ATTORNEY-GENERAL

The Honourable Christopher John Sumner, M.L.C.

\*Acting Chief Justice from 9th May, 1983 to 25th September, 1983.  
Retired, 1st October, 1983.

## MEMORANDUM

A Special sitting of the Full Court was held on Wednesday, 28th September, 1983, on the occasion of the retirement of the Honourable Dame Roma Flinders Mitchell, D.B.E.

**THE HONOURABLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE:** This special sitting of the Court is held to mark the end of a legal and judicial career, the significance of which for the Court, the legal profession and the community at large can properly be characterised as both historic and unique.

Justice Mitchell was admitted as a practitioner of this court in December 1934, at which time there were but a handful of practising women lawyers. She retires at a time when women have become an integral part of the legal profession at all levels of its structure and in all aspects of its work and when women are increasingly represented in the ranks of the judiciary. These changes in the judiciary and the legal profession reflect, of course, changes taking place in society itself. The impact of those social changes on personal well-being and the extent of their contribution to the sum of human happiness remain, I suppose, to be assessed by history. This generation is too close, I dare say, to the process of change and too involved in it to be capable of sound and detached judgment as to those matters.

There is one judgment, however, which I believe can be made with confidence, and that is that the alterations in the role of women in society which have occurred during the period covered by Justice Mitchell's career have had already and will have in the future profound effects on the judiciary, on the legal profession and on the administration of justice.

Justice Mitchell entered the profession as that process of change was beginning and she leaves it with the process in full flood. Her most distinguished career has had a substantial effect upon the quality of the impact on the administration of justice of the increasing role of women and it is that effect which gives her career its historic character and its unique quality.

Justice Mitchell brought to the legal profession in this time of change her outstanding personal qualities and in particular her independence of mind and character and a thoroughly professional approach to her work. Her unquestioned professional dedication and detachment assisted greatly in allaying the fears of the sceptics in the community, and of course there were not a few in the early days, as to the nature of the influence which women would have on the quality of justice. Moreover her professional detachment and dedication combined with sensitivity, compassion and personal warmth provided the model of the woman lawyer and judge for the emulation of the young women who were entering the profession in increasing numbers as the years passed.

Her Honour has been the example of what a woman lawyer and judge should be, indeed of what a lawyer and judge of either sex should be. Her influence on women practitioners was by no means confined to example. Her vast professional prestige and her personal warmth and accessibility have enabled her to play an immeasurable role in counselling, guiding, encouraging and assisting women practitioners through the difficulties and uncertainties of practice in a profession which is still in the process of adjustment to the advent of women to its ranks. There can be no doubt that the influence for good on the administration of justice of the increased participation of women has been greatly enhanced by the life, work and example of Justice Mitchell.

No doubt in other professions and in other places there have been other influences in this regard. In South Australia and indeed in Australia generally we have reason for gratitude that the times produced the personality, and that there emerged a personality who was able to have and did have such a beneficial effect on the process of change in which she herself was so deeply involved.

Nor was her influence by any means confined to this state or indeed to this country. The influence and example of this outstanding woman lawyer and judge spread not only throughout Australia but throughout those parts of the world which possess similar legal systems.

Thus far I have stressed the historic and unique role which was in some sense thrust upon Justice Mitchell by circumstances but which she embraced so readily and discharged so well. But of course her career in its own right, and quite apart from its peculiar historical setting, must be judged outstanding. She was a brilliant student at the University of Adelaide where she obtained the degree of Bachelor of Laws. She was articled to the great advocate, the late Mr. J. W. Nelligan Q.C., and was associated with him in partnership for many years. Mr. Justice Walters, who sits on this bench today, was her partner in the same firm for some years also. She practised in most branches of the law and was outstandingly successful, particularly as an advocate in the courts. Her prestige and popularity in the profession resulted in her being elected to high positions in the representative bodies of her profession. It would be tedious for me to particularize those positions, especially as the President of the Law Society will shortly speak. Her Honour was appointed Queen's Counsel in 1962, the first woman to be so appointed. Following a distinguished career as senior counsel, she was appointed a Judge of the Supreme Court in 1965, the first Australian woman judge of a superior court. Her appointment to this bench was received with acclaim in the legal profession and the community generally. Her period of service on the Court extends over eighteen years, during four years of which she has been Senior Puisne Judge. She has had two periods of service as Acting Chief Justice, the second of the two periods being the last four and a half months of her judicial career.

