

PRESS CONFERENCE

held by

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND AND WALES

(Lord Judge)

on

Thursday 27 September 2012

at

THE ROYAL COURTS OF JUSTICE

THE STRAND

LONDON

WC2A 2LL

---

Computer Aided Transcription by  
Wordwave International Ltd (a Merrill Communications Company)  
190 Fleet Street, London EC4  
Telephone 020-7421 4040  
(Official Shorthand Writers to the Court)

---

Thursday 27 September 2012

**STEPHEN WARD (HEAD OF NEWS):** Good morning. Let me introduce the ground rules. If you could put up your hand and I will indicate who is to ask the question. We have 45 minutes, so there is plenty of time for everybody to ask a question and a follow-up, if we need to.

If I could remind you, it is not possible for any judge ever to talk about an individual case, and we would not expect a judge to talk about anything which is party political or on the grounds thereof. The Lord Chief Justice is not making introductory remarks. It is a general press conference. Let us get started.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Anybody who wants to twitter out, you are very welcome to do so.

**MARTIN BENTHAM (EVENING STANDARD):** You are not going to comment on the details for all the reasons that have just been said, but when people look at cases like the Hamza case and so on -- I think it's taken eight years to go through the whole process; not just here but everywhere else and it is still going to come back on again -- when you are looking at the length of time that extradition cases of that sort, for example, take, and the fact that it's not in anybody's interests, whether the individuals themselves, or the public's, and so on, what message do you think the public get, and does it concern you that people will get the message that the judicial system works in a tremendously slow fashion, which cannot be necessarily a good thing, and is there a way to address that and make it more speedy.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I am not going to comment about an individual case, but any case that takes eight years through a whole series of judicial processes to come to a conclusion -- and you make the point that it has not yet come to a conclusion -- is a source of real fury to me. We really cannot have cases taking that long to reach a solution. It is not fair to anybody. It is not right. That is really all I can say about it. As to what will happen to this particular case, I know the hearing is fixed for Tuesday of next week. It cannot be quicker. I do not think, if you go through the processes, you will discover that the delays in that particular case, or in many like it, are actually to be levelled at the doors of the courts here. I cannot remember when -- I was one of the judges who decided that case in the extradition proceedings. Was it 2007? So far as we were concerned, that was the end of it. That is really all I can say.

**STEVE DOUGHTY (DAILY MAIL):** A semi-follow-on to that. It does appear as if the real Supreme Court in important cases (like the one we are not mentioning here, and another recent case, the one involving the resolution of Christian rights to display their faith) are no longer settled by the Supreme Court in London, but in Strasbourg. Is Strasbourg now the real Supreme Court? It does seem to have the most important cases. Is that something you regret?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Well, I do not agree with the premise. The Human Rights Act is absolutely unequivocal in its language. It

requires our courts to "take account" of decisions of the European Court in Strasbourg, and, properly applied, that means that the decisions of the European Court are not necessarily binding on our courts. It is inevitable that cases which involve the interpretation of the Convention will end up -- go to the European Court for decision. But, as I said, the Human Rights Act itself is quite unequivocal in its language -- and, if I may say so, that is as it should be.

**DAVID ALLEN GREEN (NEW STATESMAN):** For disclosure, I was solicitor for Paul Chambers in the appeal that was before you. A question about social media. The Director of Public Prosecutions is now consulting on guidance as to how to prosecute cases which involve social media. Both the Association of Chief Police Officers and the Police Federation have raised concerns, at least in respect of resource issues, about being asked to understand and prosecute cases which involve social media. Is there any chance that the judiciary will take an initiative in either providing guidance by means of a Practice Note, or by training through the Judicial Studies Board, so that judges can understand social media better than they appear to do generally at the moment?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Well, again, I challenge your premise. What is your evidence? Judges have training. Social media is something we all live with. Everybody in this room is living with it. I suspect everybody in this room is learning about it as we go along. If there is a case in which issues about the social media arise, then

the judges would expect to be properly informed about the issues as they apply in the social media aspect of the case by the people who appear in the case in front of them, so that if there are any gaps in their own knowledge, they are filled. I do not think we had much difficulty understanding the issues in the Paul Chambers case which you have identified, which were very simple.

