

PRESS CONFERENCE

held by

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND AND WALES

(Lord Thomas of Cwmgiedd)

on

Tuesday, 17 November 2015

at

THE ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE, THE STRAND, LONDON, WC2A 2LL

Transcribed from the Audio Recording by
Apple Transcription Limited
Suite 204, Kingfisher Business Centre, Burnley Road, Rawtenstall, Lancashire BB4 8ES
DX: 26258 Rawtenstall – Telephone: 0845 604 5642 – Fax: 01706 870838

STEPHEN WARD (HEAD OF NEWS, JUDICIAL OFFICE): Good morning. Thank you for coming and for anyone who has not been before, I am Stephen Ward. I am Head of News and I am just going to briefly introduce the ground rules for the Lord Chief Justice press conference. The first thing is could you, before you ask a question, put your hands up and if I ask you to ask a question, if you could identify yourself mainly for the transcript which we publish afterwards and, the second point, you can ask questions about any subject you like but you will have to bear in mind that no judge can talk about cases either past, present or future, either his own or other people's. Otherwise, other than that, any subject you like. So I will hand over now to the Lord Chief Justice for questions. Joshua, first question.

JOSHUA ROZENBERG (FREELANCE): Lord Chief Justice, you said on a visit to New Zealand in the summer that significant increases in court fees, together with the cost of legal assistance, is putting access to justice out of the reach of most, imperilling a core principle of Magna Carta and you also referred to the criminal courts charge which we discussed on Law in Action last week. That is the mandatory additional penalty of between £150 and £1,200 on all adults convicted of offences committed since April. With cuts in legal aid and increases in criminal and civil court fees and maybe more to come, will there still be justice for all?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: It has been a long time that people have discussed the balance between what the State should contribute to justice by way of general tax revenue and what the public ought to pay by way of fee. I attempted to trace the history of this in a lecture I gave in Bangor about ten or twelve years ago. So it is a long, long history but the position we have reached now, I think, is quite clear. Fees have been rising at quite a considerable rate. Secondly, legal aid has been diminished and lawyers, the market has been good for them on the whole. Legal fees are now quite high. We also have an expensive process. Lord Woolf pioneered these great reforms and was promised, in 1999, IT. It has never come and, added to that, we have terrible problems in managing the workload. I think that the way forward and the only way forward is reform. Modern technology over the last ten to twelve years has enabled us to change an awful lot of the way we can do things. I think that we can provide a lot more help online to people. We certainly can provide modern forms, part of which will involve controlling the length of what people say. The word count facility which, no doubt, you know much more about than I, is an excellent means of making people concise. We can do online filing. We can do online case management. We can manage the workload better and I hope that the reforms will also enable us to provide in-court mediation in the process of deciding a case and I think if we do all of this, we can reduce the cost to the litigant, either by enabling him to do it himself, or reducing the cost of lawyers, because the process will be much better. We can run the courts more efficiently and my hope and, indeed, my expectation would be that we can contain the rise both in what the general taxpayer has to pay towards the courts, indeed, I think it will reduce it, and secondly, certainly contain the rise in fees but it all is critical to reform and I think I would really say that if we do not get the ability to reform the courts in the way in which we have been looking at, then there is no doubt we will get the cuts anyway. That has been made very clear, for good reasons, by the Government which I completely understand. I think we will drive people from justice because they cannot afford it and we would, therefore, be at real substantial risk of breaching core principles of Magna Carta. That is why reform is absolutely essential.

JOSHUA ROZENBERG: And, Lord Chief Justice, you still do not know whether you are going to get the money that you have asked for.

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: No. Quite rightly, we do operate a principle here where the Government will make its announcements when the Government does and I await that announcement.

GRANIA LANGDON (FREELANCE): On that point, what do you think of the idea of the one percent levy on the top one hundred law firms?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I have always taken the view that the way in which the Government proposes to raise money, if it is by way of fees it is proper for us as judges to comment. If it was by way of charge on the legal profession, I think that is a matter on which the legal profession pre-eminently is suited to talking. At the moment, I do not think we have a direct interest in that, provided we did not put lawyers into a category of person that were too expensive for people to employ. I would anticipate that if there was such a levy it would fall most heavily on those who earn what would be described as quite significant sums and I do not think it would put justice in peril but it is a political matter and it would not be for me to comment. It is a matter for the Government.