The qualities to which I have already referred equipped her Honour admirably for judicial work. In addition to those qualities, she brought to her judicial tasks an acute legal brain and a great fund of legal knowledge.

As important as any of these qualities which I have mentioned are her composure and decisiveness. An outstanding aspect of her judicial work has been her capacity to clarify complex issues in her own mind, to reach prompt and correct decisions, and to express the reasons for those decisions clearly, incisively and without delay. These qualities, together with her tireless industry, have enabled her to sustain an astonishing output of judicial work and to find time still for an extraordinary range of other activities. If I were asked, however, to identify the outstanding characteristic of her Honour's judicial career, I think I would identify a quality which I may describe as a practical humanity, a deep and abiding sympathy with the weaknesses of those who come before the Court, and with the hardships and vicissitudes of the lives of many of them, sympathy qualified nevertheless by realistic understanding of the requirements of justice.

Justice Mitchell has led and leads a rich and varied life outside the ambit of her judicial work. I refrain from referring to those aspects of her life, partly for the reason that they are for the most part unaffected by the termination of her judicial career, and partly for a more practical reason. I asked my Associate to do some research in preparation for this occasion and the list of her Honour's achievements and activities over her long career which he produced proved so formidable that it became necessary for me to abandon any thought of referring to them in the course of these remarks. This is, after all, her Honour's occasion and not mine and these remarks are already quite long enough as it is. It is sufficient for me to say that if her Honour had been neither lawyer nor judge, the extent of her contributions to the life of the community in other respects would have been in themselves sufficient to constitute a full, rewarding and praiseworthy career.

One such activity is sufficiently connected with her Honour's judicial work, however, to require reference; and that is her Chairmanship of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee. Her prodigious and perspicacious labours on that committee were largely responsible for reports of great value which are likely to have an increased influence on the administration of the criminal law in this State and elsewhere.

Justice Mitchell's retirement will be a great loss to this Court, not only by reason of the quantity and quality of her judicial output, but also by reason of the influence which her wisdom and humanity have had upon the character of the Court as a whole. Her daily presence among us will be sadly missed by all her colleagues.

I may be permitted a personal observation. I was articled to Justice Mitchell. Her tutorship and example did much to shape my own career. In particular, I learned from her example that a client is entitled from his lawyer to prompt attention to his affairs, just as a litigant before the courts is entitled to have—and he always has had from her Honour—a prompt resolution of the dispute which brings him to court. She never forgot her articled clerks and her friendship, kindness and support have been of much assistance to me at many stages of my own professional and judicial career.

For much of my term as Chief Justice, Justice Mitchell has been Senior Puisne Judge. Her practical advice and her unfailing encouragement, support and loyalty have made my tasks far easier than they would otherwise have been. I am very conscious of my personal debt to her Honour and I take this opportunity of publicly acknowledging it.

The esteem in which her Honour is held by all connected with the law and by so many people in so many walks of life is emphasized by this large and distinguished gathering. In that connection, I should mention in passing that Mr. Justice Brennan of the High Court of Australia expected to be present today, but was prevented from being here by an unforeseen contingency.

It is really quite difficult to bring oneself to the realisation that her Honour has reached the statutory age of retirement for judges. Her freshness of outlook, her flexibility in the presence of new attitudes and ideas, and her zest and enthusiasm for activities new and old combine to intensify that difficulty.

Her retirement, of course, is merely a retirement from the Supreme Court. Her manifold other activities continue, not least of which is her important work as Chairman of the National Human Rights Commission. It is therefore not appropriate really to wish her a happy retirement. It is perhaps more appropriate to express the wish that she will enjoy her freedom from judicial responsibilities and commitments, and the opportunity that that freedom will give her to devote her energies to the other important activities which will fill her life upon her departure from the bench.

We wish you, Justice Mitchell, happiness and fulfilment in your future life and activities.

