

# TRIBUTE TO RT HON SIR IVOR RICHARDSON, PCNZM

*Hon Justice John McGrath\**

---

*The following is a tribute to the late Sir Ivor Richardson. It was delivered by Justice John McGrath at a memorial service held at Old St Paul's in Wellington on 29 January 2015.*

---

## ***I INTRODUCTION***

When the news came, over the Christmas–New Year holiday period, that Sir Ivor Richardson had died, there was an immediate sense of awareness that New Zealand had lost an extraordinary man. The Chief Justice of New Zealand paid tribute to his "unparalleled influence on New Zealand law as a judge, law teacher and adviser".<sup>1</sup> The Attorney-General said that he could think of no one who had made a more substantive contribution to law and social policy than Sir Ivor, adding that his was "a career marked by excellence in everything he did".<sup>2</sup> In private emails responding to the news, a former Secretary to the Treasury spoke of Sir Ivor's "easy manner and intelligence" and his "massive contribution to taxation policy and administration". The present Secretary for Justice recalled working with Sir Ivor when a young departmental lawyer on a project for televising courts and said how progressive he was, with a constantly open mind.

All present will have knowledge of some of the circumstances and events in the life of Ivor Lloyd Morgan Richardson. My task today is to give each of you a fuller picture of who he was, what he did and the outstanding and lasting contributions he made to New Zealand.

## ***II EARLY DAYS***

Ivor Richardson was born in Ashburton in 1930. His father, William Thomas Richardson, had immigrated to New Zealand from Wales. In the 1920s, William Richardson worked in Ashburton selling agricultural machinery for the International Harvester Company, with plans to save enough

---

\* Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand.

1 Office of the Chief Justice "Chief Justice Pays Tribute to the Late Sir Ivor Richardson" (press release, 31 December 2014).

2 New Zealand Government "Death of Sir Ivor Richardson – a career marked by excellence" (press release, 31 December 2014).

money to buy a farm. There he met Ivor's mother, Mary Kathleen Lloyd, who was from a large local family. Early in the 1930s, the couple bought a farm near Methven where Ivor, and his elder brother Bryce, grew up.

It was necessary for Bryce and Ivor to go to secondary school as boarders. During his first term at Timaru Boys' High School, when he was 13 years old, Ivor's father became ill and died. The farm was a thriving business but it had to be sold and the family moved to Ashburton.

Three years after his father's death, Ivor's mother, Mary, was killed in a car accident on a local railway crossing. Ivor, at the age of 16 years, was orphaned. Ivor and Bryce were close but the tragic circumstances of his early life no doubt contributed to his characteristic independence and resilience, his determination to shape his own future and to live life to the full.

One of his aunts, Nena, who had been a teacher, took responsibility for the boys. She talked to Ivor about his educational plans. The subjects that most interested him were English and History and the school careers advisors thought he should be a school teacher. Nena reminded Ivor he had once said he wanted to be a criminal lawyer, which his father said he would be good at. She urged him to plan to study law. She went with Ivor to see the school's principal to tell him the school had to start teaching Ivor Latin, as that would be compulsory when he studied law. The school obliged. And, in 1949, Ivor headed off to Christchurch to study law.

### ***III UNIVERSITY STUDY***

At university, he was an outstanding scholar and President of both the Canterbury University College Law Students' Society and the New Zealand Law Students' Association. He worked part time in law offices for most of the period of his study. He graduated in 1954 and was awarded, jointly with one other, the Canterbury District Law Society's gold medal for the top graduating student.

While studying at Canterbury he also met an academic lawyer from University of Chicago Law School who was in New Zealand as a visiting lecturer. Professor Allison Dunham urged Ivor to go overseas for post-graduate study and to go not to England but to the United States. He gave him information about the scholarship assistance available. Ivor applied to the University of Michigan, was accepted and awarded a very generous scholarship which would fund him to do original research and enable him to work for a doctorate. He booked his passage to the United States, left the ship at Panama and, travelling via California and Texas, eventually arrived in Ann Arbor in Michigan.