CLIVE COLEMAN (BBC): Can I just ask you specifically about the criminal courts charge? Fifty magistrates at least have resigned already because they consider it to be extremely unjust and unfair. They tell stories about defendants who are making a commercial decision whether to plead guilty or not based on the size of the charge they would have to pay in respect of that decision. The Government are committed to review within three years. The Magistrates Association want that review to take place immediately. They want the charge to become discretionary. It is causing a huge amount of concern. What is your view on that?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: When the criminal courts charge was mooted, we pointed out that the only sure area where money would be raised would be from those who commit crimes by way of motoring offences, those companies that commit environmental offences and some rich individuals and those who also have substantial means. It was unlikely ever that if anyone was sent to prison he would ever be able to pay it. I think that the reality of what we said at the time has turned out to be correct. The charge, I do not believe, is raising much money and it does seem to me that although in principle it is right that the financial penalties at the end of a case ought to reflect the ability of someone to pay, the whole thing has to be looked together. If I can give you by way of illustration, for example, at the end of a case there is the victim surcharge, the possibility of paying the prosecution's cost, there is the question of compensation, the question of confiscation. All of these issues need to be considered in the round. We have gone, as quite often happens in the justice system, from adding charge after charge after charge without looking at it in the round and I think it has all got to be looked at in the round. There must be a case for defendants who can pay and others making the contribution but it has got to be looked at in the round.

CLIVE COLEMAN: So it should be means tested.

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I do not know. I am not saying that. I am saying that you have got to look in the round at all the financial impositions that are imposed and actually come up with a proper solution of how a court should approach it and obviously one of the considerations must be the means to pay. There may be other considerations but I would not want to prejudge a proper look at the whole thing. When something has not gone correctly, I think the best solution is to look at the problem that has arisen and the problem is a much wider one.

OWEN BOWCOTT (GUARDIAN): The lot of criminal solicitors has been very confusing, the contracts they are not sure that they have, and there has also been some small industrial action. Are you worried that you are going to increasingly see unrepresented defendants in criminal cases and have you made any provision for telling judges that they should not continue with trials in that case? Many solicitors say that they cannot carry on in the way that things are going at the moment.

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: We are faced from time to time over the past two years with situations where one branch of the profession or the other has indicated that it will not be there to service a case. The position we have always taken is that where a professional person has committed himself to a case, he has a professional duty to go on with it and therefore, for example, if a case had been fixed for a particular point in time and someone wanted to go off to a meeting to discuss whether they should protest, that it not an excuse the courts could accept and what the profession did about it would be a matter for a professional regulator. If we were faced with the position where someone simply could not get legal representation where legal representation was necessary, that would cause a real problem but that problem has not yet arisen and one must remember that the legal market in certain areas is quite soft. So I do not know whether it will arise but the one thing that we are very clear about is that the overwhelming bulk of criminal barristers, or, should I say, barristers who practise in the criminal courts, and solicitors who practise in the criminal courts are people who have great skill, are very honourable and they produce the highest standards of service.

FRANCES GIBB (THE TIMES): The new Investigatory Powers Bill proposes a key role for judges in scrutinising warrants. Do you have any concerns in terms of either judicial resources or the task itself, the difficulty of it?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: As to the judicial resources required, it is the duty of the judges always to do what Parliament requires them to do subject to any advice we might give about the technicalities. As to the resources, we have asked the Home Office to share with us the kind of process that will be required so that we can take a sensible balanced view of it. So I cannot say at the moment whether we will or will not require additional resources. As to the judges being equipped for it, as some of you know I have done some of these cases myself involving difficult issues of national security and in SIAC, the Special Immigration Appeals Commission there is a great deal of assessment a judge has to make. I do not have any worries about the ability of judges to make the assessment provided that the judges have the requisite understanding and the numbers who do it are kept to a manageable number but who rotate on a regular basis. I am always anxious to ensure that judges have wide experience and do not become too specialised in any area.

