RICHARD STANLEY QC

Edited transcript of interview with Juliette Brodsky for Foley's List oral history filmed by Elisabeth Crosbie, 21 May 2015

Part 1 – "I just wanted to be a barrister"

Q Richard Stanley thank you very much for making time to be interviewed for Foley's List. What is it that drives you?

A: I enjoy it, and don't have any other alternative. I don't have a farm and you can only play so much golf and tennis. I greatly enjoy the social life you have at the Bar, and in particular, the friends I have on this floor, and the Common Law Bar generally. I enjoy the people, lunch with them each day. For me it's not just the profession but the social life you have too.

Q: One barrister I interviewed said he was virtually addicted to being at the Bar - he even sleeps on the floor of his chambers!

A: I'm certainly not like that – I couldn't say I love the law. I don't spend my weekends reading the law books. For me it's more a practical application of the law, in a common law sense.

Q: So, let's rewind some years. Is there much difference between you now and the fresh-faced young man who came to the Bar in 1964?

A: I'm sure there is! I don't know if that's an easy question to answer.

Q: What were your hopes at the time when you started out?

A: I didn't know what to expect. I knew that I didn't want to be a solicitor, just a barrister. When I was doing my articles, I'd seen a lot of litigation in common law which in those days was running down and industrial accidents cases. The firm I was with was involved with that sort of work, and I'd often be sent up to the court with messages and to take documents to the various barristers, and I was immediately captivated and quite excited by it all.

Q: What was the firm (where you were articled)?

A: I was at Alexander Grant, Dickson and King. It was a wonderful firm, an established firm, rather conservative, with very fine partners when I was there. I was very fortunate to be articled there, with Frank Greene who was a great mentor. He tried to persuade me to stay on as a solicitor because he enjoyed the life himself, but that was one piece of advice that I didn't accept. As it turned out, I'm grateful and pleased that I didn't.

Q: You say "established" – was the firm an outgrowth of others? I've heard the name "King" elsewhere.

A: No, I don't think so. "King" was from Whitney King, a marvellous man, a wonderful lawyer with a great legal family. His daughter was a solicitor and his son-in-law is Robin Gorton, who was a QC and (Robin's) son Jamie Gorton is now a QC also. I'm not quite sure of the background of the firm, but it was a very well-regarded, conservative, respected firm, with good clients. Ansett Airlines was its major commercial client apart from a number of insurance companies, in particular the State Motor Car Insurance office and so on.

Q: Where were they located?

A: In William Street - on the corner of William Street and Bourke, opposite the BP building. I've forgotten the name of the building – it was a wonderful old building that took up the whole block, opposite Menzies, on the south-west corner. I can't remember the name of the building, but it took up the whole block and Grant Dickson and King had a section in there.

Part 2. Bruising encounters and University days

Q: I had the pleasure of interviewing Ian Hayden. He talked about doing articles with Ray Dunn during those years and having a flourishing football career. Was it at that time that you first played football against him?

A: I played a lot of amateur football, but I didn't reach Ian's heights. We played against each other when we were at university; he was playing with the University Blues, I was with the Old Xavierians. We respected each other's abilities on the field and became good friends afterwards and I've always had great regard for him, both as a footballer and as a barrister.

Q: Though you did sustain an injury from him?!

A: Yes, he fixed me up one day. He was a pretty tough player, very strong, and we collided and I came out of it worst, and ended up with a couple of days in hospital.

Q: With no hard feelings.

A: No hard feelings.

Q: You mentioned the "Old Xavierians" – you went to Xavier?

A: Yes, I did.

Q: When you were at school, did you nurture any nascent ambitions for the law?