There he graduated in law with an LLM and an SJD degree in 1955. He stayed on thereafter to work, on a research appointment in the law school. While at Michigan he had met a post-graduate student, in applied social work, who was from Delaware, Jane Krchma. They met at a student party in a flat Jane shared with other students. Some foreign students were invited. She

was carrying in the food and Ivor was bringing in the beer. Jane's impression from the outset was that he was a nice young man who had a good sense of humour.

After both had graduated they were married in Delaware. Bryce came over from New Zealand for Ivor's graduation and to be his best man.

And then Ivor and Jane returned to New Zealand via England, where Ivor attended a Commonwealth Law Conference, and Europe, where they travelled extensively. Bryce joined them for part of their travel.

#### ***IV STARTING PRACTICE***

Back in New Zealand, Dr Richardson had a clear idea of what he wanted to do. It was to practice law undertaking litigation. An opportunity arose for him to enter private practice with Macalister Brothers in Invercargill, a firm which had the Crown warrant in a city where a lot of court work was undertaken. The Crown Solicitor, Mr Mills, was more interested in jury advocacy. The position was for a lawyer who would undertake cases involving legal argument. This suited Dr Richardson well and in 1957 he became a partner in the firm.

The New Zealand Law Reports between 1957 and 1963 record sixteen judgments that provide a sample of the work he did in Invercargill. In his first case, Dr Richardson succeeded in obtaining relief from forfeiture of a lease. The Judge, Sir Trevor Henry, before whom Ivor was to appear often, referred to counsel's "closely reasoned argument".<sup>3</sup> Other cases concerned mining licences, criminal appeals, regulatory enactments and increasingly, tax disputes where he appeared for the Commissioner of Inland Revenue.

From time to time, Dr Richardson came to Wellington on Crown legal business, appearing in the Court of Appeal. In the course of doing so, he came to the attention of the recently appointed Solicitor-General, HRC Wild QC, with whom he appeared on at least one occasion.

Wild had been told by the Attorney-General, the Honourable JR Marshall, "to give the Crown Law Office a shake-up". He decided to bring in three younger litigation lawyers who had established themselves in private practice: Richard Savage, Gordon Orr and Ivor Richardson. There was naturally some resentment from longstanding and respected Crown counsel in the office, in part because Wild wanted the new appointments to have higher gradings under the very structured employment arrangements in the State Services at the time. One of the incumbents, who held a position at a lower level, decided to appeal against Ivor Richardson's appointment at a level above him.

Before the appeal was heard, Ivor was in Wellington and was asked to come and have tea with the Solicitor-General. When he arrived, he found a third person present who Ivor did not know but

---

<sup>3</sup> *Re Lease, McNaught to McNaught* [1958] NZLR 72 (SC) at 76.

who appeared interested in what he had been doing. Wild later told Ivor the third person was the Chairman of the Public Service Appeal Board. There was, of course, a different view in those days of the requirements of natural justice. But the incident shows how determined the Solicitor-General was to get Ivor into the Office in a senior position. The appeal was dismissed.

Dr Richardson joined the Crown Law Office in 1963. His work covered many areas of Crown practice, all of which he approached with the intellectual enthusiasm and curiosity which characterised everything he did in the law. He relished the public significance of the cases he was handling. He became the revenue law specialist in the office, initially focusing on estate and gift duty, and then on taxation. He undertook a number of cases on behalf of the Inland Revenue which had nullified business arrangements it saw as impermissible tax avoidance, most notably, in 1966, *Elmiger v Commissioner of Inland Revenue*.<sup>4</sup>

## **V VICTORIA UNIVERSITY**

In 1967, an opportunity arose that appealed to Dr Richardson. Victoria University of Wellington's law faculty wanted to develop the extent and quality of its teaching of taxation law and the University established a chair in that area.

He saw this as an opportunity to contribute back to society some of the benefits he had derived from his own legal education in two universities. At the same time, he would be able to take on a limited role in private practice in the courts.

