IN THE DISTRICT COURT

OF NEW SOUTH WALES

**SWEARING IN OF HIS HONOUR JUDGE GRANT BRADY SC AS A JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF NEW SOUTH WALES**

Mr Dominic Toomey SC on behalf of the New South Wales Bar
Ms Jade Tyrrell, Law Society of New South Wales, on behalf of solicitors

---

 (Commission read)

 (Oaths of office taken)

PRICE CJ: Judge Brady, it gives me great pleasure to welcome you to this Court. You bring to this Court a wealth of experience in the Common Law. Your skill as an advocate is well known. On behalf of all the judges of the Court, I very warmly congratulate you, and wish you all the very best in your judicial career.

BRADY DCJ: Thank you, Chief Judge.

PRICE CJ: Mr Toomey.

TOOMEY: May it please the Court, as is customary on such occasions I acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet, and pay my respects to their elders past and present. It is my privilege to appear on behalf of the New South Wales Bar to welcome your Honour’s appointment, and it is a pleasure to welcome in Court today your wife Lorna, and son. We acknowledge the presence of your parents Les and Lorraine; your brother sister‑in‑law; and nieces. Along with family, we are joined by friends and colleagues, including friends from your Honour’s university days. Welcome to you all.

 Your Honour grew up in Tamworth in the 1970s, where it has been said that culturally, for a teenage boy, displaying sporting prowess may have seemed more important than performing academically. You and your brother were both keenly interested and competitive in sport from an early age, with your Honour being the better at cricket, and your brother at rugby league - although your Honour might dispute that. In year 11, you took a foray into baseball, when your mother was concerned that you may have been to small for rugby league. Perhaps ironically, it was baseball that proved to be the more dangerous, when you were hit in the head by the ball, resulting in a fractured skull.

 Despite your head injury, you performed well in the HSC, to go on to study law at ANU, following the lead of your brother, who had moved to Canberra a year ahead, also to study law. You had attended the Farrer Memorial Agricultural High School in Tamworth, and in your graduating year, your Honour was one of only three students who opted to study something other than agricultural economics at university. Your agricultural schooling is not entirely lost, however, as it is said that you remain handy with a pair of secateurs and you know a lot about planting sorghum, knowledge that will no doubt prove indispensable on the bench.

 A love of sport continued after school. At university, you went on to excel in Australian Rules and later AusTag, which you played for the Australian Masters team in New Zealand. Your Honour, it is quite deliberate that I lead with your sporting interests and achievements. I am told that, professionally, you prefer not to speak about yourself publicly, or to be the centre of attention, but that that humility evaporates quickly when asked about your sporting background. You have been known to remark, modestly, “There was never a sport I was unable to play.” And yet, perhaps showing humility on the home front, your Honour’s wife Lorna had known you for around a decade before discovering that you had played touch rugby for Australia, and only because she had been in the process of binning some green coloured sports kit when you very gently explained that you would prefer not to get rid of your Australian jersey, as a memento.

 You were admitted as a solicitor in 1990, practicing in general litigation in Canberra, before becoming a partner at Papas Jay Attorneys in 1995. During that time, your Honour worked on a number of very high profile criminal trials, developing an interest in advocacy. After taking a year off to travel around South America, you made your way to Sydney to pursue a career at the bar. It was during the New South Wales Bar course that you met your wife. Lorna was an English barrister, here on a Pegasus scholarship to observe the Australian legal system, and had been invited to observe the course. She was impressed by your charisma, intellect, sense of humour, and of course dashing good looks - qualities which may have earned you the nickname of Mr Darcy among some of the press, although you might be competing for that moniker with Lancaster SC.

 Your Honour was called to the Bar in the year 2000, and developed a busy practice, appearing across jurisdictions, from Local Court committals and pleas to District Court trials and sentences, and appearances in various tribunals, Coronial Inquests, and in ICAC. You went on to develop a special expertise in murder, fraud and drug matters, appearing - necessarily, in the case of murder - in trials in the New South Wales Supreme Court, and in superior courts in the ACT, Queensland, Western Australia, with appellate appearances in the New South Wales CCA, the Federal Court, and in the High Court.