THE HONOURABLE THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: May it please the Court, When a judge presents his or her commission to this Court after appointment by the Government, it is the Attorney-General who has the task of speaking first and welcoming the Judge to the court. When a judge retires, it is the Chief Justice that has the honour of speaking first and, of course, I have to take second place, so I hope that what I have to say will not be seen to be repetitious but merely a reflection of the depth of community gratitude which there is towards your Honour for your long and distinguished career, and indeed a common view held of your significant contribution to the administration of justice and the community of South Australia.

The inevitability of this occasion does nothing to remove the tinge of regret with which it must be coloured. Your Honour has sat on this Court now for almost two decades and it will seem strange to all involved in the administration of justice when, in a day or two, you are gone from it.

When your Honour presented your commission to this Court, I was a law student and still some months away from entering articles, but I recall vividly, as I am sure many others do, particularly in my circle at that time, the widespread enthusiasm, warmth and satisfaction with which

your appointment was greeted in 1965. That sentiment has continued undiminished in the years since.

Your Honour, as the Chief Justice has already mentioned, was the first woman to take silk in Australia and the first to be appointed a Supreme Court Judge. When you presented your commission to this Court on 27th September, 1975, the Attorney-General, Mr. Don Dunstan, referred somewhat defensively to the uniqueness of the occasion in these terms: 'I hope, as you do, that the fact that you are a woman will in our time give no cause for comment on an occasion such as this. The idea that positions in our society, and in public life, should be exclusively, or predominantly, the province of males is an absurd one, but because it dies hard your assumption of the high office of Supreme Court Judge is significant indeed, not only in this State, but in the whole Commonwealth'. In a sense, the Attorney-General's hope was unfulfilled because your elevation to the bench has been the subject of comment over the last eighteen years—not just because you are one of the few women to have been appointed to a judicial office, but particularly because of the range of talents which you have brought to the bench and the South Australian community.

Because of that pre-eminence in the profession and as a Judge, you have been a source of constant inspiration to younger practitioners and particularly the increasing number of women who have entered the legal profession in recent times. By example you have helped reduce the prejudice which constituted a barrier to equal opportunity and achievement for many South Australians.

Many here today and many others besides have experienced the pleasure of appearing before your Honour. Many can testify to the fact that the conduct of your judicial duties has at all times reflected an awareness and guided others to recognise that whatever the cause of action it is human beings who are involved.

Never shirking the requirements of the law and your duty to do justice according to it you have demonstrated that justice can include mercy, not least in the manner of its delivery.

In your eighteen years on this bench, your contribution to the work of the Court has ranged over the full width of its jurisdiction. Your judgments are widely renowned for their clarity, particularly in the exposition the Chief Justice has also mentioned of difficult and complex decisions and of the wisdom and common sense and learning which underlies them. Your summings up in criminal trials especially are known as models of clear guidance to juries. At a time when the community demands greater accountability from all who serve it your capacity for sustained and productive work was an example to all levels of the judiciary.

Your Honour's talents and energies have not been confined to the immediate work of the court. You were appointed a Royal Commissioner in 1978 to one of the most controversial incidents in the State's history when the Government dismissed the Police Commissioner. You were able to apply your talents to the formidable task of a comprehensive review of criminal law and penal methods and the force of intellect and



clear-sighted view of society with which you met that challenge are on display in the reports of the committee which you headed.

Nor have you feared to be involved as appropriate in public discussion and even controversy. The fruits of your work on criminal and penal methods were brought before a wider audience in your 1975 Boyer lectures broadcast by the A.B.C. under the title *The Web of Criminal Law*.

Your retirement, I might add, will also at least save me the further embarrassment which successive Attorneys have felt when appearing in this Court about the lack of legislative action on the Mitchell Committee Reports.

I mentioned in May that your Honour is entitled to some disappointment at the sparseness of the legislative harvest from the ideas you sowed. As I said then your reports concern all discussions of the criminal law, no matter where they occur in the State, in the public forums or in Parliament or the Government, and I hope that the creation of a Parliamentary committee on law reform will be an effective mechanism for ensuring that such matters are brought more prominently and directly before the Parliament. The Government is committed to continuing consideration and where accepted implementation of the recommendations.

