

Dear Sir

While recently staying with lawyer friends on a farm in the Southern Highlands, I happened to read a copy of an article entitled 'Juniors' written by one Lee Aitken. The article appeared in the Spring 2000 issue of *Bar News*, a copy of which was hanging behind the door of the outhouse on our friend's rural property.

As the wife of Bullfry QC, I feel compelled to draw the following matters to your readers' attention.

Firstly, my husband vehemently denies the accuracy of virtually all of the claims made about him by Aitken. Bullfry has never met Lee Aitken and was not given an opportunity to comment on the article before it was published.

Secondly, based on inquiries we have made about Lee Aitken, I have to question his credentials to opine on the subject matters of the article, with the following two notable exceptions:

(a) I gather that Aitken is singularly well qualified to ask the question posed in the article as to whether anywhere else but in the legal profession could 'you be overgenerously paid for talking, and drinking coffee'; and

(b) the subject of 'disappearing juniors' is very familiar to Aitken. Some years ago he was involved as junior in Federal Court proceedings in Canberra. Aitken's leader announced his appearance at 10.15am on the first day of the three day hearing. At 10.18am Aitken inexplicably left the court room, never to return. On the final day of the hearing, the presiding judge expressed surprise to Aitken's leader that Aitken had not been sighted since his brief appearance on the first day, apart that is from the fleeting glimpse on the previous night's television news footage showing him entering the ACT Supreme Court in connection with an entirely unrelated matter. Aitken's leader was as surprised as the judge with Aitken's Houdini-like performance.

I also note that the cartoon caricatures of my husband were penned by some individual called 'Poulos'. I know nothing about 'Poulos', but given the remarkable dissimilarities in each of the three portrayals of Bullfry, I hope that Poulos does not give up his day job (whatever that might be).

Finally, Aitken's dismal misunderstanding of the real Bullfry is no more clearly evident than in his claim that I was personally involved in selecting Bullfry's current secretary. The fact is that I

personally have been Bullfry's full-time secretary for many years. This will come as no surprise to your many readers who have similar arrangements with their spouses (and for the same reason that our friends have a rural property in the Southern Highlands).

Yours sincerely,
(Mrs) Alice Bullfry

Dear Sir,

Thank you for drawing my attention to the article of Mr Lee Aitken in the Spring 2000 issue of *Bar News*. I know of Mr Aitken through his work with Maxwell House.

Thank you also for sending me the letter of Mrs Alice Bullfry in advance of publication. Let me say at once that her attack on Mr Aitken was scandalous and everything that your modest correspondent said about my first husband was quite true. He is an ogre.

I also greatly admired Mr Aitken's obvious commitment to a plain English style of prose.

Yours faithfully,
Winifred Bullfry (Mrs)