 Your Honour’s deep experience in criminal law makes you an ideal appointment to this, the busiest criminal trial court in Australia. As a trial advocate, your Honour’s skills were first class. Your Honour is also regarded as a skilled appellate advocate, having appeared in the CCA regularly. As a trial advocate, your Honour has a reputation as an exceptional cross‑examiner. Impressive has been your ability to learn technical knowledge for the cross‑examination of expert witnesses across a vast array of specialities. In one trial alone, you cross‑examined experts in engineering, botany, palynology - concerned with spores, as I understand it - and pharmacology, garnering sufficient knowledge in all of those fields to enable you to deploy it in the cross‑examination of those witnesses, to your client’s distinct advantage.

 When in Court, your Honour had a characteristic focus that ensured there was never a missed question or a lost word. It is said that you appeared to be immersed in a relationship with the witness, with an ability to concentrate on that, to the exclusion of everything else. On one occasion, you were so intensely focused that you did not notice the cup of water you were holding was spilling onto your instructing solicitor, as you gesticulated in the throes of earnest cross‑examination. The solicitor took it well; perhaps better than the witness.

 Gesticulation and body language is characteristic of your Honour’s dramatic, and at times theatrical, courtroom style, particularly in your legendary closing addresses. I am told that even in chambers, while rehearsing your closing addresses, your facial expressions were so communicative that it was almost unnecessary to utter the submission. This may prove problematical if your Honour aspires to a judicial poker face.

 Your Honour was a valued member of Forbes Chambers, joining in 2010, when you were already one of the country’s leading criminal trial counsel. A very senior member of that floor recalls that fellow members of Forbes thought it was a great honour that you decided to join the floor. You continued to be one of the most sought‑after and effective counsel in all manner of criminal cases, and you took silk in 2015 - unquestionably, if I may say so, the most talented cohort of silks in many years.

 In chambers you were neat - very neat. This led one colleague to describe you as a “serial minimalist”. There is a thought that your wife Lorna may be to thank for what little bits of flair were allowed to intrude into your chamber’s décor; otherwise, your Honour, left to your natural tendencies, would be positively spartan, in attitude and surroundings. This is attributed, partly, to a chronic phobia of paper, being one of the first criminal barristers to move to a completely paperless model. You were known for super‑efficient electronic briefs, and for being able to seamlessly run a months long double murder trial from a single iPad. Barristers who know this are wondering whether they might need to be tendering documents by Dropbox link in your courtroom, lest they should irritate you with paper.

 An exception to the paperless model was, however, the enormous roll of butcher’s paper you had stuck to your chamber’s wall. You would use this to map out a case, develop theories, and prepare visual models for cross‑examinations and closing addresses. A junior recalls that watching your Honour use the butcher’s paper to distil a complex brief into a beautifully succinct case theory was almost like watching an artist at work.

 Juniors were expected to participate in butcher’s paper sessions in chambers, where you would roll out the long piece of paper, pick up a texta, and ask, “So what are we going to say to the jury?” You were always open to feedback, and sharing a good joke, which made you pleasant to work with. In addition, juniors learned the art of planning the day’s cross‑examination over poached eggs and sourdough at 7am, accompanied by an extra‑hot piccolo. In leading juniors, you were hard working and patient, generous and inclusive, teaching meticulous preparation, and involving juniors in forensic decision‑making. You provided career‑shaping opportunities, having, on more than one occasion, a first‑year barrister appear with you in very complex and serious matters.

 Over the years, you have, in the finest traditions of the Bar, generously made your advice available to all fellow members of chambers, and the wider profession, answering calls from solicitors and barristers asking curly criminal law questions, sometimes at the most inconvenient time in a barrister’s life: 9.30am. One junior recalls: before his first jury trial, you called him into your chambers and ran through all the preparation, opening, closing and cross‑examination. Another recalls an occasion when she was nervously preparing to step into a courtroom advocacy role, and you assured her that nerves were good, because it shows you care. Perhaps the greatest testament is from the same junior, who says she may have learned more from your Honour’s tutelage than during the whole of her time at law school.

 Beyond the courtroom and chambers, it is well known that your Honour has been a major contributor to the legal profession through your work in advocacy training: teaching hundreds of barristers here in New South Wales, in other states and territories, and overseas; running courses with the Australian Institute of Advocacy, the ABA, and our own Bar Readers Course. In this aspect of your vocational life, you have taken after your parents, who are both teachers. As well as inheriting a love of teaching, I am told you have your father’s characteristic persistence, and your mother’s attention to detail.