Your Honour also served the State, chairing the State Heritage Committee for three years until 1981, the Parole Board for some years. You relinquished those local duties to take up national duty chairing the Commonwealth Human Rights Commission. It is pleasing to all of us as we farewell you from this Court that you will continue that important work.

On the national level I understand that you have recently been appointed to a further term on the Council of the Order of Australia. You will also continue as deputy to the chairman of the Winston Churchill Memorial Trust, which provides opportunities for people to gain experience and knowledge by overseas study in a wide spectrum of activities that enrich the life of our society.

Locally we welcome the fact that although gone from this Court you will continue as Deputy Chancellor of the University of Adelaide. There you will continue your working association with the Chancellor, the Honourable Dr. John Bray, who we are all glad to see here today. I mention in passing he disclosed when he felt forced to retire as Chief Justice that you had earlier persuaded him to delay that event. The law prevents him from reciprocating that worthy event on this occasion.

I have still not exhausted the ways in which your Honour has played and will continue to play a valued public role. We are pleased you will continue as a member of the board of the Adelaide Festival of Arts and you will remain on several other boards and committees and continue your significant contribution to the South Australian, Australian and indeed world communities.

Your Honour, for myself I valued our recent official association during your term as Acting Chief Justice. I am also particularly asked to convey the good wishes and respects of the Premier. More broadly it is appropriate I should speak not only on behalf of the bar but also for

the Government and for the people of South Australia in expressing our gratitude for the distinguished service you have given and will in many areas continue to give. I wish to add to that an expression of our admiration and if I may our affection and the hope that your retirement from this Court will be long, happy and fulfilling.

MR. D. F. WICKS: May it please the Court, the Law Society extends to your Honour Justice Mitchell its best wishes on your retirement from the bench of this court. Your Honour's career in the law spans almost forty-nine years and has been a most distinguished one, one which has brought credit to yourself, to this Court, and to the South Australian profession which you have so amply served.

The Honourable the Attorney-General has already dealt at length with many of your Honour's achievements but I think it falls to me to refer in particular to your Honour's service to the profession. Your Honour served on the Law Society Council from 1952 until your elevation to the bench in 1965. Over that period you were also a member of the various committees of the Society, and I instance particularly the committees dealing with legal ethics, legislation and legal assistance. Your Honour also served on the Executive Committee and at the time of your appointment to this court you held the office of Senior Vice President of the Society. Your Honour also served at a national level on the Executive of the Law Council of Australia and again at the time of your appointment held office as Vice President of that body also.

On this formal occasion, on behalf of the profession I pay tribute to the service rendered by your Honour to the profession through the Law Society and the Law Council.

Since your Honour's appointment you have continued to display an active interest in the profession and particularly in relation to the various continuing legal education seminars which are organised from time to time. I place on record the gratitude of the Society for the contribution made by your Honour over the years to our programmes of continuing legal education.

I also refer to your Honour's service to the Faculty and Department of Law of the University of Adelaide. For a number of years your Honour lectured in family law. Your Honour's lectures in that subject, which was one of great importance to the practising profession, were given a proper place in the curriculum and for the first time ceased to form part of a composite subject of partnership, companies, bankruptcy and divorce which could only be described as an odd collection of bedfellows although someone with a peculiar sense of humour might discern a similarity between the winding up of a company and divorce.

Apart from the Faculty of Law your Honour has, over a considerable period, taken a most active interest in the affairs of the university. You currently hold the high office in the university of Senior Deputy Chancellor and have, for many years, given most valuable service to the Council of the University and numerous of its committees.

The Honourable the Attorney-General has already made mention of the work of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia, of which your Honour is the Chairman. The terms of reference of that committee were very far-reaching indeed and to implement them involved some six years of work, and the preparation of five very substantial reports and many hundreds of recommendations. As Chairman of that Committee the major responsibilities for that daunting task which it was asked to undertake fell upon your Honour's shoulders.

Today marks the conclusion of a most distinguished career as a member of the bench of this Court—as the Attorney-General has said, a career extending over some eighteen years. As a judge your Honour has displayed undoubted skills and learning as a lawyer, a sense of humanity and compassion, tolerance to those who appear before you, and most importantly the ability to exercise common sense and sound judgment, attributes which, in my submission, distinguish an outstanding judge.