**DAVID ALLEN GREEN:** The Paul Chambers case took two and a half years and eight hearings before it came before a Bench which showed that they understood social media. So that by itself provides --

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** That is a fair point.

**DAVID ALLEN GREEN:** -- evidence, and, as a premise, the fact that it is new and knowledge about social media will at this stage be uneven, and given that the DPP, ACPO and the Police Federation all acknowledge that there needs to be a better understanding of it, surely the judiciary also could see if there is any way forward in actually ensuring that judges know as much as they can do and not have to rely on submissions by counsel.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** There is a limit to the resources that are available for judicial training. If the Lord Chancellor gave me a blank cheque, I could think of lots of things to spend money on. But there are actually cases involving sexual violence, or sexual pressures. We need training in that rather more, I suspect, than we need training in social media issues. There has to be a balance.

But where there is a gap in the basic understanding of judges of any aspect of the legal system, I would then expect the Judicial College to address it. Now, I do not know -- if I had known about the question, I would have found out -- I do not know whether the Judicial College is currently making arrangements for further training on the issue of social media. I do not know. But I am quite sure that if that appears to be a gap in our knowledge, it will be addressed. But it is an issue of priorities, and they have a limited budget.

**DAVID ALLEN GREEN:** Thank you.

**DANNY SHAW (BBC):** Can I ask you about burglars and householders who use force against them?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Yes.

**DANNY SHAW:** There have been a couple of high profile cases in the news recently. There was a case yesterday in which a judge when sentencing said, in effect, to the burglars who were wounded, "That is the risk you take if you burgle someone's house". I know you won't comment on the cases, but do you echo those sentiments? I know that you have issued directions before that have been quite tough on burglars.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I am very happy to say what I have said time and time again. I take a very serious view about an offence of

burglary. Burglary of a home -- whether it is a grand mansion or a very modest one-up, one-down -- is always an offence against property; but, more important, it is an offence against the person. It is not a matter of being sentimental; it is a matter of how people feel. When you are at home, you want to feel safe; and in my view you are entitled to feel safe and secure. You want the streets about your home to be safe obviously, but I think that your home is (to use words which have been used by judges for hundreds of years now) -- this is your haven, this is your refuge. This is where you have the right to be safe. The burglar takes your property. But even if you are not at home when he takes very little property, there is a sense of violation and it destroys peace of mind; and if your peace of mind in your home is destroyed, you have lost something immensely precious. That is why burglary is always serious. We have said for years -- a predecessor of mine 400 years ago said that your home is your castle. That is what he is reflecting: this is the place where you pull up the drawbridge and the moat makes you safe. Some of you will remember William Pitt (the elder) talking about the poor man in his frail cottage. The roof may leak. It shakes. The wind can blow through it. The rain will come in. The storm will come in. But even the King of England cannot enter. That is the King of England entering. That is not the King of England entering as a burglar. Your home is your safe place, and so burglary is always serious. If your home is burgled and you are in there, you have the right to get rid of the burglar. Then, of course, it all depends on what it is that you are facing and what you fear. The other feature that we have to remember is that I know -- and I am not talking about

individual cases, but I know of cases, and I do read the newspapers occasionally it looks as though the householder is the criminal. Well, the householder is not in a position to exercise calm, cool judgment. I suspect if any of you have come home to find a burglar in your home, or have been in bed at night -- or indeed having an afternoon snooze and found a burglar in your home -- you are not calmly detached. You are probably very cross and you are probably very frightened -- a mixture of both -- and your judgment of precisely what you should or should not do in the circumstances cannot, as another predecessor of mine (Lord Lane) said, you cannot measure it in a jeweller's scale. You have to face the reality of how people are and how people react to these situations -- and justifiably react. I am saying no more than I have said for years now. I will add to it. When I started at the Bar, which is more years ago than I care to remember, a lot of media correspondents -- and I do not mean reporters, but pundits -- used to write long articles about "judges defend property rights when they send people to prison for committing burglary, and they really should not pass such long sentences for burglary". I have never regarded it -- and judges never regarded it -- as an offence against property only. It is an offence against the person. That is how we have to approach these offences.