He started at Victoria in 1967 and was there for six years including three as Dean of the Law School. The very strong faculty he led included Ian Campbell, George Barton, Don Inglis, Quentin Quentin-Baxter, Kenneth Keith, Don Mathieson, Peter Ellinger, Geoffrey Palmer and Peter McKenzie.

During his time at the University, he revamped the taxation course, making it part of the undergraduate law degree for the first time. He also instigated Masters degree courses in tax and other commercial law subjects. Tax seminars with Ivor brought the subject alive, because of his own keen interest in the wider policies underlying tax law and his involvement in contemporary litigation. These courses proved very popular with recent graduates, the best of whom were encouraged to spend a year or two as full-time junior lecturers in the faculty before going on to further post-graduate study overseas.

On their return to New Zealand, many of Ivor's former graduate students became the first private taxation practitioners working in major law firms in the main centres. Hitherto taxation had been an area dominated by the accountancy profession and this changed as a result of what Ivor was doing. Others of his former students became academic lawyers in New Zealand and overseas and, of course, many are, or have been, barristers and judges.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Elmiger v Commissioner of Inland Revenue* [1966] NZLR 683 (SC).

While at the University, Ivor still did tax litigation work. Brian Tyler, who was the Department's tax inspector in the *Europa Oil* cases, recalls how quickly Ivor absorbed the intricacies of international petroleum pricing. Ivor, he says, was marvellous to work with. This major tax avoidance litigation went to the Privy Council twice where Dr Richardson appeared as junior counsel to Wild's successors as Solicitor-General, JC White QC and RC Savage QC.<sup>5</sup> Ivor believed the Solicitor-General should generally lead in the Privy Council but in time he became leading counsel in tax cases at appellate level in his own right.

## **VI INVOLVEMENT IN UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION**

As well as being Dean of the Law School, Professor Richardson was a member of the Committee of the Vice Chancellor and Deans, which ran the University. He is warmly recalled there as a Dean of Law with a special interest in the well-being of the University as a whole. We see here, I believe, the origins of his close interest in public administration. He was asked to draw up what became known as the "Richardson Rules" to regulate private contracting by tenured University staff, a most sensitive exercise which he accomplished in a way that met general acceptance, by stating clear, transparent principles, which would apply across the board.

When he stepped down as Dean, Professor Richardson was appointed by the New Zealand Universities as their representative on the University Grants Committee.<sup>6</sup> The Committee determined, each five years, what grants of public funds should be made to each University for teaching and research.

In the course of the quinquennial grants exercise the members of the Committee would visit each University to examine critically their submissions as to the share of the money available that it should receive. The Chairman, Sir Alan Danks, allocated to Professor Richardson the task of questioning each University on its financial submissions. No doubt Sir Alan was delighted to have available the services of one of the leading cross-examiners of financial evidence in the Courts. But the Universities themselves of course knew of his ability and by collectively asking Professor Richardson to accept this appointment they indicated their confidence and trust in his judgement on an aspect of their administration that was crucial to each of their plans for development.

Such recognition of the wide scope of his abilities opened up further opportunities for Professor Richardson. Around this time, he was asked to accept appointment as the Vice-Chancellor of one of the Universities. He was tempted, but in the end declined the invitation. He had reached the conclusion that, having accomplished what he had sought to do as a legal academic, he would now concentrate on his future career in the application of the law.

---

5 *Commissioner of Inland Revenue v Europa Oil (NZ) Ltd* [1971] NZLR 641 (PC); and *Europa Oil (NZ) Ltd v Commissioner of Inland Revenue* [1976] 1 NZLR 546 (PC).

6 Alan Danks "Reports of the University Grants Committee and University Institutions for the Year 1970" [1970] III AJHR E3 at 3.

He did not cease to maintain his University interests and later when a judge served as Chancellor of Victoria. His collegial style and manner of presiding over the University Council refashioned the role of Chancellor. The University also very much appreciated the background and knowledge of the university system that he brought to the position.

He also chaired the Council for Legal Education where he guided the Faculty of Law at Waikato University through its difficult foundation phase, and led a consultative process that resulted in the introduction by the Council of post-degree professional legal education as a prerequisite for admission to the legal profession.