 Your Honour’s style of advocacy coaching was practical, introducing new advocates to the notion of first writing down the answers they wish to elicit in evidence, and only then formulating the questions designed to elicit those answers. You have taught other best practices in advocacy, such as primacy - that is, the best point first - and simple, single propositions. You have been able to find the most salient point in someone’s performance and provide meaningful, constructive feedback.

 The full list of your coaching and teaching contributions and achievements, and credits, is far too extensive to cover in detail in the time we have. Some of the highlights have been training teachers in advocacy in Australia, England, Singapore, Hong Kong, and South Africa, with the honour of representing Australian advocacy coaching internationally by invitation. By invitation, you have taught the UK Bar at an advanced trial advocacy course at Keeble College, Oxford, widely regarded as the starting point for large‑scale residential advocacy teaching in the Common Law world.

 Your commitment to advocacy coaching is such that you have been teaching right up until your commencement as a judge. The announcement of your judicial appointment was made during the week of a recent advanced trial advocacy intensive in Sydney, to the delight of the cohort. Just last weekend, you were training barristers to teach advocacy at the New South Wales Bar Association’s Advocacy Instructor training.

 As you transition to judicial life, it might be difficult to resist advocacy coaching from the bench. New advocates, and perhaps some old, will be seeking to get their advocacy skills up to standard before appearing in your Honour’s Court. They will need to be well‑prepared, and across the evidence. As an advocate, your Honour adhered strongly to presenting an argument that represented a balanced assessment of the evidence. Any argument presented to you which incorrectly recounts, or overstates, the evidence will not, we expect, meet with your Honour’s approval. As well as having a passion for the law, it is thought that your Honour will bring to the bench your signature no‑nonsense, hard working, sensible, and no time wasted approach, encouraging civility and courtesy between parties, and presiding in fair proceedings with compassion and understanding.
 Counsel would do well to prepare clear and succinct submissions. As an advocate, your Honour had an aversion to legalese, often remarking that it is unnecessary in the 21st century, and has the effect of distancing yourself from the witness, the jury, and the public. In preparation for trial, when settling written submissions, you would ask juniors, “Now, how can we say that in ten words or less?” Your ability to condense complex issues into simple, easy to digest morsels will be an asset in giving jury directions. On juries, may I interpolate that the late Robert Toner DCJ used to refer to the jury as “the twelve puzzled citizens”. I wonder whether, in your Honour’s court they might rather be known as The Brady Bunch.

 As an advocate, you had a practice of immersing yourself in a case and getting across every detail by reading every word on every page, with an exceptional recall for the details. This is, of course, another skill which will serve you well in judicial life. Your Honour, it is thought that you will be an excellent judge, with your appointment warmly welcomed. To quote a senior member of the profession: “There can’t be many better qualified to take up a position as a judge in Australia’s busiest trial court.”

 There is one other aspect to your Honour that new colleagues may come to learn about you, being your dedication to family. With immense pride, it is said that you light up when speaking of your wife, Lorna, and son Hugo. At the bar, even during the busiest of trials, you would find time to call Lorna in the lunch break. I am told that Hugo, who is now eight, is a very promising and talented tennis player, and you have been learning to play tennis, and might even wish to coach. I am surprised to learn that your Honour could not already play it.

 Colleagues and staff may come to know your sense of humour through your references to British television, enjoying the stylings of Rowan Atkinson in Blackadder, and often quoting from Rumpole of the Bailey, to the blank stares of juniors or instructing solicitors who have no idea of the origin of the quote, or even knowledge of the TV show itself. Are we really getting that old? It seems fitting, then, to end with a quote attributed to Rumpole himself: “Even judges are human. Not many people know that.” Your Honour, the barriers of New South Wales wish you well in your new role, as judge, and human. May it please the Court.

PRICE CJ: Thank you, Mr Toomey. Ms Tyrrell on behalf of the Law Society of New South Wales.

TYRRELL: May it please the Court. I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which the Court stands, the Gadigal of the Eora nation, and pay my respects to their elders past and present. I extend my respects, and welcome all Aboriginal and Torres Straight Islander people here today. Your Honour, it is a privilege to come before this Court on behalf of the solicitors of New South Wales to congratulate you on your appointment.

