"The Advertiser"
November 4th 1898.

if he got through the sixth class at school. (The Treasurer—"Oh, dear, no. There is a big gap." The Attorney-General—"You could not pass the senior public examination yourself.") He would guarantee that the Attorney-General could not pass the seven subjects set out in the Bill as those which a candidate had to pass. The subjects taught by the University were all of them useful at one time or another, and he would vote for the amendment.

Mr. BATCHELOR did not think it would be an advantage to the public to have a great increase in the number of lawyers. The big men would secure the same prices as now, and there would be a lot of others who would get about one job a month, and who would be inclined to make their jobs last as long as they could. Still the examination prior to being articled was too difficult, and it placed a bar against learning the profession. He had no objection to a stiff examination being passed before a candidate was admitted to profession, but there was such a big gap between the State school and the matriculation examination that no child of poor parents could bridge it without gaining a bursary or exhibition, and so he would oppose striking out subsection "A." Let them make the standard of admissions high, but give everyone a chance to get up to that standard.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said a candidate for articles must pass the senior public examination before he could get them. There was a wide gap between the University examination and the State school, and he knew of cases where this gap had been most mischievous and annoying. Why should he and others who were admitted under easy circumstances seek to maintain a bar with which they had not been hampered? It would be most selfish of them to do so. The late Mr. George Ash was a man of no ordinary ability, but the work he had to do in order to gain admittance to the profession was most harassing, and he should never have been asked to undergo it. Before being articled a clerk had to pass the matriculation examination, and he would give a few of the subjects. He had to pass in English history and literature; one of the following five subjects:—Latin, Greek, Italian, French, or German; then one of the following six subjects;—Pure mathematics, and to encourage him he was told that this included the binomial theorem, plain trigonometry, logarithms, and a few other enticing things; applied mathematics, including elementary static dynamics and hydrostatics; chemistry, [botany, physiology, physical geography, or the principles of geology. The students were worse off; they were wasting their time on subjects that would be of no use to them in after life. (Mr. Darling—"I would have been a better man if I had passed the examinations.") The Government did not altogether reject the possibility of the honorable member being a better man. (Mr. Darling—"I wish I had studied them.") Mr. Darling would then have been a professor instead of a corn merchant, and a very useful citizen would be lost to South Australia. He did much better in his present position. (Mr. Darling—"In the corn trade it would be advantageous.") If the honorable member were striving to drive a good bargain it would be of infinite advantage to know something about "The Addled Parliament," "The Barebones Parliament," or "The Instrument of Government." That was the sort of literature he had to study for the purpose of gaining admission to the study of the law. If Mr. Darling were a buyer he could knock 1d. a bushel off the other man if he could "narrate the military events of 1644, or give an account of Cromwell's foreign policy." In English literature the students had to give an account of the ghost of Macbeth, and contrast the character of Macbeth before and after the slaying of Duncan. (Mr. Homburg—"That is not a fair way of putting it.") The University did not say a lawyer must know that, but it insisted that the poor unfortunate student should. The questions he had been reading were those which the candidates for the senior public examination had to answer in 1896. Mr. Homburg had not studied the University calendar, and did not know the sort of rubbish—he used the word advisedly with regard to the law—a student was required to know before he became articled. (Mr. Homburg—"I have studied the calendar. Two of my sons have passed the examination.") Their most successful men had never suggested that knowledge of this sort should be required. People said it was now required in the interests of higher education, but the effect was to keep out of the law many keen intelligences which ought to be in it. There were men in the House who held their own with the best trained minds, and he would like to see them practising the law, but this obstacle prevented them from beginning their studies. The sooner the Bill was passed the better.

Mr. WOOD felt that some examination was necessary. An examination had to be passed before entering the Civil Service. If it were necessary to do away with examinations for candidates for admission as a solicitor it was much more necessary that the Civil Service examination should be abolished, because the Civil Service was more available to the public. A lot of what the Attorney-General had read was not necessary, and a man would be a lunatic to learn it. The view he took was borne out by a little work by Mr. E. B. B. Christian. The Attorney-General was different to all trades unionists, as he was anxious to make any number of lawyers. He had admitted in the Civil Service Bill that an examination was necessary, and it was all the more necessary here. Cheap lawyers would not be able to hold their own with the lawyers of the other colonies. He would ask leave to withdraw his amendment down to subsection D.

Leave was granted, and the amendment was withdrawn.

