Australian Law Journal

GENERAL EDITOR
Mr Justice PW Young AO

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Cheryle King

ASSISTANT GENERAL EDITOR

Angelina Gomez

Barrister-at-Law

The mode of citation of this volume is (2008) 82 ALJ [page]

The Australian Law Journal is a refereed journal.

Australian Law Journal Reports

PRODUCTION EDITOR
Carolyn May

CASE REPORTERS

John Carroll

Philip G Claxton

Alan Luchetti

James McGregor

Colleen Tognetti

Christine Tooma Eldabbagh

Adam Weir

The mode of citation of this volume is 82 ALJR [page]

THE AUSTRALIAN LAW JOURNAL

Volume 82, Number 9

September 2008

CURRENT ISSUES – Acting Editor: Hon Paul de Jersey AC, Chief Justice of
Queensland
Chief Justice of Australia 58
Co-operative federalism 58
A national judicial complaints commission
Ensuring a fair trial
A commercial hub 58 Technology update 58
An Orwellian twist 59 Decentralisation 59
All eyes on China 59
Advice for unrepresented claimants 59
A pro bono profession 59
And yet
2 ma y 60 mm.
CONVEYANCING AND PROPERTY – Editor: Peter Butt
Watch what you witness
What is a "use" of land? 59
Running of covenants: A drafting reminder 59
Letter to Editor
PEOPLE IN THE LAW – Editor: Geoff Lindsay SC
Stephen Gageler SC, Solicitor-General (Cth)
stephen suggest se, someter constar (car)
RECENT CASES – Acting Editor: Hon Paul de Jersey AC, Chief Justice of Queensland
Aurukun rape appeals
Enforcing the equity of expectation
Statutory construction 60
Habeas corpus rights for Guantanamo Bay detainees
Legislative intrusion into traditional concepts: "Selling" land and "entering upon" a sale . 60-
Witness anonymity and the right to a fair trial

ARTICLES

ASPECTS OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE JUDICIAL FUNCTION

Hon P de Jersey AC

607

JUDICIAL HONORIFICS

Hon B H McPherson CBE

In a society with a cultural heritage that stresses law as the foundation of legitimate government, judges attract formal marks of respect. Consequently, the judicial honorific "your Honour" is used countless times every day in courts all around Australia. But what is the origin of this practice? Why do we, New Zealand and the United States use, "your Honour", while judges in England and elsewhere in the Commonwealth are addressed as "my Lord"? This article marshals the historical material and offers possible explanations for the difference as it now exists.

614

JUDICIAL REVIEW: THE COURTS AND THE ACADEMY

P A Keane

The decisions of the High Court in NEAT Domestic Trading Pty Ltd v AWB Ltd (2003) 216 CLR 277 and Griffith University v Tang (2005) 221 CLR 99 have been criticised by academic lawyers. Some of these criticisms exhibit a failure to appreciate the forensic context in which the decisions came to be made. Other criticisms reflect a failure to accept that the Administrative Decisions (Judicial Review) Act 1977 (Cth), in providing only for judicial review of administrative decisions "made under an enactment", imposed a limitation on the scope of judicial review which was well-settled by decisions of the Federal Court prior to the decisions of the High Court. And some of the academic criticism of the decisions of the High Court reflects a deficient understanding of the legal milieu in which public decision-making occurs and a failure to appreciate that, when governmental agencies exercise rights which they enjoy equally with private entities, the Act is not concerned with the quality of the decision-making which led to the exercise of those rights.

623

MILITARY COMMISSIONS: SHOULD AUSTRALIA HAVE SOME?

H G Fryberg

During the 20th century, increased attention was paid to how justice is administered by military authorities to people under their control who are not subject to military law or to trial by court-martial. This article examines aspects of the most sophisticated system so far developed, the United States military commission. The current United States model

procedural features are identified and questioned. The article addresses the citile in relation to Australia's current and foreseeable defence strategy		630
INTERMEDIATE APPELLATE COURTS: THE MULTIPLE ISSUES DIL	LEMMA	
Ronald Sackville		
Intermediate appellate courts are frequently presented with appeals raising nof fact and law. These appeals can create a dilemma for the court concerned are reluctant to expend scarce time and resources in addressing issue unnecessary to decide. Yet in a series of cases the High Court has intermediate appellate courts should consider dealing with all grounds of at the decisive ones, to accommodate the possibility that the losing part successfully for leave to appeal to the High Court. An examination of the case the High Court has transformed a specific procedural observation made in the patent case into a general statement of wider significance for intermed courts. The court has done so without fully considering the resource im intermediate appellate courts, particularly having regard to the low numbers civil special leave applications in any given year. This article argues that the should rethink its approach to the multiple issues dilemma in order to available under the patents of the surface o	d. Busy courts es which are indicated that ppeal, not just ty will apply ses shows that he context of a liate appellate applications for sof successful he High Court word imposing	650
BOOK REVIEW		
State Constitutional Landmarks by George Winterton		65
ODITHADV		
OBITUARY Hon John Murtagh Macrossan AC		659
Hon John Murtagh Macrossan AC		659
Hon John Murtagh Macrossan AC		659
Hon John Murtagh Macrossan AC		659
Hon John Murtagh Macrossan AC The Australian Law Journal Reports HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Lawbook Co DECISIONS RECEIVED IN JULY/AUGUST 2008		
The Australian Law Journal Reports HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Lawbook Co DECISIONS RECEIVED IN JULY/AUGUST 2008 Burrell v The Queen (Criminal Law; Procedure) ([2008] HCA 34)	 vofessions and	122
The Australian Law Journal Reports HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Lawbook Co DECISIONS RECEIVED IN JULY/AUGUST 2008 Burrell v The Queen (Criminal Law; Procedure) ([2008] HCA 34)	ofessions and	122 113:
The Australian Law Journal Reports HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Lawbook Co DECISIONS RECEIVED IN JULY/AUGUST 2008 Burrell v The Queen (Criminal Law; Procedure) ([2008] HCA 34)	rofessions and	1122 1113:
The Australian Law Journal Reports HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Lawbook Co DECISIONS RECEIVED IN JULY/AUGUST 2008 Burrell v The Queen (Criminal Law; Procedure) ([2008] HCA 34)	ofessions and	122 113 124 1099
The Australian Law Journal Reports HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Lawbook Co DECISIONS RECEIVED IN JULY/AUGUST 2008 Burrell v The Queen (Criminal Law; Procedure) ([2008] HCA 34)	rofessions and nals; Primary itizenship and	1122 11133 11244 11099
The Australian Law Journal Reports HIGH COURT REPORTS – Staff of Lawbook Co DECISIONS RECEIVED IN JULY/AUGUST 2008 Burrell v The Queen (Criminal Law; Procedure) ([2008] HCA 34)	nals; Primary itizenship and istrative Law; 2)	122 113 124 1099 1114