 Your Honour, this has been a momentous week of beginnings. Lorna started a new job on Monday; Hugo, a new school; and now you commence your term as a judge of the New South Wales District Court. Not that taking on this role has overawed your Honour in any way, but when asked by our researchers how it felt to take on this appointment, your Honour replied, “It is just another job.” Your old humility aside, it is a role that is an accumulation of more than thirty years of legal practice across an array of jurisdictions almost too numerous to count.

 Since your admission as a solicitor in 1990, your Honour has appeared in murder, fraud and drug trials in the New South Wales and ACT Supreme Courts; various trials and sentences in New South Wales District Court, Queensland, Western Australia, the Land and Environment Court, the Independent Commission Against Corruption, Coronial Inquests, and numerous other tribunals. An incredible career, for someone who only studied law because you gained the required University entry marks; inspiring for any young lawyer here. Nevertheless, your academic success was not surprising, given your Honour is a lifelong, voracious, reader, and the son of two teachers.

 Your Honour’s career has been one spent thriving in the deep end. Your Honour had been a solicitor for only six months in the ACT, when the partner who did all the criminal and family law matters retired, meaning you effectively took over his practice. In your Honour’s words, “It was sink or swim,” and, just as you have mastered many sports in your day, as we have already heard - including representing Australia in touch football - you dived right in, and swiftly conquered this challenge. This is no shock to anyone who knows you best. Your wife Lorna says, “It is sickening, really,” just how easily you take to any sport you try your hand at.

 From those early days in criminal law, your Honour has risen to become one of the most respected advocates in the country. Your colleagues in the profession put that down to three things. That number is important, because, your Honour, we were told that one of the magic tricks of your advocacy is the rule of three: to always have three points to sum up an argument. So crucial is this rule that it is often a source of irritation for your Honour if a matter has four or five points that one cannot cut or condense - or, sadly, if there are only two points to be made. With that in mind, some of your Honour’s colleagues felt it especially important to follow the rule of three when summarising your professional strengths.

 The first point is that your Honour is incredibly thorough. Known for going over and above, beyond the usual reading of a brief. Your attention to detail, and your ability to recall the exact location of a minor point, is, in the words of one junior, “remarkable.” Second, your commitment to making your advocacy accessible and digestible, for your Honour has a fierce allergy to legalese, as we have heard already. It was said to us that far from showcasing your impressive vocabulary, your Honour emphasises speaking frankly and directly to the Court, ensuring your client’s case has been truly understood.

 And third, your Honour is highly regarded for the confidence you bring to your work. Every part of your case is planned to the letter; the answer to every question in cross‑examination considered ahead of time. Every argument has a counter‑argument. Those who have worked alongside you in trials say that although those days are long, they always feel reassured by such extensive preparation. Your Honour is renowned for your advocacy, which you have taught throughout Australia, and all over the world, as we have heard, including in England, South Africa, Hong Kong, Singapore and India. For you, it is at the very heart of why you practice law.

 Your Honour has an enduring belief in fairness, and the way strong advocacy can make a difference in someone’s life. Through your extensive work in criminal law, your Honour has, in your own words, “Seen people at their worst, all the time, whether they are innocent or guilty.” If innocent, your Honour observed, they(as said) are witnessing someone caught in unimaginable torment, accused of an offence they did not commit. If the person is guilty of the offence, your Honour considers the circumstances that have lead that person to such a place of despair.

 Advocacy is a skill that comes naturally to your Honour. You say you have always been interested in the act of persuasion. Your wife Lorna says you are very confident, “in the nicest possible way.” Being a good advocate, in your Honour’s mind, is critical to the sound running of criminal matters. Everyone, as you say, benefits from robust and strong advocacy, including the judge, jury, and the accused.

 One story we were told encapsulates your Honour’s approach: in one criminal trial, a more inexperienced Crown prosecutor kept asking a leading question of a witness. It was not a point in the case upon which anything of significance were going to turn, but frustrations were growing, as the case was unable to move forward. Your Honour leaned over to the Crown, and calmly suggested, “Why don’t you ask it like this?” The question was then asked in the correct manner, and both the prosecutor and the judge were relieved for your Honour’s assistance. One colleague remembered this event as a perfect example, not only of your decency, but also of your dedication to strong and skilled advocacy, to never be a gatekeeper, but to always share and pass on knowledge.

