

# Restaurant Reviews

## Food with a View

Readers may recall an earlier review of the Dining Room at the Cricketer's Arms Hotel. Merroneys at The Quay apartments first floor is the latest and up market venture of this stylish restaurateur.

The views of course are stunning, the food absolutely first class. The House champagne by the glass was Laurent Perrier, the White Jarra Hill, the Red Penfolds Kalimna 1986.

Old Paul Merroney favourites such as raw beef with deep fried onion rings, fish and chips (thick and perfectly cooked) are interspersed with new and exciting ideas.

The party of the second part had chilled asparagus soup creamy and rich followed by fillet of pork roasted with garlic shallots and peas. I had roast tomato and spring onion salad dressed with a light virgin olive oil and white wine vinegar and superb. Then a rare sirloin in a pool of brilliant bearnaise sauce with fresh tarragon and a brown sauce underneath, with just the so special House chips.

The Downside? Very noisy at 9.30 pm on a Thursday night. It is bright and modern and sound just reverberates. Carpet, wall hangings and some plants would help.

The service was superb and \$100 for two including drinks seemed very reasonable. Book early: this classy join is doing very well and it took three attempts to get in for my second visit.

□ John Coombs

## Celestial

15 Bligh Street, Sydney

Cuisine: Chinese (mainly Cantonese but also a Peking & Szechuan style).

Phone: 233 3871  
Cards: AX BC DC MC VC  
Hours: Lunch - 12.00 pm to 3.00 pm Mon-Fri  
Dinner - 5.30 pm to 10.30 pm Mon-Sun

Norwich House conceals a secret deep within. However the secret to which I am referring is not a well kept one as anyone venturing in during the "short adjournment" will find. The secret is the Celestial Restaurant which is proving popular with city diners and deservedly so.

Members of the Bar have traditionally shown support for Chinese restaurants; Harmon's V.I.P. and the Emperor's Choice (latterly known as "The Emperor Strikes Back") come to mind. Certain barristers may have fond, if perhaps hazy, memories of long Friday lunches at those establishments. The Celestial is no exception and hospitality abounds.

The Celestial has successfully completed its first 12 months of trading (usually the most hazardous for new restaurants) and continues to win new custom.

Diners entering from Bligh Street could be excused for thinking that they were proceeding into the basement carpark. It is necessary to descend two flights of stairs to reach the bar and dining area. For first timers the trip can be spectacular.

Inside the building the owners have recreated an ornamental garden complete with waterfall, lake and tea houses. It

is possible to dine either overlooking the lake, in an elevated teahouse, in private rooms or in the main dining chamber. All preferences are catered to as well as all tastes.

The food is moderately priced for a Chinese Restaurant in the City and the value is enhanced by the elaborate surroundings and the efficient and attentive service. House specialties include butterfly king prawns (\$16.80), pork spare ribs with plum sauce (\$11.50) and special sizzling steak served with piles of sliced onions (definitely not for those returning for a conference!). For the more adventurous gold and silver fish (ie: coral trout fillet stir-fried with snow peas) or fried frog legs are available.

The wine list is modest in reds although more extensive in whites with the median price around \$22.00 per bottle. As usual the Chardonnays are expensive given the quality but bargains may be found among the varietals. I leave the choice to readers.

My tip is to go there and experience the sensation.

□ Stuart Diamond

## One Question Too Many

*The dangers of asking one question too many in a fairly common situation were emphasised by a ruling on evidence recently given by a Federal Court Judge sitting in Brisbane. In the course of a section 52 case, the applicant had annexed to a long affidavit by its managing director a photograph which was particularly injurious to the defendant's case. The affidavit innocuously said that a photograph of the subject property as at a certain date was annexed and marked with the letter "Z". When counsel for the respondent objected on the ground of hearsay, the Judge ruled that admissibility of the photograph should be deferred in order to see whether it was within the witness's own knowledge. The witness was not asked about the matter by counsel in chief but counsel cross-examining asked the following questions:*

Q. Did you take the photograph being exhibit "Z"?

A. No.

Q. Have you ever seen the building the subject of that photograph?

A. No.

Q. Indeed, have you ever been to Cairns?

A. No.

Q. So when you said in paragraph 38 of your affidavit that annexure "Z" was a photograph of the shop taken on 18th August, that was just what someone had told you?

A. Yes.

*He then objected to annexure "Z".*

*Sydney counsel for the applicant successfully argued that, although the photograph was quite inadmissible until ten seconds ago the last question got it in. The last question was objectionable on the basis of hearsay but, counsel for the applicant not having objected, the hearsay was in and the photograph was therefore proved.*

*His Honour (we think correctly) admitted the photograph on the basis of the last question.*

*Bar News would be interested in any comments as to the correctness of the ruling. It stands, however, as a warning against asking one question too many in a situation where this is frequently done.* □