A: No, not really. I didn't have any plans one way or another during virtually all my schooling. I did two years of matriculation, which was common in those days. In the first year I'd done mathematics – pure maths calculus and applied physics and chemistry. The second year of matric, I did the histories, and I had a marvellous history teacher who encouraged me to think beyond the square a bit, and I became interested in politics. Then when I first went to university, I did an arts degree and combined it with my law degree and I majored in political science. But within a year or so of doing Tort and Contract, I then developed a real liking for the law, and politics seemed to recede in my plans. Then I gradually came to the view that I was destined to be a lawyer, which – as I said to you before – being a lawyer for me always meant being a barrister.

Q: Just on the political science front, was that when McMahon Ball headed up the political science faculty? Those were very interesting times, I'm surprised they didn't entice you a little more…

A: Yes, there were some great characters there – Creighton Burns who went on to edit The Age – he was one of my lecturers - and McMahon Ball. Some very clever fellows during my time.

Q: Was Sir Zelman Cowen dean of law then?

A: David Derham, I think, was the dean when I was first there, and then Sir Zelman came in shortly thereafter.

Q: Did anyone strike you as a fine lecturer?

A: Harry Ford in Contract was a very good lecturer. It was through attending lectures on Evidence given by Jim Gobbo that I formed a great opinion of Jim that later became an association.

Part 3 – Master James Gobbo and capricious magistrates

Q: Let's talk about James Gobbo, who later became QC and Governor of Victoria. You read with him when you came to the Bar. And that was a foregone conclusion, on the basis of that previous (university) experience?

A: I can't say that – I was very lucky. I mentioned before that I was articled to Frank Greene. He was a great Newman College man, as was Jim Gobbo. Frank made the overtures to Jim Gobbo, asking if I could read with him, and I went to see Jim and he accepted me, fortunately. It was a great plus for my professional career and also my social life. I wasn't married at the time, we lived not far from each other, so at least once or twice a week, his wife Shirley would cook the pasta and we'd have dinner. We became very close friends over the years – Shirley and Jim, and Sue and I.

Q: What did you take away in terms of influence from James Gobbo in terms of your approach to advocacy? Did you ever try to emulate him?

A: No, I never tried to emulate him in terms of advocacy as such. I rarely saw him in court. In those days, Jim's practice was principally in town planning – that was where he was supreme. Although he also did do quite a lot of paperwork, even for running down cases because he had a tie-up with Galbally and O'Bryan, with Frank Galbally in particular. I used to do a lot of devilling for Jim,which was good for me as a very junior barrister. What I learnt from Jim was more an approach to dealing with people. He was an exremely straightforward and decent person, and obviously still is. A very good person,and hopefully some of that rubbed off. At that time, I remember I thought he knew everything. Any problem I had in any sort of case, he'd have an answer. As a very young barrister, it absolutely amazed me. He had an extraordinarily wide range of knowledge. It was very helpful.

Q: Did town planning ever interest you?

A: No. I always preferred dealing with people. When you're very young and junior, you're out doing cases in the Magistrates' Court – "crash and bash" (as we called them) or small traffic offences, speeding charges, and so on – I found mixing with different people every day in different circumstnaces just fantastic.

Q: In those days, the Magistrates' Courts were called the Courts of Petty Sessions. You must have some interesting memories of people there, sitting on the bench. Did you dread appearing before anyone?

A: Mr Scott, the magistrate out at Heidelberg, was an extraordinary person to appear before – you never knew what was going to happen next.

Q: Why was that? Was he capricious?

A: Very capricious – sometimes he'd even run two cases at once. It would just be a circus – there'd be two matters with a witness on either side of him, which was quite shambolic – you didn't always know where you were with him.

Q: Did you gnash your teeth about that?

A: Often you were – you felt you didn't get a fair go. He wasn't a popular magistrate. But some of them were great – Ron Brown, the magistrate out in Ringwood was very fair. Most of them were.

Q: I have read one barrister's account of "the exquisite pain" of appearing before Judge Moore.

A: Oh, he was before my time. He was regarded as very tough to appear before. The Bench has changed. We don't have those old-time characters. Some were still around when I came to the Bar – there was Judge Mitchell (an extraordinary fellow), Judge Leckie, Judge Corsen and others. They could be very difficult to appear before.