 Your Honour, as we have already heard, was still running advocacy workshops until just a few days ago. No doubt, some of your former students will feel the nerves when it comes to appearing before you on the bench. But they need not worry, for those who know your Honour best say there is no doubt that you will be a tremendous judge: a deeply compassionate judge, committed to making the often stressful components of a trial run as easily as they possibly can.

 Those who have worked alongside your Honour also wanted us to make note of your generosity: how you will never let a solicitor or a junior pay for coffee or lunch. They also observed how part of your meticulous trial preparation includes a down-pat morning regime, for, if your Honour was appearing in the Downing Centre, you would always be found on the morning of Court, sitting either at Miss Carter café, known colloquially as “Taz’s”, or The Associate, from some ridiculously early hour, sitting in the same seat, ordering the same coffee - that extra‑hot piccolo - and breakfast. Rumour has it that your affection for CBD cafés only grew stronger when, while appearing in a country trial, you were offered a jug of milk with your green tea.

 That systems work as they should is a matter of great importance to your Honour. When asked for examples that have stood out among the most significant in your career, your Honour recalled the trial of two fishermen. They had been charged as part of a drug importation plot, where illicit substances were brought into Australia from South America via submarine. More than a dozen people had been charged over the syndicate. Your Honour was acting for two very decent men who had, in your words, been “caught up in the wrong thing”, and had done their best to stop it.

 Given the complexities of the case, the high‑profile background of some of the co‑accused, the number of charges, and the colourful descriptions of some of the alleged facts in the matter as being “akin to a Hollywood blockbuster”, your Honour held fears that this case could turn pear‑shaped. Yet, with thorough preparation and hard work, you were able to obtain Not Guilty verdicts for both men. Your Honour reflected on this case as one of those very satisfying moments when you saw the system working as it should.

 Many of the criminal matters in which your Honour has appeared, over the years, have attracted significant press attention, including a passing mention in Helen Garner’s esteemed true crime book, Jo Cinque’s Consolation. Yet courting headlines, or media, is not your Honour’s style. Your position when it comes to dealing with journalists is to let the words you speak in the courtroom do the talking for you.

 Your colleagues wanted it made known how much they will miss your appearance in criminal trials. They said all the hard work and effort which goes into a trial is worth it, just to have the privilege of watching you in one of your closing addresses.

 Your Honour, I have no doubt that while this may just be “just another job,” it is a role to which you will bring the diligence, consideration and responsibility that has been the hallmark of your remarkable career. On behalf of the solicitors of New South Wales, we congratulate your Honour, and we wish you all the best for this next chapter. As the Court pleases.

PRICE CJ: Thank you, Ms Tyrell. Judge Brady.

BRADY DCJ: Chief Judge; Supreme Court justices; District Court judges; members of the profession; family and friends. Chief Judge, thank you so much for your kind words and for your support over many years, and, well, for your patience. Mr Toomey, thank you for those words. What the junior did not tell you, of course, getting across those various experts so I could cross‑examine them, was that of course, I lost the case - which went to appeal, went back, someone else ran it, and won it. And thank you very much, Ms Tyrrell, for those words. It is, to be fair, not just another job.

 There are three things I want to say. Actually, there is more like 33 things. But it will be well‑structured; I will get to the point; it will be succinct. 33 years in the law is a bit too long to, obviously, thank everyone who has helped, supported, and shaped my career, and I will not pretend to thank everyone. Actually, it is a bit longer than 33 years, because I have a number of friends from university here; friends that I have been able to rely on and trust for some 40‑odd years. And I know what they are thinking right now: yes, you really are that old.

 My first job was at Barrads, in Canberra. I was working with Graeme Nettle, Rob Barnett, and Gary Stilling: three partners. I learned a huge amount in that first job. It was a general firm; I did everything from crime through family, civil, commercial - even acting on mortgages. It was a great way of getting experience across the law. That sort of generalist experience is fantastic for then moving on to specialist areas: it is amazing how much the general law knowledge has been of great assistance when specialising in crime, particularly in trials. It is phenomenal how often other areas of law come into play when one is running a criminal trial. I know that Graeme Nettle, my first boss, is listening in. I say my first boss - in fact, my only boss, in the law, until now.

