

19 April 2005

Chief Instice's Chumbers Bakart

Professor K Warner
Director
Tasmanian Law Reform Institute
Private Bag 89
HOBART 7001

**Dear Professor Warner** 

Thank you for sending me a copy of Issues Paper No 7, "Intoxication and Criminal Responsibility". I congratulate you on its depth.

I have always thought that this Court served the State rather badly by its decision in Attorney-General's Reference No 1 of 1996 (1998) 7 Tas R 293. The different views expressed by the five members of the Court did little to solve the problems associated with intoxication and knowledge. As you know, these problems arise on a daily basis in the Court, particularly in the case of crimes such as wounding and causing grievous bodily harm. So, your review of this area of the law and your recommendations are timely.

I am in no doubt that the option to be preferred is an amendment to the Code that would bring the law in this State into line with the common law of Australia as expounded in R v O'Connor (1980) 146 CLR 64. Whilst I do not resile from the argument I advanced in Attorney-General's Reference No 1 of 1996, that the task of the Court is to construe the intention of Parliament, the world has moved on a long way since 1920 (Director of Public Prosecutions v Beard [1920] AC 479) and Parliament should reflect reasoned and settled societal views.

The common law position is consistent with current principles of criminal responsibility and there is no longer any suggestion abroad that adoption of the "O'Connor approach" will result in unjustified acquittals or give licence to drunken criminal behaviour. As the Issues Paper observes at 88, "a drunken intent is till an intent". I think that today's juror understands that very well; that has been my experience.

TELEPHONE: 03 62 33 3442

FACSIMILE: 03 62 31 1918

justice.underwood@justice.tas.gov.au

Thank you for inviting my comment.

Yours syncerely

Peter G Underwood Chief Justice