

Enjoy laughing at the failings, foibles and faux pas of others? Of course you do. Then why not contribute to **WADR?**

By email to [wadr@liv.asn.au](mailto:wadr@liv.asn.au), by fax on 9607 9451 or by mail C/- The LJ, 470 Bourke Street, Melbourne 3000.

# Something to Brahe about

**It's comforting to know that there are some of you out there who obviously have your priorities straight, and know which page of the LJ to turn to first.**

The presses had barely gone cold on the print run for our November column, when we received our winning entry for the Holiday! Celebrate! Competition.

For his prompt reply, Joseph Kelly (pictured centre with colleagues), will be able to sit around the Christmas tree listening to such delights as "Rainmaker Reindeer" and "Surfin' for an Expert late on Christmas Eve" from the "Legal Holidayze" CD. Or maybe it will lead to a festive sing-along at the Christmas party where he works at Garland Hawthorn Brahe? And thank you to the many other avid *WADR* readers who sent us an email, including Roland Muller, Anna Tobin and Rena Padman. A special mention goes to Lawrence Liew, whose subject line, completely disregarding the rules of the competition, read: "I want a copy of Legal Holidayze!"



## We are happy to be able to

spread such comfort and joy, as it appears that in the lead up to the season of merriment, many lawyers are in need of a bit of a laugh.

In the latest survey about the state of minds of employees, those in the legal sector have been portrayed as a sorry lot.

More than half (55 per cent) working in the legal sector are either very unhappy or unhappy in their jobs. Not happy Jan!

A close second, at 52 per cent, were those working in the financial/banking/insurance sector, according to the survey of 6000 employees by Seek employment agency.

And of whom should lawyers be envious? The happiest bunch were consultants, with 39 per cent describing themselves as happy or very happy in their work, followed closely by 38 per cent who work in education/science.

## It often helps to have a sense

of humour and Peter Johnstone obviously still has his. He was still chuckling weeks after his five minutes of fame on Channel Ten's national

television show, *Rove Live*.

It all came about because Mr Johnstone is a member of a large firm (in fact a partner at Blake Dawson Waldron in Sydney).

He was standing for a new, entrenched position for members of large firms on the Law Society of New South Wales Council.

But nobody realised the potential phallogocentric connotations that could be associated with the newly created position until after the election material was sent out.

Mr Johnstone's election pitch to voters was under the heading: "Large Firm Member".

"Kate" from NSW picked up on the double entendre and sent it in to the "What The . . . ?" segment on *Rove*, where it was screened in October.

"My daughter rang me in fits of laughter and said: 'Dad, you have got to turn the TV on'," Mr Johnstone told *WADR*, still chuckling over the incident.

"And then we got a tape of it and it was all very funny. As you can imagine I have copped all sorts of ribbings and emails and phone calls since.

"Someone said to me, 'are you going to sue for defamation' and I

said, "Well, it is hardly defamatory"."

Mr Johnstone, who was previously managing partner of his firm in Melbourne between 1988 and 2000, eventually won the position on Council.

The council position is now referred to as "Large Firms Member".

## And here's a few more laughs

to finish up the year, a couple of amusing stories taken from the Internet and retold in the law journal, *Brief*, in Western Australia.

A motorist was stopped by police at a random breath-testing roadblock, and blew .055. He said: "Well, if you allow for GST, that's OK isn't it?" In typical police-speak, the reply came: "I'm sorry Sir. GST does not apply to the RBT measurements in the state of Western Australia."

Another cheeky motorist was caught by a speed camera and duly received his ticket in the mail, along with the photograph of his speeding car. Instead of payment, he sent the police department a photograph of \$40. Several days later, he received a letter from the police that contained another picture . . . of handcuffs. ●