 I was always grateful to Graeme. When he interviewed me some 33 years ago, in my youthful exuberance, 33 years ago, my CV - bearing in mind I had had, really, no experience in anything - I put in great detail one of my summer jobs, cross‑pollinating sorghum plants, and cross‑pollinating sunflower seeds. Of course, I went into excruciating detail in my CV, just, really, let us face it, to pad it out a bit. Graeme, to his great credit, when asking me questions about that, did so with earnestness, and not even the slightest bit of smile on his face, as he is asking me about my efforts in cross‑pollinating sorghum, when giving a legal interview. When I mentioned to him, recently, that I had been appointed to the District Court, his immediate reaction was, “You’ve come a long way from counting seeds, then.” That sort of memory is one of the reasons why he is one of the best lawyers I know - or maybe it was just a great thing to put in the CV, because it will always be remembered.

 I had the opportunity, then, of becoming partner at Pappas Jay Attorney, learning a lot, doing it with Geraldine Blanch, one of my friends. In fact, particularly, learning a lot of advocacy from Jack Pappas. I then moved to Sydney and went to the Bar course, which became the most important moment in my life, although I just did not realise it at that stage. In fact, it took eight or nine years to realise it thereafter. I then went to Garfield Barwick Chambers, where I had the guidance of Bryan Murray., Bruce Stratton, Clive Stern, and Grahame Ellis, who is here today as well.

 In 2002, there was a defining moment in my advocacy career. I was appearing in a trial, and I was appearing in trial in front of Judge Ann Ainslie‑Wallace, as she then was - and then stopped being, and has now become again. I was undertaking a cross‑examination, and on reflection, it was clear that it was overly ambitious. It was clear it could have gone wrong at any moment. Thankfully, though, more through good luck than good management, it did not. As a result of that, Ann asked me to come and teach with the Australian Advocacy Institute. That was, and still is, a defining moment in my advocacy life.

 With George Hampel, Felicity Hampel, and Ann Anslie‑Wallace, amongst others, helping, guiding and supporting me in coaching advocacy, I have now had the opportunity of coaching advocacy around Australia, and around the world, and doing so with like‑minded coaches of advocacy; doing so with those who also have a passion for ensuring advocacy at the highest standard. Because advocacy at the highest standard, in, particularly, criminal courts, leads to justice. In addition to Ann Anslie-Wallace and George Hampel and Felicity Hampel, Phil Greenwood SC then gave me the opportunity of coaching with the ABA, and with Ian Robertson SC continuing on with that, I have been coaching with the ABA now for some time, and again, doing so both here and around the world.

 Since that moment with Ann, I have spent thousands, literally thousands of hours, teaching, talking about, and learning about advocacy. It has been, apart from my family, my great passion. I just want to thank all those, as well, that I have, over the last 22 years in coaching advocacy, dragged into it. A number of judges, and coaches from the bar that have, really, given no choice to. People like Slade Howell, who I just told was coming along. Sharon Hall SC as well.

 Of course, my start in that trial in front of Ann Ainslie‑Wallace could not have happened without the support of, particularly, five people. When I came to Sydney, I knew no one, really, in the criminal law world. There were five people who gave me a start: Greg Grogin, now a magistrate, then a barrister; Phil Gibson; Phil Stewart, now a magistrate; Ross Hudson; and Pat Conaghan. None of them knew me. They all gave me an opportunity: I do not know why, but they gave me the chance - Greg Rogan by recommending me to people, and the other four by briefing me, and briefing me regularly. That gave me my start at the bar in New South Wales, and I will not ever forget them for giving me that opportunity.

 Since then, of course, my career has been supported and shaped by many, many people, and I can’t begin to thank the number of people that have done so. Obviously Forbes Chambers was fantastic. A group of people who are dedicated to justice, a group of people who are dedicated to good advocacy, and a group of people who are dedicated to the wellbeing of every member of the chambers. I will not, again, try and thank everyone within Forbes Chambers that has helped, but obviously Phil Boulten and Tim Game I want to thank for their support and encouragement. And I particularly want to thank Ryan Coliero for all that he did for me over the last 14 years.