FRANCES GIBB: There would need to be extra training for them?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I have no doubt at all that, having done several closed cases myself, you do need to understand the way in which a process that is closed works. I often feel I would love to have all of you in to a closed hearing so you could see how fair it actually is. My telling you that will never persuade you, I know, but it is understanding how you conduct a hearing which is closed and the proactive stance a judge in those circumstances has to take and a similar process will apply to warrants. It requires some training and understanding but it is not extensive and most judges are quite capable of doing it.

STEVE DOUGHTY (DAILY MAIL): Reform of family courts. About 15 months ago, we had a consultation paper proposing various reforms including transparency reforms. Since then, silence. Has reform of the family courts been halted? If so, why and, if not, are we going to hear something in the near future?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: Very great progress has been made in making the family courts more transparent. Many judgments are now published and made available. In individual cases, judges might decide that they should restrict the name of experts or the like but the President of the Family Division, I know, is absolutely committed to transparency and in one of the areas which is closely related to the family area, which is the Court of Protection, it is intended at the beginning of the New Year we will run a pilot trying there to make certain that area is transparent also. It seems to me the Court of Protection and the whole problem of us making certain that

those who no longer have their faculties and where you have someone who is acting on their behalf, it is essential that that area is also open and transparent. Over the past year, I had one case which worried me very considerably where I felt very much that the fact everything was closed did not provide the extra assurances of shining the light from the outside which all of you do so successfully.

STEVE DOUGHTY: Could you identify that case?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I cannot. It is difficult for me to go into any particular case.

GRANIA LANGDON-DOWN: Can I ask you have you got concerns about forensic science and expert evidence? I think the forensic science regulator at the minute is investigating some sexual assault cases. There is concern about quality of resources, using experts. I know there certainly was a [inaudible 00:15:59] within [inaudible 00:16:02] on the way. Are you concerned about the quality?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: At the moment, the quality is good. There has been tremendous technical advance in forensic sciences, as one would anticipate, but we are always concerned to make certain that forensic science standards do not slip. In the course of the year, the Royal Society held a conference which was open, and I am sure some of you went, which went through all areas of forensic science and what I found refreshing was that actually we were taking the lead in this. We were taking the lead in setting the standards but also doing it in a way that was practical. Now, you could set up huge numbers of committees to deal with it. That actually does not work. What you need is, I think, close working with the regulator, close working with those at universities to make certain that standards remain high and are looked at and a close interest by the identified community as a whole in ensuring that standards are maintained and, you may recall, about five or six years ago, there were quite considerable concerns about the way in which low template DNA analysis had been introduced. When that was examined scientifically and looked at properly, the problems were dealt with. I hope for the future, any advance in forensic science will actually have scrutiny before we end up with cases where serious question marks arise and we have tried to address this problem with the recent change to DNA-17.

GRANIA LANGDON-DOWN: But is there concern about the [inaudible] or that people are cracking down on [inaudible].

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: So far, I have not detected any evidence that the way in which the service is run is causing a problem. I have been quite forthright in saying that whereas for commercial providers retaining information that is confidential is quite important to their business model, you cannot have that in an area where you are looking at convicting people. You have to have full disclosure and transparency and I think the companies are certainly doing that. We do take a very close interest in forensic science because nothing would undermine the confidence that the public must have in justice if forensic scientists are not one hundred percent capable and one hundred percent honest.

JOHN BINGHAM (DAILY TELEGRAPH): Going back to what you were saying earlier about reform in terms of certification of processes, how far would you like to see reform go in the area of divorce in terms of taking most cases, or much of most cases [all sorts, I do not know? 00:19:00] and would you support a situation where kitchen settlements became the norm?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: There are two separate questions. The first: how do people resolve the complicated issues that relate to money and children that arise when a partnership or a marriage breaks up? It seems to me that the more amicable an arrangement that can be made, the better but, you know, we all know that sometimes that is very difficult and the more the courts can do to help, particularly where you need to avoid the cost of lawyers. One of the things that

always horrifies me is actually how much you can spend on solving those problems through lawyers. As regards the mechanics of the actual divorce itself, it is a matter obviously for Parliament to decide the grounds upon which there can be a divorce but the way in which it is processed, I hope we will be able to make it, that part of it, the formal dissolution of a marriage, as simple as possible.