Nowadays, judges are far more civil, more pleasant and polite to appear before, than many of them were years ago.

Q: It was suggested that boredom was often the reason for some of them being nasty?

A: I think more that some didn't have the intellectual capacity for the job, and therefore found it difficult. Some in my experience were affected by having too much alcohol over lunch. Others were just plain lazy, but they were the exceptions.

Part 4 – Joining Foley's List

Q: In the Bar Centenary edition, I read Hartog Berkeley's account of being at the Bar in the 1960s. When he started, he was told if he wanted to be successful, he had to drink regularly with the insurance company solicitors at the Scots' Hotel - were you ever presented with that sort of ultimatum?

A: No.

Q: You came to Foley's List straight away?

A: In those days, it was the practice that you would go on the same list as your master. Jim Gobbo was on Foley's. It was just organised for me – I didn't have to do anything. I was in effect told I would be on Foley's List. As it turns out, I was very pleased.

Q: Are you saying you changed your views about clerking later?

A: No, no – I had no views about wherther one clerk was better than another. As I gained experience, I realised how good Foley's List was, particularly for common lawyers.

Q: Did you meet Jim Foley?

A: He was "Mr Foley". As I'm sure others have told you, a wonderful man who took a fatherly interest in me, and all the young barristers that were on the list. A very honourable fellow- you'd know never to do the wrong thing in any way in case it got back to him. Not a disciplinarian, but you wouldn't want to disappoint him. Kevin (Foley) was a great operator – and we became very close over the years. Then I was chairman of the list when Kevin died. He was quite a different character to his father. He loved life and was a wonderful clerk who had great rapport with all these solicitors. That was part of the reason why the list was so successful.

Q: Before we turn to your early cases, I was curious about something else I read in that Bar Centenary edition – in one of the articles, it said there was "an obsession with clerking" during the 1970s. Why was this – what was going down at the time?

A: Well, there were some problems there. In those days, there would have been five clerks. Earlier with one of them, there were some problems with defalcation. One of the other lists – Calvin's - effectively died – it was not successful. I can't really be more specific than that – we're talking forty years ago.

Q: When you were chairman of Foley's List, what do you think it took to make a succesful list?

A: First of all, it's like a football team - you've got to have good barristers on the list. It's also a fantastic help if you've got a clerk who (a) gets on with the solicitors, a good people person and who's prepared to work hard, and (b) one who is very trustworthy, so that the solicitors can trust they'll be given someone who's suitable for the brief, and from the barristers' point of view, they don't feel there's any favouritism either for or against them. Those factors were very evident with Foley's.

Q: Over the course of 50 years, you've had the opportunity to observe many things - do you see things changing in (clerking)?

A: The clerking system has changed in a number of ways. You've just got to look at the number of clerks, the size of the lists – you're looking at a totally different operation.

Q: Is it more impersonal?

A: More impersonal - it has to be, and you've got much bigger staff. It's clearly different, but on the other hand, they still provide the same service that's been provided for many years, especially for the younger barristers. Even when you've been around as long as I have, you still do rely on your clerk for many aspects of your professional life.

Part 5 – First Years at the Bar

Q: Just briefly, you were saying before that James Gobbo had chambers next door to Haddon Storey –

A: Yes, Haddon Storey who later became a leading member of parliament, and there was Norman O'Bryan who became a Supreme Court Judge, John Reid, and John Walker who you've interviewed previously. Daryl Dawson was there too; it was a very good area for an aspiring young barrister to be situated. You learned of course from them all. Jim's best friend at the time was the late Peter Brusey. Mixing with those people had a considerable influence on me.

Q: I saw a photo of Peter Brusey taken by the late Allayne Kiddle. In her account of life at the Bar, she spoke of how the talk of "running down cases" was all very strange, compared to when she was at the Inner Temple in England. Was that something peculiar to Victoria?