**DANNY SHAW:** Do you think the law provides adequate protection for the householder in those situations where they are disturbed by an intruder?



**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Yes. I think you can phrase the law in all sorts of different ways, but the reality will end up being that the householder is entitled to use reasonable force to get rid of the burglar and that in measuring whether the force is reasonable or not, you are not doing a paper exercise six months later. You have to put yourself in the position of the man or woman who has reacted to the presence of a burglar and has reacted with fury, with anxiety, with fear, and with all the various different emotions which will be generated, and who has no time for calm reflection. I could go on, but if I went on we would have nothing else to talk about.

**OWEN BOWCOTT (THE GUARDIAN):** There was a Council of Europe report the other day which suggested that Britain was way out balance with other countries in terms of the diversity of its judiciary, suggesting that Armenia and Azerbaijan only have few of their own judges and obviously there is a lot being done to address the problem of changes in the law and provision being made for more flexible working time, but some people have suggested that maybe at some time if the balance does not change, more radical measures are necessary. Do you take that view?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Well, I challenge the way in which the Council of Europe report has been produced, because for a start it ignored 27,000 magistrates. We have 27,000 members of the public who sit in judgment and they have power to send people to prison. They are, in effect, junior judges. If you take the magistracy into account -- and they do have these judicial powers -- then actually

our statistics are about 50 per cent. Now, if you exclude people who do exercise judicial functions from a piece of research like that, you are not actually comparing like with like.

That said -- I would not want you to think that is the end of the answer -- of course I am concerned about the fact that the Bench -- particularly at the higher levels -- does not have a broader representation of women on the Bench, and indeed men and women from the minority ethnic communities who are part of our community. I have spent quite a lot of my time trying to change that. But we are turning a tanker around, and it takes time. You can only appoint people by selecting from those who apply. 11 per cent of the Queen's Counsel in this country are women. That means 89 per cent are men. Solicitors who are partners in solicitors' firms, who are women, amount to 25 per cent -- that is 75 per cent men. It would be surprising if you had a Bench which was not inevitably affected by those sort of statistics when you are choosing from lawyers to become judges.

I am going to make a slightly controversial point. What is our society like in relation to the opportunities given to women and the appointments given to women? If I ask a rhetorical question: how many editors of national newspapers are female? How many editors of provincial newspapers are female? How many directors of large companies are female? In that sense the judicial system is -- I am not happy about it, but it is, in fact, reflective of our society.

There is, to deal with the final point in your question, this absolute principle, as far as I am concerned, that the only basis for appointment to the Bench must be on merit. I simply do not see how anybody can countenance the possibility of having quotas: "We will have more women because they are women. We will have more people from minority ethnic backgrounds because we must have them". Litigants expect their cases to be decided by the best quality people. I think it would be insulting to women -- or to any minority -- to say: "We are going to appoint you as part of a quota". I think most of them would feel insulted. I certainly would. I think that is rather a long answer to a very important question. But I want to end by saying: believe me, I am extremely concerned and unhappy about the proportion of women and people from different minorities who are not represented on the Bench, and, as I repeat, I spend a lot of my time as Lord Chief Justice trying to address that problem.

**NICK HILBORNE (SOLICITORS JOURNAL):** I just wanted to ask you, do you think you can come to an agreement with Chris Grayling about judges' pensions?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Well, I hope so. There is no reason why we should not. But he was appointed last week -- or the week before last now. The proposals from the Lord Chancellor about judicial pensions came to us in July and there has to be a long conversation about it. I hope you will understand why I think it would be totally inappropriate and indeed somehow rather disrespectful if I now conducted a negotiation with the Lord Chancellor in the course of the

Lord Chief Justice's press conference. But the answer to your question is: I see no reason at all why we should not have a sensible discussion about these issues.

**MARTIN BECKFORD (DAILY TELEGRAPH):** New Ministry of Justice figures show there being a fall of about 25 per cent in the number of cases coming to court since 2004. On that basis do you think there is any need for plans to open courts at weekends?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I think that if by opening the courts at weekends we got a more efficient system, there is a great deal to be said for it whether the figures are going up or down. The real problem with having courts open at weekends, save at crisis time, is that -- actually it would largely be magistrates there to sit. But you have got to get the defendant there, and the prosecution witnesses, and the police, and the CPS and defence lawyers. If the defendant is in custody, you have to get him out of custody to get him to court, and that involves transporting him. So there are actually a significant number of difficulties about having weekend courts. But, as a matter of principle, why not? If it can be done in a realistic way, then I am quite sure that it would be done.