MICHAEL CROSS (LAW SOCIETY GAZETTE): I come back to the reform question. Obviously, a big part of this is shutting or reducing a number of courtroom premises. Are you confident your colleagues in the judiciary will have places to work?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: Yes. But that is not enough of an answer. There are two particular – and you have got to keep them in mind – two completely separate issues. First of all, because of the way our court structure grew up with magistrates' courts, county courts, crown courts and tribunals, we have lots of buildings in the same town or within the same metropolitan area where, if you consolidate them, you change very little. Secondly, in that process of consolidation the working life of the judge has changed. An awful lot more of the process now takes place by the judge being required to read a great deal so you probably need fewer courtrooms but more judges' rooms. That is a relatively straightforward issue to solve providing you get the money to do it, hence my return to reform. Much more difficult are parts of England and Wales, such as Wales which a large part of it is rural, Cumbria, Cornwall and Lincolnshire are probably the prime examples, where you really do need to make provision for justice locally so that people can actually get to a court. I have said on numerous occasions I see nothing wrong with using public premises for an awful lot of cases where you do not need a court. There are the occasional cases in the magistrates' courts where you do need custody but they are not nearly as many as we currently have and I believe we can use modern technology to take justice back to basics. The great difference is, as you walked into this place, you will have seen boxes and files lining the corridors. If you were to expect a judge to carry all that to a remote location, you are asking too much. If, as is now possible, you can carry it on a memory stick or in the computer, then the whole thing is different and that is why I think technology can make such a difference

MICHAEL CROSS: Just a follow-up, it is years since the Leveson Report on criminal justice reform but what steps have been taken since—?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: Well, we have been quite busy. In two courts, Leeds and Southwark, if you go there in the majority of courts now you will find the judge has no pile of paper on his desk. He simply has a tablet computer and on it he or she will have the case papers and that has been true for... the CPS have had this for some time and it is now extended to the courts and I hope soon to the defence. So we are making that sort of inroad. Secondly, one of the great successes has been the use body-worn video cameras, like with the police. Like everything new, people were a bit worried about them but actually being able to record the evidence of someone within a relatively short time, sometimes within minutes of an event having occurred, you (a) get a more accurate account and (b) a more vivid account and so that is another area where technology is making a difference and we are also, with regard to the legal profession, hoping to do much more in the criminal courts by way of summonses for or orders for directions and the like being done without the lawyer having to come to court because one appreciates actually if a lawyer can stay in his office and be connected to the court, it saves money to the lawyer and hence he can increase his income but the result to the courts will remain the same. So we are hopeful that we can make a big change there.

CLIVE COLEMAN: Can I just press you a little bit on the criminal courts charge because you stress the importance of the ability to pay and you also said that when something has not gone correctly then everything should be looked at in the round. Can I take that to mean that you think

that something has not gone correctly and that there are people are who currently paying this charge who do not have the ability to pay and should not be paying?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I think the problem has arisen in this way. It goes back. We have for a very long time had a principle that the amount that someone should be fined is the amount which he can properly be expected to pay normally within a two-year period. It is normally thought highly undesirable to saddle someone with a debt for longer than that. The difficulty that is arising is if you impose all kinds of charges on someone without an overview of what is the right way to do this, you inevitably will come to cases where you impose amounts on people who simply cannot pay. To go back to something where the figures are much clearer, when you may recall that there was great keenness on fixed penalty notices, amounts that were levied on people, the police would stop someone, a fixed penalty notice was ordered, you clock up £80 and maybe you would have another one and another one and we found in that era that there were people who had very significant sums levied against them for whom there was absolutely no prospect of payment and I think that it is looking at it so that you impose a penalty that is fair, that can be paid off in a proper timescale but which brings home to the person concerned (a) the gravity of his offending and (b) makes a proper contribution to the court system in a way that everyone considers fair and just. That is why, I think and would very much hope, the Lord Chancellor would look at the matter in the round, maybe finding some interim solution to deal with the problems in relation to the criminal courts charge which is what has provoked the problem but it is a much deeper problem.