 I’ve been very privileged to be briefed by solicitors pretty much all around Australia - obviously mainly in Sydney and Canberra - and what I can say, almost without exception, is the level of hard work and dedication solicitors doing criminal law have engaged in in defending accused around the country. Particular, and I don’t mean this in any exhaustive way: I want to thank Justin Wong and Streetons, Carol and Karen, and Hugo Law Group, and Michael and One Group, as well as of course Simon and McGirr’s. Again, don’t think that in any way shape or form covers everyone that I need to thank, and I hope that all the solicitors I have worked with over the years understand how much I appreciate their support.
 In addition, of course, to the solicitors that have been briefing me, I have appeared against countless DPP solicitors and Crown, and, again, almost without exception, I have found them to be hard‑working, diligent, collegiate, and exceptionally fair. Working in the criminal law is hard: it is exceptionally hard. It is, on the other hand, very fulfilling, and unbelievably important. Working in the criminal law can be made better by all of us understanding not only how important it is, but also understanding how taxing it can be on the individuals. How taxing it can be on witnesses, how taxing it can be on complainants, on the accused, on the police. And, importantly, how taxing it can be on lawyers. The more we are aware of that, the better it will be for all of us.

 I have also had the opportunity of working with numerous juniors: juniors with careers on the rise. Again, I hesitate to single out because of the number of exceptional juniors I have worked with, but latterly, particularly Rose Khalilizadeh and Adam Faro, both of whom briefed me as solicitors before them becoming juniors, both of whom are, without a doubt, destined for greater things. They are just two of many who have assisted: Jack Tyler‑Stott, for example; Dan McMahon; Varinda Parwar. Again, although I am naming some names, I cannot help but think all of the juniors that I have worked with, almost without exception, again: hard working, dedicated, and have supported me in the way that one would hope.

 I know I have said, within the criminal law, so much about people being hard‑working and dedicated. But that’s because it is true. People go into the law for all sorts of reasons - they get the marks. People stay in the law, generally, because they want to make a difference. Almost without exception, that is what I have found over the 33 years I have been doing this.

 I have also been very lucky to have appeared in front of a myriad of wonderful justices, judges and magistrates. I am thrilled to be joining so many judges that I know and respect, and so many who have supported me both at the bar and since joining. In fact, I have been astounded by the welcome I have received. I will not go through all the judges who have supported me from the various jurisdictions. That would take a long time, we would be here for some time, and although I do not think I would run the risk of holding the record for the longest speech, one does not want to run that risk. I have also been gratified by a number of retired judges who have reached out to congratulate me: thank you very much.

 On a completely personal basis, can I thank Acting Judge Blackmore and Lisa, for everything they have done for us. For Acting Judge Latham, and her support for us, particularly Lorna; and Acting Judge Levy, who I am not sure has managed to make it - sorry, Acting Judge Levy - who of course, did one of the most important things in my life: Acting Judge Levy is the reason that Lorna came to Australia in the first place. To my family, Thanks so much for everything you have done for me. It seems a little light on, bearing in mind all that you have done for me, for me to say it, but, well, thanks.

 My parents: both hard‑working, supporting us; but not only hard‑working to support us, both of them, but exceptionally generous with their time. In fact, even before the Family Court started coining the phrase, my parents were both very “child‑focused”. They gave their time, their energy, to do all that they could to ensure that we got the opportunities that they did not have, and to ensure that we understood that we could be anything that we wanted to be. I know online is Lorna’s family, John and Jane and Helen and Jess, and thank you very much for all the support you have given us. And Aunty Lily: what would we do without you.

 Lorna, without whom none of this would be possible. She told me not to say anything more about her; I always do what I am told. Having said that - so, when Lorna came out from England, she had to re‑qualify. Part of that re‑qualifying was going to the Bar course. At the Bar course, of course, you do your advocacy exercises, and you have an advocacy instructor. Lorna had the great pleasure of having Phil Greenwood, SC, as her advocacy instructor during the Bar course; and she will tell anyone, to this day, right in front of my face, that Phil Greenwood is the best advocacy instructor ever. That is even after I reviewed her videos every afternoon when she came back from the Bar course. I will say one more thing: I wouldn’t be here without you.

 Thank you very much, Chief Judge.

PRICE CJ: Thank you, judge. I invite you all to join us now for morning tea.