A: I don't know – that was always how the personal injury motor accident cases had been described– it's just the "running-down" jurisdiction. These days, there aren't as many cases getting to court because so many of the cases are settled by the TAC.

Q: Looking at your areas of practice, you were talking earlier about common law which you ended up specialising in– did you ever think about becoming a criminal barrister?

A: Not really, although I did do criminal work when I was at the junior Bar and I really enjoyed it. I did some prosecuting work which was great experience in learning how to get a case together and presenting it, but in time, I moved out of crime into civil.

Q: Before we turn to a couple of your landmark cases – were there any early cases where you felt some sense of doing an exemplary job, or conversely there was an outcome where you were disappointed?

A: I'm sure that's happened in cases. There are some (cases) you feel very badly about – sometimes you feel you could have done better in terms of a mistake you made. They don't immediately spring to mind but I'm sure that happened. On the other hand, it's not very often where you can honestly say that what you did was the determinant of a favourable outcome. If a barrister is being really honest, he can't say that all that often. In the end, it's the facts that win or lose cases. It's the barrister's job to present the right facts in the right way so as to persuade a tribunal, whether it's a judge alone or a jury. Sometimes there are cases where you might be lucky – a tactic that you adopt to run a case and it works in your favour – that's happened to me a few times. Obviously, when that happens, you get an extra sense of satisfaction. That's the great thing about acting for plaintiffs. I act now for both plaintiffs and defendants (more for defendants in the last period), but early on, I was essentially a plaintiffs barrister when I started off and that's really where the adrenalin runs. Acting for plaintiffs and jury work is the greatest aspect of a barrister's life that I really enjoyed. In the same way, I really respect the criminal barristers – they're under stress. It's a bit like acting for a plaintiff in a difficult jury trial.

Q: How would you describe your advocacy style, Richard?

A: That's a hard question – I don't know.

Q: Measured? Eloquent? Do you feel you have a particular approach that works well in the majority of your cases?

A: …. Look, I really can't answer that.

Part 6 – An Emotionally Draining Case

Q: There have been a number of landmark cases that you've appeared in. One you mentioned before the interview was a very "emotionally draining" case. It was the first case in which a haemophiliac successfully claimed damages for HIV infection resulting from a blood transfusion. Would you like to tell us about that?

A: That was the case of PQ agaist the Australian Red Cross, CSL and the Alfred Hospital. PQ was a young married father of two, in his late thirties, a haemophiliac, who became HIV infected as a result of a blood transfusion. It was very, very early days - in the 1980s – I've forgotten….

Q: Are we talking of during the height of the Grim Reaper era where fears were running high?

A: Yes. It was 1990. The case was before Justice McGarvie, with a bevy of good barristers – it was Jeff Sher for the Red Cross, John Barnard for the Alfred Hosptial and I think, Ross Gillies for CSL. It was a very hard fought case, over six months. We got a verdict on Christmas Eve. It was emotionally draining, because we had a wonderful plaintiff who at that stage, according to the best medical opinion, would not live any more than 18 months (although it transpired that he ended up living at least 7-8 years afterward). It was a successful result for the plaintiff, and an important win because it set something of a precedent. There were still a lot of other haemophiliacs who were in the wings waiting to sue, (but) I don't think another case went to verdict. We did fight a few others against hospitals and so on, but I'm confident that they all ended up settling in light of the PQ case. No-one wanted to spend another six months fighting that sort of case.

Q: What were the knotty aspects of the case that caused it to be so protracted?

A: The real issue was one of timing – what was known, or ought to have been known, by the Red Cross, the hospital and the Commonwealth Serum Laboratories. It was about 1983 when knowledge of HIV first arose, and there were competing views, medically, about whether or not it was reasonable for the hospital's doctors and the Red Cross to have acted. It was round about 1986 when the plaintiff, PQ, was infected. There were very well-qualified, international medical experts from America and Europe, who gave evidence and strong conflicting opinions about what was known or should have been known. Indeed, even if they had known, there were questions about what the Blood Bank could or should have done. The plaintiff's case was run to show that it was known by the relevant time that there was a very high incidence of HIV in the homosexual community, and that the Red Cross should have been alive to that and should not have been taking blood from haemophiliacs, whereas in fact they were encouraging haemophiliacs to give blood, by giving them a free blood test. Haemophiliacs would come to give blood every three months,which was the minimum period, and they did that because they would get free testing against sexually transmitted diseases. That was one of the issues we had to confront.