Ivor Richardson never needed to serve for long periods to make an impact in positions that he held. This led one of his daughters to observe that he seemed to have difficulty holding jobs down for long. The Attorney-General puts it differently, saying that Ivor Richardson was ahead of his time as someone who had multiple careers in the law: in private practice, government, academia and the judiciary.

### ***VII RETURN TO PRIVATE LAW PRACTICE***

When Professor Richardson relinquished his chair in 1973 he headed for practice in the private sector. He joined Watts and Patterson, a specialist corporate law firm, where his good friend Colin Patterson was a senior partner. There he built a hugely busy and successful practice in litigation and corporate advice, gaining valuable insight into the commercial world.

His heavy workload in private practice did not stop him accepting other briefs from the government. On one Sunday morning, he returned from London, where he had appeared in the Privy Council, to learn that he was required to travel immediately to Dunedin where a major company in the business of accepting deposits for investment was experiencing financial difficulties. By the next morning the government had his recommendations and it accepted them. New management of the company was put in place and his proposals for legislation that would protect investors from a rush on funds were quickly given effect by Parliament. This was the origin of statutory management.

Ivor also chaired a Committee of Inquiry into Inflation Accounting. The legal and accounting problems raised by inflation had become a particular interest, which he maintained for the rest of his life. The Committee of Inquiry reported in September 1976 and its recommendations generated considerable publicity.

### ***VIII APPOINTMENT TO THE HIGH COURT***

There was, however, soon to be another career change. Sir Richard Wild, by now Chief Justice, had been authorised by the Attorney-General to ask Ivor to accept appointment as a Judge of what we call the High Court. The day after the report of the Committee on Inflation Accounting was submitted, the Chief Justice made his approach.

Ivor and Jane decided to tell their three daughters, Helen, Megan and Sarah of the forthcoming new appointment, which would take the family to Auckland, as the five of them were driving there for a holiday. They did so over a picnic lunch at Taihape. Ivor told me that the reaction was dramatic. Each of the three girls had burst into tears. For various personal reasons this family move did not suit them at all. Nor was the appointment particularly convenient for Jane who had to leave her position as a social worker at Wellington Hospital.

The news got out when his appointment was prematurely leaked to the media. This precluded his plans for an orderly departure and Justice Ivor Richardson started his career as a Judge in Auckland in May 1977.

Justice Richardson was not to serve long on the High Court. In September 1977, there was much discussion in judicial and legal circles about who would fill a vacancy on the Court of Appeal. The news of the appointment broke, again prematurely, when the Attorney-General rang the Court's office in Auckland and left a message asking if Mr Justice Richardson would be available to have lunch with him the next day. It was not hard to guess what this would be about. The news spread with alacrity among those working at the Court. The Judge was in Court at the time and he got the news when he came out at the end of the day to find his associate in tears. Soon it was confirmed. Justice Richardson was returning to Wellington as a Judge of the Court of Appeal.

## ***IX COURT OF APPEAL***

In October 1977, Justice Richardson commenced work as a permanent Judge of the Court of Appeal. When he retired 25 years after his appointment, he was by far the longest serving Judge of the Court, ever. For the last six years, he was the Court's President.

In this time as an appellate Judge, Sir Ivor decided many many cases covering all aspects of the law. Most involved application of statutory provisions and his approach to the interpretation of statutes, based on scheme and purpose as well as text, is a major part of his judicial legacy. He delivered ground-breaking judgments in cases relating to the Treaty of Waitangi and its principles, the Bill of Rights, and relationship property. His judgments in many areas of regulatory law, including tax, competition and securities law, and employment, are just as extensive. I cannot possibly today give an account of the full spectrum covered by Sir Ivor's judicial work in a way that would do justice to it. What I will do instead is attempt to summarise his approach to judging. I am assisted in this by his own published writings.