**MARTIN BECKFORD:** Apart from magistrates, can you see Crown Court Judges wanting to sit?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Well, it depends. If they have a rather difficult rape case to prepare for the Monday, they tend to spend

their weekends reading up for that and preparing it. So they will not be available to sit. But the Crown Court system does not work with judges alone. The same problem arises, only more so because many more of the defendants who come to court are people who are in custody. How many jurors are going to want to sit in the Crown Court on a Saturday or a Sunday? They will not. And what is more, it being a heavy responsibility anyway, we really should not think of forcing them. So there are significant problems about the suggestion. I do not think you are making a suggestion actually; you are simply asking a question, are you not?

**MARTIN BECKFORD:** Yes.

**FRANCES GIBB (THE TIMES):** Can I ask you about the indeterminate sentences for public protection? I wondered whether you thought something was needed in its place. Also can you say how concerned you are about the number of prisoners who are now in prison, who have served their tariffs and cannot be let out, and what should be done about them?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Well, the sentence of imprisonment for public protection sounded very much better than it was because there were various problems with the legislation, like an automatic assumption that such-and-such would follow. But let us ignore that for this purpose. The imprisonment for public protection was designed -- and John Halliday was the person who suggested it; part of his proposal was: "Yes, they are dangerous to the public. They

must not be released until they are safe. But there must be a system in prison to make sure that they are trained, educated -- whatever it is -- receive the necessary treatment to address the reasons why they present a danger to the public". What happened was that we got the IPP, but the Prison Service never got the resources. So you ended up with a system in which people were sentenced to -- for the sake of argument, in those days it could be very short sentences -- 28 days for spying on a couple having sex, followed by an IPP, because the statutory presumptions applied, and then staying in custody for a year, two years, three years. So we then got rid of bits of it -- ie, it had to be a sentence of not less than four years. Nevertheless, people stayed in custody long after the expiry of the time which represented the punishment for the crime they had committed, and was designed to deal with the safety issue. I do not think it is satisfactory to have a system in which we keep people in prison, unless they are seriously dangerous -- obviously that is a completely different matter and you still have the life sentence, and it is a life sentence which has to be part of the sentencing armoury. But as to IPPs, we seem, at last, to be getting them into better shape.

**FRANCES GIBB:** But do you think -- I mean, they are going to get rid of that provision -- do you need another sanction to deal with those kinds of prisoners?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** No, because if you commit a serious offence, particularly an offence of violence -- and that includes sexual

violence, of course, -- the sentence ought to be a very heavy sentence. If there is evidence that, having committed this serious offence perhaps for a second time, that actually you are a serious danger to the public, the court is then left with the life sentence option. Then you pass that sentence.

**JOHN HYDE (LAW SOCIETY GAZETTE):** There are going to be significant changes to the legal aid regime from April. Do you foresee an increase in litigants in person? Is that a concern to you? And is there anything the judiciary can do in terms of training to help the process run more smoothly?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Yes, I am concerned about it and there has already been a significant increase in the number of -- I am sorry, it is politically correct now to say "self-represented litigants". Okay? I am sorry, but it is nice to be a judge who is being politically correct. It undoubtedly increases the burden upon the judge. Let us think what the judge has to do. Normally speaking, he has two sides, both represented. He listens to both sides and he (or she) draws a conclusion. With a self-represented litigant the judge actually has to help one of the litigants and say, "Well, maybe you should take this point", or, "Maybe what you are trying to say is this". That presents a great difficulty, because the person who is represented is sitting there thinking, "Well, whose side is the judge on? The judge is on the side of the self-represented litigant". So this is an extremely delicate balance, to make sure that the self-represented litigant is getting justice and doing justice to his own

case, without simultaneously upsetting, and understandably upsetting, the litigant who is represented into thinking the judge has made up his mind against them.