Q: It seems astonishing, knowing what we know now. As a result of that case, what protocols were put in place to prevent future problems?

A: It wasn't solely the result of that case, but certainly by the time the case was actually heard, I suspect the Red Cross had started bringing in some restrictions, which were certainly extended and became more specific thereafter.

Part 7 – All in the Mind?

Q: You were involved with a case to do with RSI (repetitive strain injury).

A: Yes, I was briefed by the Commonwealth to act for the Tax Department and Australia Post. The data process operators were coming down like flies with this RSI which would start in one hand, travel up the arm, across the neck and down to the other arm. It was really causing problems for the two departments. We - myself and the junior, the instructing solicitor and representatives from the Tax department and Australia Post - travelled across to America and Europe, seeing what was being done over thre. When the case of *Cooper v The Commonwealth* came on for trial before a judge and jury in the Supreme Court, we called witnesses from America to describe their systems of work, which were far more strenuous and aggressive than the way data process operators of Australia were being treated. Yet they'd never heard of or had experience of RSI, which they called "Kangaroo Paw" disease.

Q: I remember hearing a lot about RSI for quite a while. RSI didn't come out of nowhere. What started all this?

A: There's no doubt if you overuse your arms at a keyboard, you can get muscle soreness when doing reptitive work. No argument about that, but what happened was, this was getting out of control. The medical view was that it started being largely psychologically driven rather than organically based. What might have been a small muscle ache became magnified, and became in many of these cases, quite disabling, even though the medical evidence was that there was no real physical basis for the problems the plaintiffs were complaining of (RSI). It spawned an entire industry and was promoted by ergonomists, furniture manufacturers, physiotherapists, by lawyers. The jury rejected the plaintiff's case, even though there was no doubting her honesty in the way she described and complained about her symptoms, but the jury in the end wasn't satisfied that it was caused by her employer's negligence, and they threw (the case) out. That (verdict) had an enormous impact upon RSI litigation – indeed, doctors who were expert in the field at the time told me it effectively killed RSI as a medical problem. You can still get people who do suffer tendonitis, but that's a different matter altogether.

Q: And it's never resurfaced under any other name?

A: Not in Australia, but it did arise in America, later on. But I'm not sure what the current position is there.

Q: Have you had cases in your career where a person has persuaded themselves something happened, but it didn't or maybe not?

A: Yes, that's something that I believe does happen and it can happen there being without any conscious intent to deceive on the part of a plaintiff. There can be some precipiating factor that encourages this perception to survive and to grow, with time, but yes, it happens.

Part 8 – *King v Amaca* (Pty Ltd)

Q: Another landmark case was *King v Amaca*, where the jury awarded the highest award ($730,000) upheld by the Court of Appeal in personal injury litigation. Can you tell us about that case?

A: That was only 2-3 years ago where a fellow in his late 60s, Mr King, developed mesothelioma –

Q: From exposure to asbestos?