## ***X APPROACH TO JUDGING***

Sir Ivor knew that the role of the appellate courts, in particular, went beyond determining disputes between parties to particular litigation. At times the courts' decisions, and the reasons given for them, would impact on other cases and ultimately lead to development of the law.<sup>7</sup> Mostly in

---

<sup>7</sup> Ivor Richardson "The Role of an Appellate Judge" (1981) 5 Otago LR 1 at 1.

litigation it was the factual issues before the courts that were critical as, once they were resolved, settled legal principles would be applied. But in some cases, the courts had to apply evolving legal principles or, as Sir Ivor candidly acknowledged, lay down new ones.<sup>8</sup> While long-standing precedents had to be respected, legal principles in his view needed to be continually reassessed to ensure the courts were not too far behind, or too far ahead, of society in their thinking.<sup>9</sup>

In those situations, as Sir Ivor believed, the courts had to make value judgments.<sup>10</sup> These were not, however, to be based on the individual values of the judges hearing a case. Rather the judges had to ascertain and apply the community's values.<sup>11</sup> This might be a relatively straightforward task where there was a social consensus on the relevant values. But where there were clear divisions in society on an issue, because there were different economic, moral, political or social attitudes in society, which were strongly held, he recognised that the task could be a difficult one.<sup>12</sup>

Accordingly, for Sir Ivor, the social awareness of a judge was as important as technical competence in some cases.<sup>13</sup> Judges had to have sufficient "nous", meaning sufficient awareness of the nature and complexity of society, and being sufficiently sensitive to their own limitations and the influences arising from their particular social backgrounds.<sup>14</sup> But judges also had to take a principled approach. He was not at all comfortable with judges treating "fairness in the round" as the ultimate test.<sup>15</sup>

Sir Ivor was also very conscious that the courts needed to be alert to the limits of their role. These limits were both constitutional and practical. When developing the law, judges had to be conscious of the respective constitutional roles of the three branches of government: Parliament, executive government and the courts. At a practical level, the courts also had to recognise that the larger the public policy context of any particular issue, the less well equipped the courts would be to weigh the considerations involved. The judges were not law reform commissioners and needed to realise they lacked both method and, in a democratic society, mandate to solve

---

8 Ivor Richardson "Judicial decision-making: a New Zealand perspective" (1984) 58 *Law Inst J* 545 at 545.

9 Ivor Richardson "Changing Needs for Judicial Decision-making" (1991) 1 *JJA* 61 at 64.

10 Ivor Richardson "The Courts and the Public" [1995] *NZLJ* 11 at 12.

11 *R v Hines* [1997] 3 *NZLR* 529 (CA) at 538.

12 Richardson, above n 8, at 547.

13 Richardson, above n 8, at 547.

14 Ivor Richardson "Judges as Lawmakers in the 1990s" (1986) 12 *Mon LR* 35 at 40.

15 *Gillies v Keogh* [1989] 2 *NZLR* 327 (CA) at 344.



every social or economic problem.<sup>16</sup> He distrusted the idea that judges somehow inherently know better.

Sir Ivor openly stated his views of judging, especially appellate judging, and they provided for him a framework for testing the economic social and political questions involved in appellate judging.

Sir Ivor's frankness in these matters also reflected the great value he placed on openness by the courts and the clear articulation of reasons, particularly when a decision involved developing the law. The public would only then recognise the decisions of courts were to be respected not only because they involved exercise of judicial authority but because they were well-reasoned justifications for the legal answer to problems predicted by a particular dispute.<sup>17</sup> This is one of the reasons why he is so highly regarded as a Judge in circles which are sceptical of some of what judges do.

## ***XI OTHER INVOLVEMENTS***

As a Judge of the Court of Appeal, Sir Ivor continued to undertake assignments for successive governments which were keen to draw on his special abilities in public administration. Two of importance were his chairmanships of the Royal Commission on Social Policy and the Organisational Review of the Inland Revenue Department.