Over the last eighteen years your Honour has made a very significant contribution to the high standing and reputation of this honourable Court and I believe that the State Reports offer a testimonial to that fact. On behalf of the profession, I extend to your Honour, Justice Mitchell, our warmest wishes on your retirement from the bench of this Court. I realise that it is not retirement in the full sense, but that your Honour will continue to devote substantial time and effort to the work of the Australian Human Rights Commission of which you are currently Chairman. The work of that Commission is at a critical and formative stage in its development, and on behalf of the profession I wish you well in what will undoubtedly prove to be a most challenging and rewarding task.

**THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE MITCHELL:** Chief Justice, Mr. Attorney, Mr. Wicks: It is rarely that I can say with honesty that I am overwhelmed, but I think that is an appropriate term to use now. I must say that I have felt some of the time in the last half hour that I was hearing a description of someone else, but I am very grateful to all of you for your kindness. Of course, this is not an occasion when the obverse of the coin is produced. No one has talked about an obsession with punctuality. No one has mentioned an untimely habit of asking whether anybody learns to spell these days, and I am grateful for those omissions.

This is, of course, a great day for me. I have had a very interesting eighteen years on the bench, years that I did not look forward to when I accepted the appointment.

I have had the great good fortune to have three outstanding Chief Justices. I was fortunate enough to come in while Sir Mellis Napier was still Chief Justice and it is a pity that many of you will not have known the real kindness of that Chief Justice. He was faced with the inexorable oddity of a woman placed on the bench when he was about eighty-three. I think he was shocked. He gave me the appearance of being shocked, although he and I had always got on very well together. But he recovered from his shock within twenty-four hours and from then on, I had nothing but kindness and consideration from him. That era ended on 28th

February, 1967 when Dr. Bray came on to the bench as Chief Justice. I had regarded him as being a friend since the earlier part of my student days, and that was a great success. He, as you know, was followed by the present Chief Justice, who has admitted to having been my articled clerk, on 27th October, 1977. Comparatively recently one of the Law Lords of the English bench said to me that a Bray is thrown up only once in a generation. I agreed, but I think in South Australia we have had a succession of appropriate Chief Justices thrown up as the occasion has arisen. I have learned a great deal from each of the three of them—not as much as they could teach. I think South Australia has been and continues to be tremendously well served by its Chief Justices.

At this time, may I mention some of the people who are present. I am delighted to see some of the former members of the Court who were here for part of the time while I was here. Sir Roderic Chamberlain showed me nothing but kindness and consideration and taught me quite a lot, particularly in my early days on the bench, and I very much enjoyed the occasions when I sat with him. Mr. Hogarth and Mr. Williams were friends from university days and I had a long time with the former and regrettably a short time with the latter on this bench, but appreciated every minute of it.

I am very appreciative of the fact that so many of the Judges of the various Courts are present today and may I reflect something of what the Chief Justice has said in saying that I am very proud to see a member—in fact, the senior member—of the Family Court here in Justice Murray; and a member of the Local and District Criminal Court here in Judge Stevens. We do have, as most of you know, one or two other women on the bench, different benches, who were not able to be present today, and that makes me feel that perhaps I have achieved what I said when I was appointed to the bench that I hoped I would achieve: That was to live long enough to see the fact that a woman's appointment to the bench was not regarded as anything abnormal.

Unfortunately, two of my brethren of this Court are not able to be present today—Mr. Justice Zelling and Mr. Justice Mohr, both of whom are away, but I very much appreciate the fact, that the other members of the bench have come along to support me. I wondered whether we might have had some falling off from the ends, but I see that Mr. Justice Millhouse and Mr. Justice Johnston are still with us, so that has not happened.

I am also delighted that four members of the Federal Court have found their way here. I had hoped for Mr. Justice Fisher, but it is certainly a bonus to have Mr. Justice Smithers, Mr. Justice St. John and Mr. Justice Davies. Without being selective, I must say that Mr. Justice Smithers and I have had associations in law conferences and in other ways—before I was on the bench when he was on the bench—over many years, and I am particularly delighted that he was able to be here today.