A: Yes. The only known cause of mesothelioma is exposure to asbestos. Mr King's only recollection of exposure to asbestos dust and fibres was on two occasions during his employment when he was required to visit a factory where asbestos was being worked with, and when he worked on a machine where he may have been exposed to asbestos dust at the factory. The exposure was extremely short and slight, and Amaca (which was really James Hardie) contested the case on the basis that the plaintiff could not prove the mesothelioma was as a result of exposure at their factory, that it must have been due to background exposure to air that we all have in an industrial city. The case, again, was very hard fought. Hardies called experts to argue their case, that exposure in their factory could not have caused mesothelioma, but from the defendant's point of view, there was a crucial issue. The plaintiff's solicitors in the course of discovery found documents from the doctor who'd been engaged by James Hardie to advise them with respect to respiratory problems caused by exposure to asbestos in their various factories. He had written letters to the West Australian factory where Mr King worked and those letters indicated that the doctor believed that the factory managers were deliberately falsifying the records. (This) gave the plaintiff a big kick along, and the jury obviously were not impressed with that conduct. The amount that they awarded was the highest – signalling a real dissatisfaction with Hardie's conduct as well as their desire to properly compensate this wonderful, non-complaining plaintiff who suffered this dreadful disease.

Q: This was also at a time when there was very unfavourable publicity about James Hardie.

A: Exactly.

Q: James Hardie had known for many years about asbestos causing mesothelioma. Was there a flow-on effect from that case that affected others? I'm thinking of people like Bernie Banton who passed away from mesothelioma.

A: Over the last five years or even ten years now, because of the public reputation that James Hardie has with asbestos, they're very reluctant to fight cases in court. The result is that nearly all absbestos cases these days – particularly if they involve Hardies or Amaca - are settled out of court, which is a good result for the plaintiffs who are often elderly and dying as a result of those conditions, and (also for) Hardies. I think there's little doubt that since that case, it's made Hardies even more wary of fighting cases. I also believe - and I hear this from solicitors who are acting in the field - that it has raised the going rate, as it were, for settlement figures for general damages in asbsestos-related cases.

Part 9 – Defending the Indefensible?

Q: Also, Richard, you have acted in cases where smokers were suing tobacco companies. You acted in one case for Phillip Morris, where you said the verdict produced "a very good result" (for Phillip Morris, I presume). Were you couching those words for a particular reason?

A: I think I was accosted by a reporter after the case and was asked about the verdict, and I said words to the effect that the jury got it right. It was a good result for the jury system, notwithstanding the fact that Phillip Morris was not a popular defendant in many respects. It was our view and the jury confirmed it - that it wasn't a case in which the plaintiff should have been compensated, because he well and truly knew and appreciated the risks at the time he started and continued with his smoking.

Q: Did that case have a similar effect on cases since, such as Rolah McCabe?

A: Yes, I was involved in that case. I acted for the defendant on the assessment of damages. I came into it to run the trial, which was simply an assessment of damages – in other words, it had been determined that the defendant pay damages. Certainly since that time, the real issue is how do plaintiffs these days get over the fact that warnings have been put on cigarette packs for so long? Juries are at the stage now –

Q: - where they're less sympathetic?

A: Exactly.

Q: Now that I think about it, there have been fewer cases since then. I'm curious: if an advocate wins on behalf of a client, it's been said that the highest praise is that

s/he has the ability to "dress up the wholly unarguable as if it has the scintilla of a basis of reason"?

A: Well, it's the facts that win or lose cases. When I was a junior barrister, I did a case before a County Court judge, Bill Martin, who was a bit of a character and he was pretty good for plaintiffs. I was acting for a child who'd been hit running across a road up in Ballarat. There was a fellow who'd said he'd witnessed it, but we didn't want to call him for the plaintiff, and neither did the defendant, because he was hopelessly drunk at the time. I can't remember all the details. The case was fought and I think the plaintiff must have lost, but after I talked with Bill Martin who asked why that evidence wasn't called. I told him the fellow was drunk. He said to me "An ounce of evidence is worth a ton of tactics." It was a good lesson to learn. You've got to have the evidence, even if it's not the best evidence.

Q: And you've stuck by that ever since?

A: I'm certainly conscious of it. You don't always call the evidence, but you have to have a good reason not to call it.

Part 10 – Readers and Taking Silk

Q: You had a number of readers who've gone to bigger things including (former Liberal Party president) Shane Stone who was famous for describing the former Prime Minister John Howard as "mean and tricky". (Shane Stone) later became the Chief Minister of the Northern Territory and gave himself the title of silk. So, you had Shane….