Sir JOHN DOWNER opposed the clause altogether. Mr. Wood had made a sensible and practical speech; in every business there must be some training. He had previously quoted the view of Bacon, which was the view of every jurist throughout Europe, as to the necessity of sufficient training for the law. In the legal profession the public must repose the greatest confidence, and was it not necessary that its members should have some degree of culture to fit them for their responsibilities. Yet those who protested most in favor of the necessity of skill in matters which affected them more, but were much less serious, wanted to do away with every limitation in the case of the law. Did members desire it to be open to all persons without qualification? (Mr. Batchelor—"No.") Then who were to be the judges of that qualification? He admitted the general capacity of members of this House to deal with everything, but in this instance there was a phalanx of gentlemen who, though firm and strong when their own trades were affected, wished in dealing with a trade they knew nothing about to remove everything that would guarantee that it would be carried on in an honest and straightforward manner. No candidate for admission as a solicitor would be required by this clause to pass any examination prior to being articled, to take any degree or attend University lectures, to submit to any examination in any dead or foreign language, or to serve under articles of clerkship for more than three years. Was there a trade to which a youth was admitted without some test? The scheme embodied in this Bill contemplated the establishment of the legal profession in ignorance and its continuance without education against the experience of ages. These people to whom all personal interests were confided, and to whom the public appealed in the most sacred relations of life, were to be subjected neither to test nor examination, three years' clerkship being all that was necessary. He had no hope of successfully resisting it, because the mere mention of law reform was sufficient to enlist support for the scheme, but he desired to enter his protest against it.

Mr. PRICE said trades unionists had come to the conclusion that there could be no limitation on apprentices, nor was there any assumption now that a man cannot become a full-fledged craftsman unless he has been an apprentice. He was astonished at a representative of labor like Mr. Wood seeking to bolster up the fat man by placing impediments in the way of boys becoming lawyers. He would like to see it arranged that before a mechanic could claim the maximum wage he should have to prove that he is a skilled worker.

Mr. WOOD asked how long it was since Mr. Price and other hon. members blamed Mr. Owen-Smyth for making laborers into painters? Did they not try to restrict the number of apprentices at Islington? Was there not a qualification for engineers? (Mr. Batchelor—"No.") The hon. member knew there was, and a man had to prove himself a skilled workman.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said Mr. Wood's attitude was very amusing. When the Bill was first introduced Mr. Wood did not consider the period of apprenticeship too short, but said no apprenticeship at all was required. Sir John Downer had declaimed against the proposal to do away with the examination before articles, the degree and the lectures at the University, as a return to a state of barbarism, and yet that was the very state of things which obtained from 1836 to 1883. With the exception of Mr. Ash no gentleman had graduated at the University who had a seat in the Legislature. Under the old system men had been admitted to the Bar who had done and could still do good work. Prior to 1883 the term was five years: to-day it was three years. The hard-working clerk in the solicitor's office, who gave most of his time to his master's services, had to take five years to get through, whereas the three years' course man had to dance attendance on University lectures and to fill himself with knowledge which would be of no use to him in after life. The mere fact of taking a degree did not justify them in concluding that the recipient of the distinction had any great knowledge of the law. During the last 15 years access to the profession had been simplified for those who had the opportunity of paying for it without any guarantee being made as regards extra knowledge or experience beyond that secured under the old system. He asked the House to no longer tolerate the continuance of the distinction between those who could not afford to go in for the University and those who could. The concession was enjoyed now by the privileged class, and it should be thrown open to all—rich or poor.

Mr. HOMBURG said the proposal of the Attorney-General would kill the University as far as the training for the legal profession was concerned, and he asked Mr. Kingston to employ his reforming abilities on removing the abuses in connection with the training of students, which he alleged existed. Whilst the Attorney-General wanted to do away with the attendance at lectures and the passing of examinations it was strange indeed that in the Public Service code it was stipulated that no person was eligible for a clerkship in the Civil Service unless he first passed an examination. According to the regulations of the examination held recently each candidate was required to read aloud from a standard author, write a passage from dictation, compose a short essay on some given subject, and show a specimen of his handwriting, while it was announced that for the next examination the text books would be "mathematics, French, Latin, and German, the same as those for the University Junior Examination." (The Attorney-General—"I cannot believe that. To expect boys entering the Civil Service to pass in French, Latin, or German is nonsense.") He was not saying anything about that. He merely pointed out the inconsistency between the Public Service code, and the Law Reform Bill as regards the standard of examinations. The University was our highest school of training and its efficiency should be maintained. If there was anything wrong in the syllabus of examination it should be altered, but they should not seek to destroy that valuable institution by Act of Parliament. It would not be a serious matter to let this question stand over for a year or two, and he appealed to the Attorney-General to wait and try to alter the examinations.

Mr. GILES seconded the appeal of Mr. Homburg. This part of the Bill was not law reform, it was educational reform, and it was of small importance. He supported the simplification of practice and other items of law reform, but there were plenty of lawyers now and it would do little good to admit more. The training was valuable to the minds of the students, even if some of the subjects were not. Many bright young men went from the State schools to the colleges and thence to the University without any cost to their parents except for their keep, so that talented children were not kept out of the profession by the examinations.

Mr. McDONALD said there seemed to be a spirit of bitterness against the University in the remarks of the Attorney-General, and he did not like it. The portion now under consideration was a blot on the Bill. Distinctions had been drawn between lawyers and doctors, but he went to his lawyer with the same confidence as he went to a doctor, and he did not want to lose that confidence. He was surprised to find the Labor members opposing the necessity for examinations when they upheld it in their own trades. He hoped the Attorney-General would accept the amendment.