FRANCES GIBB: Last week, the judge who was sentencing the killers of Becky Watts broke down in tears and I just wondered do you have any concerns with the rise in sex offence cases about the stresses that judges are under or are judges just going soft?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I think that few people have any idea of the sheer depravity to which people can sink and a judge often has material in front of him which cannot but distress people. I mentioned last year a particular terrible case that I did, which I expressed my gratitude to you for not reporting it in detail because it was so horrific, but some of the images of pornography are beyond belief in what they show and it undoubtedly does have an effect on people but there are two things I would say: firstly, a judge will reach the decision in a particular case always in his room and we know, and I think there are people who find, when you actually have to come and deliver a decision, it is a different kind of emotion, that actually the co-rationality which you use when you are deciding what to do, I think that is one important distinction and, secondly, I think it is important... we consider it very important to give judges as wide a variety of cases as possible. The difficulty we face at the moment is that the rise in sexual offending is continuing. I think some people thought that we had a problem that arose because of historic sexual crimes. I think the view now is taken that is not right and that there is an increasing amount of sexual offending relating to what has happened, if I may call it, which is contemporaneous and that is quite a serious problem but we do try and make certain that judges do have as wide a variety of work as is possible. This is not a new problem but it is one that requires much more careful management bearing in mind the increase to which I have just referred.

FRANCES GIBB: Do they need counselling or do they get counselling?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I think that most people find that the collegiality of the judge's life, being able to talk to people, talk it through with their colleagues who see all of this stuff and who have to bear what is sometimes extraordinarily distressing testimony, generally that collegiality, which is the great strength of judicial life, enables them to sustain what are subjects which are really beyond the understanding of most people. Most people simply do not see what a judge sees by the way of the horrors of what happens. One may think of this as, by speaking of it in the

way I have, a massive problem. It is confined to a tiny minority of people but what they do is simply horrific.

JOHN BINGHAM: Just going back a second to the feeling that there actually is a rise in this offending, is that because we are simply becoming better at detecting it or that there is actually a problem in society?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I have no doubt that the way in which we have improved the treatment of witnesses at the police station, by the prosecution authorities and in court, although there is a long way to go with the first two of those, have made people much more willing to take their complaint to court. It would not be for me to say whether there has been a change in social or moral behaviour. My own observation is undoubtedly thanks to, I think, if I may again say so, a focus on this and a great deal more concern, we have made giving evidence, I think, better. Better, it is a horrible experience anyway and I also think that one of the things that I am very anxious we go on with is what we have done in Kingston, Liverpool and Leeds this year which is to enable people to be cross-examined pretty soon after the events in question so that they can move on in their lives, have counselling, etc, yet allow the defendants to have a proper opportunity of cross-examination but nearer the event of the trial. So I do think we are making considerable progress in the way in which we deal with what is, for the complainants in these cases, a very traumatic, serious offence and I suspect that is a factor but whether society is changing is not a matter on which a judge would be wise to express any view. I think that is for others to research.

GRANIA LANGDON-DOWN: I was interested in what your views are on judicial diversity and we need to wait for fifty years to get a more balanced bench?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I made my position quite clear with a speech I made on the judiciary's position in a speech in Leeds. You are right, as I think I said then, there are two things in my mind. One, there is bound to be a huge difference in views about judicial activism but I think there should not be any difference in view in activism done properly in relation to improving diversity and secondly, as I have said, I really do think that a judiciary that reflects society really is very important to people's confidence in justice itself and we are making progress. It may appear slow but it is getting better and we are taking a whole lot of steps to try and improve it. The area where I remain concerned, but I think this is reflective of other public bodies, which is increasing the ethnic diversity and minority diversity of the judiciary.

JOSHUA ROZENBERG: There has been some concern about increased bail limits and people held on bail for a long time. It is usually before they are charged. Do you think that is undermining the process of justice and particularly in sex cases where people, say, they have been left for several years awaiting waiting for the outcome of a trial.