A: I did – Shane was with me for six months. He gave me this pen-stand. Altogether, I had eight or nine readers, and without exception I enjoyed them all tremendously. It's a wonderful way for the Bar to bring new barristers into the fold. I had very good relations with every one of the readers, and some are still very close, like Jack Forrest and Shane when he's in town, which isn't often these days. They've (all) done very well.

Q: Speaking of taking silk, not everybody does. Ian Hayden said it never entered his mind. You took silk in 1983, the same year as Gareth Evans, another politician.

A: I was ambitious to take silk, because in those days and before then, there was a ladder. You went from doing Magistrates' Court work to County Court work to Supreme Court work. That's what you did, and if you said you wouldn't do anymore County Court work, it was a bit of a risk, and so on, because you might find you didn't get the work you wanted. It's different now because silks appear both in the Supreme Court and the County Court, willy-nilly. But in those days, it was quite a marked distinction. Once you got a lot of Supreme Court work, the obvious thing - for me anyway - was to apply for silk.

Q: And work didn't fall away (when you became QC)?

A: No, I was scared that it would, but it didn't. I had some good supporters, solicitors I'd done a lot of work for over the years, some on circuit – in Ballarat, particularly - and they stood by me, and things just grew.

Part 11 – The Common Law Bar Association

Q: I interviewed Colin Lovitt QC who helped set up the Criminal Bar Association back in 1978, partly because there was a feeling that criminal barristers were like the "poor relations" at the Bar. You have been on the Common Law Bar Association for many years. How long has that been around?

A: I can't remember exactly when the Common Law Bar Association started, but it would have been before (1978). I don't know it did all that much, but when there was a threat by government to bring in changes that would affect the rights of people to bring claims, which the common law Bar was very worried would reduce the amount of personal injury work and remove significant rights to compensation. The (common law) Bar got itself motivated, we had a fighting fund, we advertised and I remember John Barnard (who was then a common law silk) and myself spent quite a lot of time at Parliament House, speaking with Liberal politicians who were then concerned about the proposed legislation. Many of them had no idea how the new laws were going to operate in practice. John was very good at explaining and persuading those politicians in a way that did have a helpful effect, I believe, on the legislation that was subsequently introduced.

Q: Did you subsequently do much lobbying in any similar capacity?

A: Not really. It's been some years when the last one was. We've got a pretty good fighting fund, which hasn't been used for a while.

Part 12 – Concluding Thoughts

Q: Does (your son) practise in an area similar to you?

A: Yes, he does – he's moved into exactly the same sort of work.

Q: But not through any influence of yours? No suggestion whatsoever?

A: No. I deliberately avoided his coming onto the same list. I thought it better for him to do his own thing. He's only ever been my junior once, and that was just this year. He got the brief on his own merit.

Q: Do you ever have arguments over the dinner table over differences of approach?

A: Not really. We do talk about cases occasionally, but he doesn't come to me on any regular basis. I ask him how things are going, pretty much as I do in a social situation with any other barrister.

Q: Do you feel looking back, Richard, that you attained all the things you set out to do? You said earlier that you were ambitious. There still seems to be a bit of fire in your belly.

A: I'm satisfied – others may have a different opinion. I didn't ever want to be anything other than a successful QC in terms of my profession – I didn't aspire to go on the Bench – I didn't think that that was right for me. Yes, I've been satisfed with the way my career has gone.

Q: Have there been changes you welcome or deplore as far as practising in the profession is concerned?

A: I would be regarded as having a pretty conservative approach to the way barristers should conduct themselves, both in and out of court. The idea of barristers self-promoting is difficult to accept. I realise things have changed a lot, and these days one has to sell oneself and that's the way things are, but personally, I feel it's an unfortunate trend.

Q: So, despite (the new-found) touting, word of mouth counts just as much?

A: Yes, I do think so. Very much. Even more.

Q: Richard Stanley, thank you very much.

A: Thank you.

***