I thank the Local and District Criminal Court and the Industrial Court Judges and the Magistrates for coming in such considerable numbers, and I have mentioned in part the members of the Family Court.

The Chief Justice mentioned the other members of my firm, one other member of my firm at present on our bench, Mr. Justice Walters. I think I might even make a slight boast and say we have, in addition, two members of the Family Court—Mr. Justice Haese, who is here, and Justice Davey, who unfortunately is away; and we have one of the woman magistrates in Mrs. J. Sanders also from my firm. And not only was the Chief Justice articulated there, but Mr. Justice McGovern, who is here today, and who is a member of the Family Court, was also articulated there, so that this is the one occasion when I feel I can make a little boast.

And I would like to say on this occasion that I, like Mr. Justice King, give a great deal of credit to the late Mr. Joe Nelligan, who was indeed a very fine barrister and from whom I learned a great deal.

May I thank the staff of the Supreme Court who have always been particularly considerate and helpful to me.

I have had in the time I have been here, thirteen Associates, seven women and six men. As one of the men came back for a second term, I think I can say that there was no sex discrimination.

For the last thirteen years, the Judges of the Supreme Court have been enabled to have a secretary devoted to that particular Judge. I have been fortunate enough to have only one secretary, Miss Peggy Harvey, without whom I certainly could not have got through the amount of work that I have and who has been very largely responsible for getting my judgments out in good time—if they have been got out in good time. She decided that she did not want to break in another Judge and she would retire early. I would have doubted whether that was a compliment but for the fact that she has consented to be my part-time secretary on the Human Rights Commission, so I have decided that it is a compliment.

I have had only two tipstaves in eighteen years. The first one was Mr. Harry Palmer who retired from this work in December 1966. If my arithmetic is correct, he is now in his eighty-second year. He is, I think—yes, I have picked him out—he is here today and he is in what may be described as rude health.

Mr. Reg Soan has been with me for nearly seventeen years. This is a very sad day for me and I flatter myself in thinking that it is a sad day for him. Our association has been close. Having a personal tipstaff is, I think, a very important factor for a judge. In consequence of my good fortune in having such an excellent tipstaff I am leaving to Mr. Justice Johnston, I suppose because he is my successor, an extremely well annotated set of law reports, a well-bound set of judgments of this Court, and various other adjuncts to judicial work in fine order.

Of course I cannot refer to the other members of the staff who have given me such enormous assistance but I would like just briefly to say that like every Judge I am very dependent upon the Masters and now upon the Registrar. From all of them I have received nothing but help over the whole of my eighteen years.

You, Mr. Attorney, and you, Mr. Wicks, referred to a number of the other outside matters that I have been able to undertake since I have

been on the bench. In fact the first such job which I took was to be a member of the Karmel Committee of Inquiry into Education. I did not know anything much about education when Mrs. Joyce Steele, who is present today, was then Minister of Education, asked me to be part of the committee. I was, with some trepidation. I flatter myself I did learn quite a bit about it and I am grateful that she who was the first woman minister in South Australia is also able to be present today.

When I walked on to the bench on 24th September, 1965 I felt some unease as I think every new Judge does and I was astounded when I looked into the body of the court to see about half a dozen Sisters of Mercy from St. Aloysius College, my old school. They were very obvious in those days, they wore their full uniform. They have discarded it, we have not. We can be picked out but they cannot. I am delighted to say that I can see five of them here present today. You cannot pick them out but I can. One of them, Sister Carmel, has just celebrated her golden jubilee in the order and a couple of them were at school with me and I think it is a very gracious action on their part to come today.

I could go on indefinitely, ladies and gentlemen. I would like to conclude first by thanking everyone who has done me the honour of coming here today, and secondly, and particularly, by thanking the members of the bar and the solicitors. The bench is dependent for its assistance almost entirely on those who belong to the bar and the solicitors who prepare the work for the bar. I have had nothing but a tremendous amount of assistance from both sections of the profession. We rely enormously upon you for the presentation of cases honestly and fairly. I have no criticism whatsoever to make and I have only gratitude to those members who have appeared before me. I shall miss you in this capacity. I hope I will have an opportunity of seeing you in another capacity. Thank you all very much.