Where you have two self-represented litigants, life becomes very difficult indeed, and up and down the country, particularly in civil cases, district judges up and down the country have long lists in which both sides are now self-represented. The cases take much longer and they are much more difficult for the judge. The judge, contrary to some popular idea, does not know all the law. He does not go into court with 25 cases in his list and know the law applicable to every case. He does not. He needs help. He needs to be shown where to find the law. And so district judges in particular in the civil courts have lists of cases in which both sides are self-represented. That undoubtedly slows the process down, and it makes it more difficult for the judge. That is the short answer -- or the long answer.

**JOHN HYDE:** And is there more chance of that from April?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Yes, of course.

**STEVE DOUGHTY (DAILY MAIL):** Following the killing of two police officers in Manchester earlier this month, there was a certain amount of talk about the death penalty. Do you have any sympathy with course of the return of capital punishment.



**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I think that is a topic of such sensitivity on which so many people have different views, Mr Doughty, I do not think I should answer that question. It was a good try.

**MARTIN BENTHAM (EVENING STANDARD):** In the Clinton case, in the appeal -- the second appeal, you will remember, I am sure --

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Yes.

**MARTIN BENTHAM:** You mentioned in the appeal hearing that you were concerned that in the initial trial there had not been QCs appointed by the CPS.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Yes.

**MARTIN BENTHAM:** Is this a general concern? It seems to me that there are not enough -- the CPS, because of cut-backs and so on, for whatever reason, is not often enough appointing QCs and therefore having the most skilled people, and therefore the defence does not necessarily have the ability to appoint a QC either, potentially, and that leads to less effective justice than might otherwise be the case.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** In our adversarial system high quality advocacy on both sides is more likely to produce a just result. I am not going to comment about Clinton, for all the reasons I am not allowed to comment about any case. But where there is a new bit of

law which is difficult -- and, believe me, the new law of provocation was difficult -- it is sensible for a top-flight lawyer to be appointed to deal with the case. Now, it may be, after a year or two, when the law has settled down and we all know what Parliament actually meant by the statute, that it is not necessary. But where you have new criminal justice provisions which do change the law, or appear to change the law, generally speaking you get a better answer if you have a good quality advocate.

**MARTIN BENTHAM:** And are you concerned that cost-cutting is leading to too many cases where that is not the case from the CPS point of view?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Well, there is a problem, is there not? Everybody knows perfectly well -- and I remember saying it at one conference, and I was told I should never have said it -- the country is in a financial mess and it has now been recognised. Every single body of people recognises it and says, "Yes, we have to be sensible and parsimonious and save money", and so on so forth, "for everything except me." Everybody can say, "Yes, very sensible, but not for hospitals, not for ...." -- you name whatever it is their interest is. So, yes, I would say I am very concerned, but if the Director of Public Prosecutions has no money, he has no money. That is the reality. It does not mean I like it, but I have to face the reality that the country is in a financial mess.

**DAVID ALLEN GREEN (NEW STATESMAN):** How closely have you been

following the Leveson inquiry?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I have been following it by reading the newspapers.

**DAVID ALLEN GREEN:** Not the transcripts or any other materials?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** No. That is the question. Do you want to say anything else?

**DAVID ALLEN GREEN:** No, that is just the question I wanted to ask. Because it is a judicial inquiry set up to deal with a whole range of sensitive issues, including ones which the Prime Minister himself has put before the inquiry, it has been an interesting exercise to see how a judge can actually deal with that sort of matter, and I was just interested, given that it is in a way a bit of an experiment to put a judge in charge of an inquiry on such a sensitive issue, and that you were responsible for proposing Sir Brian Leveson for the appointment, I was interested how much of an interest you have taken of it as a consequence.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I have taken a very close interest in it, but I have certainly not read a single page of transcript. But I think I am fairly well known to be a passionate believer in a free press. I feel deeply about it. This is an essential ingredient in our society. It is as important as an independent judiciary. I recommended Lord Justice Leveson to the Prime Minister because I know

he takes the same view. What the result of his recommendations will be, having heard months of evidence, I do not know. But at the end of it what he will be doing is making recommendations. He will have no power to change anything. It will be for Parliament to decide whether it wishes to change anything and, if so, what changes there should be.