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I think that every case where bringing someone to justice is delayed, there is a sense of concern, both to the person who is complaining and to the person who is complained against. I think it very important that investigations are progressed as quickly as possible and I know the Government has considered time limits. I think to say there is an absolute time limit for doing certain things is impossible because every case will vary but, on the other hand, there is something to be said for holding people to account if, in the particular circumstances of a case, an investigation is taking longer than it should. I see this in various areas. It is the same if someone has disciplinary proceedings brought against them, if someone is subject to one litigation where personal allegations are made against them. The process of the law in all its spheres should be swift and it should start, I have always believed, that if you... you need to go to the end- to-end process, from when the person concerned has been brought within the justice system and then it finishes. Any time limits in between those always enable people to find means of slowing it down but I do think the process of justice is from beginning to end and

keeping an overall view on timeliness is essential but it has to be judged on the facts of any particular case.

JOSHUA ROZENBERG: Can I press you a little further on the subject of the criminal courts charge? It seems clear, from what you say, Lord Chief Justice, that you do not think that the criminal courts charge is operating at the moment in a way that is fair. Now, you are not going to tell us about your private conversations with the Justice Secretary Michael Gove but do you think that there is any prospect of reform of the criminal courts charge in the immediate future and how important do you think it is that there should be?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: It is obvious to anyone who sees what is happening that there is a problem with the financial penalties as a whole. One appreciates that the Government has an awful lots of problems on its hands which come, some of which are anticipated and some of which come out of the blue and one would hope that this is an area where I would hope the Government would address it as soon as possible but in the wider context which I have mentioned because I think that it is very, very important to see the criminal charge as just one further imposition and which needs looking at in the round.

JANE CROFT (FINANCIAL TIMES): I just wanted to ask about the impact that you thought of if the Human Rights Act is scrapped, what you thought the impact would be on certain cases. Is it so embedded already in case law that a lot of that is still going to be taken into account by judges?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: I have been studious in saying that the one thing that the judiciary will not get involved in is the debate as to what the Government intends to do in relation to the Human Rights Act. It is particularly important that the judges... This is a highly political issue and the judges must stay independent of it. I have said this on numerous occasions but, in any event, it would be very difficult for me to say anything now because I do not know what the Government is going to do and so any speculation now is impossible. I doubt whether any of you will persuade me to say anything about the subject at all. I am sorry, I regard the independence of the judiciary from political issues as of paramount importance in maintaining confidence in our independence.

STEPHEN WARD: We have got time for one more question if anyone has one.

JOHN [BINGHAM?]: If I could, what is the current position on the wearing of the full-face veil in court?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: The current position is this. When I had the first of these two conferences two years ago, I thought I had a major problem on my hands. Actually, the last two years have shown that it is not a major problem. There have been no problems but we do have a number of other problems about which you have asked me this morning and so one would love to be able to do everything at once but that is not sensible. So it has actually gone to the back of the queue. At the moment, there is not a problem. We will keep it under review. There are very strong views that are held about it in many countries of the world and we listen to those, we monitor what goes on and we may proceed but if it is not a problem, it may be better just to stay where we are.

GRANIA LANGDON-DOWN: Dominic Grieve was saying at the Bar Conference there is alarm bells ringing that we are at a particular point of the criminal justice system. There is a lot of concern about it being at breaking point. Overall, what is your view?

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: The current position is that we are beginning to bring down the delay in getting cases to trial and that to my mind is the most important thing. You raised in this

the question of long investigations. That is not a matter within my responsibility but the responsibility for bringing people to trial absolutely is and providing we get the resources I hope we will continue to do it but we do need much better long-term planning. I have spoken earlier about the increase in sexual offending. There are also trends of an increase in cybercrime and also one we will obviously anticipate there will be an increase in terrorism cases and so it is important for us to have the resources to deal with it and also to modernise the systems and I think that the report Sir Brian Leveson produced earlier in the year which set out a huge number of recommendations, he did it in such a way that he got consensus on everything that lay within what I would call the procedural process and the report was accepted one hundred percent by the Government. Three are obviously other bits in his chapter ten which he has left to the Government but at the moment, providing we can reform and modernise, taking IT, I am reasonably confident that our criminal justice system will cope with the problems that I can today foresee. Without proper investment, then the picture is very, very different.

STEPHEN WARD: Thank you all for coming and there will be a transcript on the Judicial Office website, hopefully early this afternoon, for you to check your quotes.

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE: My thanks to you always for your great courtesy. Thank you very much.

[Ends]