CRIMINAL LAW JOURNAL

Volume 34, Number 6

December	2010
----------	------

EDITORIAL	
Bail	345
ARTICLES	
Facilitating children to give best evidence: Are there better ways to challenge children's testimony? – Emma Davies, Emily Henderson and Kirsten Hanna	
The purpose of this article is to contribute to debate about how to strengthen the New Zealand adversarial criminal justice system's capacity to facilitate children's best evidence. It reports on the implications of the findings from a two-year research project on child witnesses in the New Zealand criminal courts and alternative practices in Western Australia, South Africa, England and Wales and Norway. Two intractable problems in New Zealand were identified: long average delays before trial; and the use of age-inappropriate and potentially confusing vocabulary, grammar and question sequencing, particularly during cross-examination. The authors contend that improving when and how children's evidence is challenged is in the interests of both children and obtaining best evidence. Other processes, particularly pre-recording cross-examination and the use of specialist child examiners to put the defendant's challenges to the child, offer better hope of ensuring best evidence.	347
Sentencing by videolink: Up in the air? – <i>Emma Rowden, Anne Wallace</i> and <i>Jane Goodman-Delahunty</i>	
A United Kingdom pilot scheme – where defendants pleading guilty to certain offences remotely from a police station are sentenced via videolink – has sparked considerable controversy. Although attracting less attention, sentencing by videolink also occurs in Australia. The enabling legislation contains few guidelines for the exercise of judicial discretion and little is known about the nature and scope of remote – or videolinked – sentencing, or its impact on the sentencing process and participants. This article presents unique findings from an Australian empirical study about uses of videoconferencing in the justice system. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 56 judicial officers, court administrators, court staff, justice department officials, prosecutors, witnesses and lawyers. Responses pertinent to sentencing reflected both the rationale for implementing remote sentencing as well as concerns about remote sentencing procedures. Results indicated that the use of videolinks can alter the nature of sentencing proceedings, but views that technology necessarily degrades the sentencing process or renders it less effective are overly simplistic. Attention to the configuration of the technology and participants, as well as protocols and procedures for videolink use can potentially preserve the essential functions of sentencing conducted remotely. Recommendations on ways to address stakeholders' concerns without compromising the critical features of sentencing	
proceedings are proposed.	363
Sentencing review 2009-2010 – Kate Warner	385

(2010) 34 Crim LJ 341 341

CASE AND COMMENT

Reflections on R v Dobie – Andreas Schloenhardt and Joseph O'Shea	
DIGEST OF CRIMINAL LAW CASES	408
VOLUME 34 – 2010	
Table of Authors	417
Table of Cases	419

Corrigendum

Please note an error in the Case and Comment published in Volume 34, Issue 5, "R v Gouros: Interpreting motivation under Victoria's new hate crime laws", where the author's name was inadvertently omitted. The author is Ms Gail Mason. The production editor apologises for any inconvenience caused.

342 (2010) 34 Crim LJ 341

Submission requirements

All contributions to the journal are welcome and should be emailed to the Production Editor, *Criminal Law Journal*, at LTA.crimlj@thomsonreuters.com for forwarding to the Editor.

Licences

It is a condition of publication in the journal that contributors complete a licence agreement. Licence agreements can be
downloaded at http://www.thomsonreuters.com.au/support/as contributors.asp and emailed with the submission or mailed
separately to the Production Editor, *Criminal Law Journal*, Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited, PO Box
3502, Rozelle, NSW 2039.

Letters to the Editor

By submitting a letter to the Editor of this journal for publication, you agree that Thomson Reuters, trading as Lawbook
Co, may edit and has the right to, and may license third parties to, reproduce in electronic form and communicate the
letter.

Manuscript

- Manuscript must be original, unpublished work that has not been submitted or accepted for publication elsewhere, including for online publication.
- Personal details (name, qualifications, position) for publication and a delivery address, email address and phone number must be included with the manuscript on a separate page.
- Manuscript must be submitted electronically via email in Microsoft Word format.
- Manuscript should not exceed 10,000 words for articles or 3,000 words for section commentary or book reviews.
- An abstract of 100-150 words must be included at the head of articles.
- Authors are responsible for the accuracy of case names, citations and other references. Proof pages will be emailed to contributors but excessive changes cannot be accommodated.
- Graphics (diagrams and graphs) to be grayscale; in .jpeg format; no more than 12 cm in width; within a box; of high resolution (at least 300 dpi); font is to be Times New Roman, no more than 10pt. The heading for a graphic should be placed outside the box.

Peer review

• This journal complies with the Higher Education Research Data Collection (HERDC) Specifications for peer review. Each article is, prior to acceptance, reviewed in its entirety by a suitably qualified expert who is independent of the author.

Style

- 1. Levels of headings must be clearly indicated (no more than four levels).
- 2. Unpointed style is to be used there are no full stops after any abbreviation or contraction.
- 3. Cases:
 - Where a case is cited in the text, the citation follows immediately after the case name, not as a footnote.
 - Authorised reports must be cited where published, and one other reference can be used in addition.
 - For "at" references use media-neutral paragraph numbers within square brackets whenever available.
 - For international cases best references only should be used.
- 4. **Legislation** is cited as follows:
 - Trade Practices Act 1974 (Cth), s 51AC (including in full within footnotes).
- 5. Books are cited as follows:
 - Ross D, Ross on Crime (3rd ed, Lawbook Co, Sydney, 2006) pp 100-101.
 - In footnotes do not use ibid or op cit. Repeat author surname and add footnote reference to first mention.
 - ¹ Hayton D, "Unique Rules for the Unique Institution, The Trust" in Degeling S and Edelman J (eds), *Equity in Commercial Law* (Lawbook Co, Sydney, 2005) p 284.
 - ² Hayton, n 1, p 286.
- Journals are cited as follows:
 Kirby M, "The Urgent Need for Forensic Excellence" (2008) 32 Crim LJ 205.
 - In footnotes do not use ibid or op cit. Repeat author surname and add footnote reference to first mention.
 - ³ Trindade R and Smith R, "Modernising Australian Merger Analysis" (2007) 35 ABLR 358.
 - ⁴ Trindade and Smith, n 3 at 358-359.
 - Wherever possible use official journal title abbreviations.
- 7. **Internet references** are cited as follows:

Ricketson S, *The Law of Intellectual Property: Copyright, Designs and Confidential Information* (Lawbook Co, subscription service) at [16.340], http://www.thomsonreuters.com.au/default.asp viewed 25 June 2007. Underline the URL and include the date the document was viewed.

(2010) 34 Crim LJ 341 343

SUBSCRIPTION INFORMATION

The Criminal Law Journal comprises six parts a year.

Customer service and sales inquiries:
Tel: 1300 304 195 Fax: 1300 304 196
Web: www.thomsonreuters.com.au
Email: LTA.Service@thomsonreuters.com

Editorial inquiries: Tel: (02) 8587 7000

HEAD OFFICE 100 Harris Street PYRMONT NSW 2009 Tel: (02) 8587 7000 Fax: (02) 8587 7100



© 2010 Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited ABN 64 058 914 668 Lawbook Co. Published in Sydney

ISSN 0314-1160

Typeset by Thomson Reuters (Professional) Australia Limited, Pyrmont, NSW

Printed by Ligare Pty Ltd, Riverwood, NSW

344 (2010) 34 Crim LJ 341