The Royal Commission was appointed by the Labour government in October 1986. As with everything, Sir Ivor brought a highly methodical approach to its work. The Royal Commission embarked on public consultation receiving some 6,000 submissions (one from the spouse of a Cabinet Minister).<sup>18</sup> Many more citizens came to public meetings held all over New Zealand. Sir Ivor himself visited 35 maraes in the course of this exercise. He kept the proceedings informal to make them more accessible and to facilitate the submitters getting the points across in their own way.

The Department of Statistics conducted a survey of public attitudes to social policy, covering a carefully chosen cross-section of 1,792 people. As well, many reports were commissioned from recognised experts on particular aspects of social policy.

The Royal Commission's work was prematurely brought to a close as a result of changes of policy within the government, driven in part by the financial crisis of 1987. The Commission nevertheless published a very full report which included much of the material it had commissioned and received as well as its own views. It found much to praise in the

---

<sup>16</sup> *R v Hines*, above n 11, at 539. See also Richardson, above n 8, at 546–547.

<sup>17</sup> Richardson, above n 7, at 7; Richardson, above n 14, at 39.

<sup>18</sup> Margaret Palmer.

comprehensive nature of New Zealand's welfare state, while seeing plenty of room for improvement. Its report provided the government with a "comprehensive and coherent" basis for future policy development.<sup>19</sup> As the *Oxford History of New Zealand* says, the report also provided "a remarkable snapshot of New Zealand society in the late twentieth century".<sup>20</sup>

The other major public policy project that Sir Ivor chaired involved "a fundamental strategic review of the Inland Revenue Department" to address the optimal arrangements for tax assessment and collection as well as other matters including the provision of tax policy advice. The review made proposals for a new tax policy development process, involving structured consultation with taxpayers. These were quickly implemented. They have generally been seen as highly successful. Another important recommendation was for a new internal dispute resolution process, the main feature of which was to require openness with both sides putting all their cards on the table. Sir Ivor told me that his view was that this recommendation, which was implemented by legislation, was less successful as he felt that the process had tended to favour the Department over the taxpayer in ways that were not envisaged.

## ***XII COURT OF APPEAL REFORMS***

After becoming President of the Court in 1996, Sir Ivor did not take on further governmental assignments of this kind. Instead he concentrated on his judicial work, leading the Court of Appeal while implementing changes that would improve its functioning.

He achieved these reforms consultatively through two reviews, the first of case processing and management, particularly as it affected judges, the court's registry, and counsel. One outcome was the institution of regular monthly meetings of judges, at which there was open discussion of judgments yet to be completed. These came to be known by some of us as "squirm time"! The second review was of the court office and systems, looking to get improvements through the best use of technology and staff.

The resulting changes gave effect to Sir Ivor's beliefs that the proper administration of justice was fundamental in a democratic society, and that the courts were "the peoples' courts" and that ready access to them had to be maintained. Efficiency and speed in the processing of the Court's work were for him important features of the right to access to justice but so were quality and careful deliberation in its delivery.

## ***XIII RETIREMENT***

On retirement, Sir Ivor did not want to launch a fresh private sector career. He returned to the Law School at Victoria as a Distinguished Fellow. He continued to publish his writing in law

---

19 Geoffrey Rice "A Revolution in Social Policy: 1981–1991" in Geoffrey Rice (ed) *The Oxford History of New Zealand* (2nd ed, Oxford University Press, Auckland, 1992) 482 at 486–488.

20 Rice, above n 19, at 486–488.

reviews on particular legal issues of importance. As a result of recent work done by Professor Prebble and others at the Victoria Law Faculty, Sir Ivor's 100 scholarly papers are all available on the Social Science Research Network.<sup>21</sup> In retirement, he also enjoyed wider interests, including playing snooker twice a week in the Wellington Club with a group of close friends.

Justice Richardson was knighted in 1976. He received honorary doctorates in law from both Victoria and Canterbury Universities. On his retirement in 2002, Victoria's law school convened a conference in his honour, its theme reflecting the roles Sir Ivor had played in the law. In the same year he was appointed Principal Companion of the New Zealand Order of Merit.