Mr. CONEYBEER did not agree with Mr. Giles that this part of the Bill had nothing to do with law reform. If they made the avenues to the profession easier it would mean a very substantial measure of law reform, and it would not do any harm to the University to pass the section they were debating. He knew of a bright intelligent lad who worked hard to get into a profession, but because of the unnecessary rubbish he had to learn he was prevented from doing so. There had been a lot of nonsense talked about trades unions, but they never stipulated that a boy should pass an examination before being apprenticed, in spite of the sneers of Sir John Downer. He could mention trades too where the apprenticeship was not more than two years. He hoped the section would not be struck out. It was a step in the right direction, and would remove the barrier that blocked the intelligent son of poor parents.

Mr. POYNTON understood that if the clause were passed they would get back to the state of things prevailing 15 years ago. They had evidence of the utility of that training, for it was then that the Attorney-General, Sir John Downer, the Chief Justice, Mr. Homburg, and Mr. Symon were admitted to the bar. He intended to support the clause.

Mr. KING O'MALLEY, as a tiller of brains for the last 20 years, was glad the Government were going to give the smart boy a chance whether he was rich or poor. Some of the foremost men in America had been without a University training, and a relative, who was a leading lawyer, had told him it was a mistake to go back to dead and forgotten languages. It was a good thing to have a degree if one could get it, but some of the ablest men after memorising all the night failed when they got before the examiner. He had prepared speeches that would have made the Lord Chancellor of England sit up, but he had forgotten them when the time came to deliver them. Mr. Glynn was the only University graduate here who was a great man. The other great lawyers were not graduates. Mr. Symon, the Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Bundey, and the Attorney-General were not University men. Some of the foremost men in the American Senate were plucked. When he had his case with Mr. Moorehead his counsel (Mr. Hamp) did not require to look up musty old books and he got 40 bob. He did not collect it, and the Government ought to pay the money. Any dunce whose father had money could be a lawyer, but the poor boy must stop outside and blacken the boots of the other fellows. Some men, like the late Mr. Ash, could force themselves to the front, but they were exceptions. Mr. Roberts was doing the same thing, and he hoped to see him one of the greatest men in South Australia. In America they had the grand system of everyone going where he liked, and it did not matter whether the poor boys' fathers wore goat skins on their backs or dog skins on their chests. They gave the poor man a show in America, and they ought to do it here.

Mr. WOOD asked the Attorney-General what premium was paid for an articled clerk in a good lawyer's office. (The Attorney-General—"It depends.") He understood it was £400 in the big offices and £100 in an ordinary office. (Mr. Roberts—"You are wrong." The Attorney-General—"Sometimes nothing." Mr. Glynn—"Yes, in a good many cases.") They might take one out of charity. What would be said by trades unions if legislation were suggested interfering with the present restrictions as regards apprentices? Yet if they interfered with the legal profession in the way proposed that would be very probable. Let them then be careful. The greatest bar to admission to the bar was not the examinations but the fees charged for articling clerks.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said this was not a question of trades union but whether all future lawyers should be trained at the University, however competent the master might be to teach an articled clerk. Why should admission to the bar be through the doors of the University? He had no bitter feeling against the University, as Mr. McDonald suggested. He took the greatest interest in the institution and hoped it would prosper. At its head he was proud to say was the old master under whom he served and to whom he was indebted for much. But this Bill did not propose that those seeking admission to the bar should not go to the University. It merely gave a liberty of choice to such candidates, and the public would have the choice after as to whom they employed. He hoped the clause would be passed.

Mr. GLYNN said the point was whether a certain educational standard should be acquired. He did not think it made the smallest difference to clever men, but it did to those who ought not to be in the profession. He thought some of the educational tests were too high, but some such tests had been found desirable. In America, for instance, they had been resorted to and found effective. Here the fact that a man took a degree relieved him in respect to his articles. There was no remission of that sort in England because a man took a B.A. degree. The difficulty here arose through the amalgamation of solicitors and barristers—an amalgamation which he thought was best. In the old country if a solicitor took an LL.B. degree a year was taken off his articles, but if he took fifty LL.B. degrees that would not make him a barrister. Could not the Attorney-General agree to some compromise which would reconcile the two branches of the profession? There should, however, be some inducement for a man to take a degree. Why not have a maximum of four years' articles with three years in the case of the possession of an LL.B. degree? He would rather see a five years' period temporarily established during which Latin would not be required for admission than see Latin abolished altogether, and that language might in the meantime be introduced into the curriculum of our State schools.

Mr. HOMBURG asked the Attorney-General to postpone the clause. He would raise no objection to clause 3. By passing clause 4 this afternoon they would do irreparable injury to the University, and perhaps abolish the school of law. He would vote for subsection A, but he would like to see the University made the school for instruction in law.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the Bill had been on the files a long time, and had been before the House for years. This very clause had been passed time and again since 1895, and they had now been discussing it for four hours. Let the clause pass, and Mr.