

should be under the tuition of a single lecturer is scarcely consistent with the dignity of any department of advanced education. Even at our own University, excepting in the peculiar case of the course in music, the Law School is singular as regards its scheme of lectures, and the obvious suggestion is that as soon as possible additional lecturers and more frequent lectures should be provided. The curriculum through which pass our future lawyers is already the one most fully furnished with students, and as gentlemen of the long robe are identified with the gravest concerns of business and social life, and also are numerically so strong in the political world, the Law School of the University is the one which promises to impress itself most directly upon the people. This being so it is entitled to receive generous treatment; and if the University itself cannot afford to find more lecturers the attention of wealthy colonists who intend to help forward the local *alma mater* may well be turned to the endowment of lectureships in some of the departments of the law degree. Men of wealth in the colony have made their gains by the practice of the legal profession; and possibly some of these, if their attention is turned to the matter, may feel moved to help in honoring the calling which has showered its favors on them by assisting to raise up a body of liberally-educated gentlemen to take their places in coming generations.

The endowment of a single lectureship ought fairly to be within the means of some of the leaders of the profession. And given the necessary remuneration there need be no difficulty in finding lecturers. There ought to be, and are, lawyers here who could capably instruct in at any rate those technical branches of the profession with which a large practice keeps them continuously familiar, and the regular lecturer of the University would thus be set free to deal thoroughly with the more distinctly literary and theoretical side of the curriculum. The failure of thirty-three students out of forty-one at the November examination, and the subsequent fact that only six of the unsuccessful ones got through the other day,

have properly provoked enquiry as to the reason for such disgraceful results. The additional circumstance that the six LL.B. graduates for the year are all simply in the pass list, and yet two of them came out first-class in arts, and one in addition obtained the South Australian scholarship, points to something more than a want of mental power in the students. We have ventured to submit that some ground of explanation may be found in the deficient lecturing system now in operation, and if the usefulness of a practically important part of the University work is to be what it pretends to be, the law faculty should carefully consider whether the arrangements for which they are at least in some degree responsible at all adequately meet the requirements of the case.

Register March 30th 1886

LAW EXAMINATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—The letter on this subject in your paper of Saturday could hardly have been written by a University man, because he does not know his Latin grammar. He says that after the examination the men “had faces *miserabile visu*,” thus making a singular agree with a plural. I may say he does not know English or any other grammar. If he were a law student himself he would not be able to make much of the Institutes or the Digest, to say nothing of understanding the legal maxims in which so many of our legal principles are expressed. Letters on this subject come with a bad grace from those who have not matriculated, or who, whether they have or not, would be properly placed in the

LOWER FOURTH FORM.

Adelaide, March 29.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—Deep indeed must have been the emotion and heartfelt the gratitude of the University Examiners in Law at the late examination upon reading the masterly defence of their questions in your issue of to-day. The University Faculty of Laws, doubtless upon ill-judged and hastily formed reasons, have decreed that one subject, or at the most two, are quite enough to demand the skill and attention of any one examiner; but Mr. d’Arenberg, with admirable modesty, takes upon himself the task of testing the fairness of all the questions of all the subjects in all three years of the LL.B. degree—a task which, to one of his intellect and ability, must be simplicity itself; but the weight of his verdict is unfortunately robbed of half its value when it is known that he himself has acknowledged that he himself knows nothing whatever of one of the branches—constitutional law—which acknowledgment is impliedly confirmed as to the whole subject by the tenor of his letter. Mr. d’Arenberg is not, as far as I know, a Bachelor of Laws, and even the elements of such subjects as international law, jurisprudence, and constitutional law are but imperfectly known to those who do not make such subjects a particular study. Whether the theory of law is as highly essential as the practical knowledge of it I leave to your readers to judge, but it is an indisputed fact that few, if any, of our most eminent Queen’s Counsel and leading members of the Bar could off-hand sit down and answer the requisite number of questions in each paper necessary for obtaining the respective years of the LL.B. degree. Such men as these students have made it their aim to follow and their ambition to imitate, and not those theorists unknown in the Courts of Law and Justice, save as tutors, whose knowledge ends with the theory of law itself, and whose success consists simply in the capacity of their pupils to gorge set answers to set questions. I have written thus strongly upon the subject, because I feel keenly the injustice imputed in Mr. d’Arenberg’s letter to the students—

an imputation which, if allowed to pass unchallenged, may prove seriously detrimental to their future career.

I am, Sir, &c.,

NUNC DIMITTIS.

Adelaide, March 26.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—The quickest and cheapest mode of advertisement is to publicly write on a subject of which you know absolutely nothing. This is what "F. A. d'Arenberg" no doubt intended when he wrote on the quality and quantity of study of colonial students. What he can possibly pretend to know of this subject is beyond comprehension, for his experience applies to a very small percentage of "law pupils" here (about one in twelve), but no doubt it suited his purpose to let the public know that he was not "altogether unsuccessful" in this field. As regards those who were under him, he says, perhaps not in so many words—I have had pupils; they were not wanting in ability, but they did not work. They were successful. I got them through—to me alone is all praise due.

I am, Sir, &c.,

OUTSIDER.