#### ***XIV PERSONAL AND FAMILY LIFE***

I have already touched on Sir Ivor's personality and how he was interested in and supportive of all those he encountered. Former students, younger legal colleagues, and his clerks (as judges call their research assistants) all benefited from this and many have kept in touch with him.

He had a very large network and maintained his friendships throughout his life. As Lady Richardson said to the *Dominion Post*: "He was always fun and enjoyable. He had a good sense of humour and he was friendly. Everyone liked him." Lady Richardson and he enjoyed a wide circle of friends. Frank, forthright and lively conversation was a feature of their social life, especially at dinner.

In Lady Richardson, Sir Ivor had a life partner who was exciting, intelligent and enthusiastic, and who, like him, wanted to live an adventurous life, starting with their move to New Zealand. They were a formidable team. The support she gave him in all his endeavours was based on their great mutual understanding, which is not to say they were always entirely in agreement.

And Sir Ivor wanted his daughters to be like Jane Richardson: strong, with their own opinions, standing up for themselves, and growing up in the belief they could do anything they wanted. He always encouraged Helen, Megan and Sarah fully to realise their potential. He believed in incentives: in their younger days he would offer a dollar for each "A" on their report cards and later he fully supported their pursuing graduate studies. He encouraged their industriousness. When their house was being built at Duthie Street he offered a dollar for every 100 nails they picked up from the site.

In later life, Helen, Megan and Sarah would often when calling home seek his personal advice on matters of strategy or dealing with work problems. He was hugely supportive and proud of them at all times.

---

21 "Richardson, Ivor" Social Science Research Network <[www.ssrn.com](http://www.ssrn.com)>.

Sir Ivor's intellectual curiosity extended to his wider interests outside of the law. He loved knowledge and reading. On one visit to Chicago where Sarah was studying for her MBA, in between sightseeing he read all her textbooks.

He loved overseas travel in which he was intrepid. He and Jane took their daughters to places as diverse as Ethiopia, Kenya, Mexico, India and Mauritius, where he had earlier been to write the country's tax law. As well, he travelled widely in the United States and Europe. He did not neglect what was closer to home, including restaurants, theatre, museums and art galleries. The collection of New Zealand art he and Jane assembled was a most notable one enjoyed by many visitors and opened up for tours on occasions such as the International Arts Festival. He also enjoyed his involvement in the New Zealand Institute of International Affairs.

## ***XV CONCLUSION***

Let me bring this multitude of themes together.

Ivor Richardson started life on a farm riding his pony to a country school.

Despite, or perhaps because of, early setbacks in life, coupled with his adventurous spirit and enquiring mind, he made ambitious choices about his education and early career which, although at the time novel, proved very influential on the course of his life.

His astute mind and the intellectual independence and rigour he brought to everything he took on became key features of whatever he did. He became one of New Zealand's greatest judges. As to his style, the Chief Justice said:<sup>22</sup>

[I]n his own work as a judge he shunned 'flamboyant rhetoric and evangelical fervour' to express conclusions that were plain, principled, and fit to meet the needs of New Zealand society.

What I have not perhaps spoken of as much as I could have today is what an open-minded and nice person he was at all times, whatever the circumstances. He was never provoked into discourtesy, (not even by the most stupid of submissions).

All this without ever compromising his intellectual objectivity and honesty in giving his decisions and reasons for them.

Also, I could reflect on how generous he was to those he came to work with and know in his wide-ranging career. Many of us here will reflect on the support he gave us at crucial stages of our careers and how much the privilege of our association and friendship with him helped develop our lives.

On behalf of this large assembly, gathered to remember Sir Ivor Richardson, I wish to acknowledge the members of his family who are present, whose deep sorrow we share. They

---

<sup>22</sup> Office of the Chief Justice, above n 1.

include Bryce's daughters, Ann and Mary, with whom he was close. And I extend especially to Lady Richardson, Helen, Megan and Sarah our deepest sympathy in their great personal loss.

And finally, I acknowledge the sense of public loss we all feel in the death of Sir Ivor Richardson, a great New Zealander who made extraordinary and durable contributions to the law and to public life.

