

Where Did You Get That Hat?

It has come to the attention of the Law Society that local practitioners appear to be ignorant of the following addendum to Law Society Professional Practice Rules which concerns dress code.

17. PERMITTED HEADWARE

- (1) A practitioner may wear a Panama Hat whilst in the course of his practice as a barrister and solicitor provided that the hat is fitted and equipped with an approved headband.
- (2) For the purposes of the preceding sub-rule an "approved headband" shall be:
 - (a) In the case of a Queen's Counsel, a pink headband, and;
 - (b) In the case of Junior Counsel, a blue headband and;
 - (c) In the case of a practitioner with more than five years experience or being the holder of an unrestricted practising certificate, a green headband and;
 - (d) In the case of a practitioner with less than five years experience but more than two years experience, a yellow headband, and;
 - (e) In the case of a practitioner with less than two years experience, a white headband.
- (3) An articled clerk shall be permitted to wear a boater with no headband.
- (4) A practitioner, not being the President of the Law Society, who is a member of the Executive of the Law Society shall be permitted to wear a purple headband.
- (5) The president of the Law Society, from time to time, shall be permitted to wear a purple headband with a white stripe.
- (6) A practitioner, not being a member of the Executive, may adorn the headband with one multicoloured feather for each Law Society Committee on which such practitioner serves during the tenure of such service.
- (7) A Barrister who, in the opinion of the Executive, is considered to be senior junior counsel, may wear a blue headband with thin diagonal pink stripes.
- (8) A practitioner to whom sub-rule (7) refers may apply to the Executive in writing stating the reasons why that practitioner should be considered by the Executive as senior junior counsel.

RICHARD GILES
President (1985-1987)

THE SPIDER'S WEB



Hand Me My Kalashnikov

Q. When he went, had you gone and had she, if she wanted to and were able, for the time being excluding all restraints on her not to go, gone also, would he have brought you, meaning you and she, with him to the station?

Response: Objection. That question should be taken out and shot!

ML Gilman, *Humor in the Court*

Confused Us with Someone Else?

This letter, received recently by the Society, wins the "exercise in complete futility" award for September.

"The Law Society of the NT
18 Knuckey St
Darwin NT

I write to ask you for some information and assistance. I practice in the UK, Canada and the USA as an expert witness in matters relating to skiing and wintersports.

I wonder therefore if you operate a register of expert witnesses and if so the way in which a person might become accepted into this register.

I'd appreciate any information on this if you have a moment

Thanks for your help.

Faithfully,
XXXXX"

(We sent him a bunch of tourist brochures depicting the ski runs of Darwin.)

Bull****?

Dr Craig Lilienthal, NSW branch medical Secretary of the AMA, tells readers of the *NSW Doctor* that in his view medical witnesses, whether they were treating doctors or independent experts, were merely the football in the lawyers' game.

However, it seems that lawyers view things differently. At a discussion on expert evidence during the AMA's recent national conference, lawyers who "represented the cream of Australia's counsel" quickly demonstrated that expert evidence was but one small but important part of the legal jigsaw puzzle and how easily the experts can get it wrong.

"One barrister aptly described medical evidence as being the grass upon which the legal cow grazes and stated that doctors were but part of the food chain. The medical audience rose to the occasion and came to the conclusion that training doctors in the art of giving medical evidence would do nothing more than enrich the quality of grass upon which lawyers fed"

Law Society Journal Vol 34, No 8, Sept 1996

Only the Lonely

More anecdotal amusement from the speech of Mr Junior Silk, Kim Hargrave QC, at the Victorian Bar Dinner. This was addressed to the Honourable Justice Linda Dessau of the Family Court.

"Whilst still a Magistrate you were hearing a family law application regarding maintenance. The applicant wife was being cross-examined about an alleged affair that she was having with a man whom it was said was helping to support her. When it became absolutely clear to her that she had no alternative but to admit that this was true, she looked at your Honour plaintively and said: 'Well, your Worship, I was so sad and lonely, I would have done anything for a little infection'".