**DANNY SHAW (BBC):** Can I just return to your fury about eight years to resolve a legal case? I think actually the case of Khalid Al Fawaz has actually taken fourteen years since he was first detained.

What could you do, if you were asked to advise on streamlining the process and speeding up these cases, what practical steps do you think could be taken to do that, and do you think there is a point at which you actually have to limit the number of appeals -- you actually have to say: "You can go to the Court of Appeal, but no further"?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Well, there is a limit on the number of appeals. The problem is not that there is not a limit on the number of appeals; the problem is that new points keep coming up. New points are taken and then they go through the process. What you need is a process in which all the points that need to be addressed are addressed once, then there is an appeal process, and then it comes to an end. Any case that takes eight years -- I was not actually focusing on that particular case -- any case that takes eight years -- unless there is some extraordinary explanation, like the parties do not want it, they are not in a hurry and so on -- is unacceptable.

People have to live their lives, and they have to live their lives knowing where they stand. In those sort of cases -- alleged terrorist cases -- well, actually there is a great public interest in disposing of them, fairly, justly, but with speed.

**MARTIN BENTHAM (EVENING STANDARD):** One final thing on waste of money and so on -- or potential waste of money -- on the issue of legal aid, does it disturb you when you see offenders with large restrained assets appearing before you receiving legal aid as a result of that?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I do not mind them receiving the legal aid. What I mind about is them keeping the assets afterwards, and not having their assets used to pay for their legal aid. In other words, it usually happens that there is an examination of means. If there is an examination of means -- which is not a police inquiry -- but if the examination of means appears to show that there is a shortage of money, then I expect there to be legal aid. But if, after the trial is over, it emerges that the defendant is absolutely stashed with cash, then I would expect the cost of his defence to be paid out of his stashes of cash, save to the extent that they are the proceeds of crime, in which case they should be confiscated.

**MARTIN BENTHAM:** And are you concerned that that does not happen effectively enough?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I am not aware of it not happening effectively enough. But if it does not happen, it should.

**JOHN HYDE (LAW SOCIETY GAZETTE):** Do you have any reservations about cameras, albeit tentatively, being allowed into court? And have you voiced them to the government?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** No, I have not because I do not have any -- I have concerns, but they are concerns which I have thought about and decided to regard as not serious. So the legislation is going through that will enable proceedings in the Appeal Courts to be filmed. As I said, I think last year, whether you are going to think it is a wow a minute is another question. I am not sure I think it is always highly entertaining. But as to further changes, the Courts and Crime Bill, which is currently going through, and presumably will be enacted, though that is for Parliament to say, any further changes to the system will require the consent of the Lord Chief Justice, as well as the Lord Chancellor, and any further changes to the system will have to be examined with only one single criterion in mind, and that is whether by letting the cameras into that part of the process, the administration of justice is likely to suffer. If it is, then we cannot have it. If it is not, then we should. This applies to all modern technology - after all, television is only former modern technology -- it applies to twitter, it applies to everything. You examine modern technology. Technology which we in this room have not yet even begun to think of, which will come in the next five years, and each time the question is: Will this damage the administration of justice? If not, fine, so people like you can twitter out of court, because there is no danger to the administration of justice. If

there is a danger, then we must not let it happen.

**FRANCES GIBB:** Very briefly, just one last question on social media.

Do you get a feeling that the law is struggling to keep up in terms of contempt and what people can say and what they cannot say, when cases should be prosecuted? I mean, I know we are going to get the guidelines from the DPP and it is going to go on to debate, but what is your view on it?

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I do not think we are struggling, but I do think that the pace at which these changes are coming is actually catching the whole of society on the wrong foot. So I do not think we are struggling, because in the end we have to ask ourselves the same question time and time again: How does this impact on the administration of justice? I think systems of justice have to be -- I am not talking politically -- conservative. You just have to give things time to develop. You have to watch out for the law of unintended consequences, or unforeseen consequences. So we do not need to be in a rush to show off and say "We are ahead of it", or even necessarily that we are entirely abreast of it. But we do need to follow it, to make sure that what it can add to improve the administration of justice is added, and what it may damage is omitted.

**STEPHEN WARD (HEAD OF NEWS):** Thank you everybody for coming and for your questions.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Thank you all.

---