"Advertiser"
11th Nov. 1898

Say a person sued for £100 and £20 was paid into court, if a verdict was obtained by the plaintiff for £5 more he would get costs on the £25. This provision was in the interests of the litigants, and Mr. Caldwell contemplated it in his Reform Bill some time ago, while it would not deprive the solicitor of his fee. He moved the recommittal of the clauses he had indicated.

Mr. GLYNN moved for the recommittal of clause 8, which read:—"This Act shall not necessitate the passing of any examination in any additional subject by any person whose service has already commenced, nor shall this Act prevent any person seeking and securing admission as a solicitor by compliance with the now existing rules." He wanted to make it clear that in the event of a solicitor chosing the University course he need only serve three years. It was doubtful whether if a candidate wished to go through the University course he would not also have to serve five years articles, and there was no harm in making it clear. (The Attorney-General—"You have no doubt about it?") Not very much, but others whose opinions were worth considering had grave doubts, and had asked him to move in the matter. He would suggest that the clause be amended by adding after the word "compliance" "subject to subsection (*d*) in clause 4." Mr. Homburg's speech was rendered necessary by the refusal of the Attorney-General to accept in committee a suggestion which he (Mr. Glynn) made to him which was that in clause 46 it should be made clear that only the value of property for assessment purposes, and not the assessment of duties should be dealt with by the new court proposed to be constituted, and this could be done by striking out the first line and substituting the words "in all cases of disputed assessment of the value of property as distinguished from the interest therein for the purposes of." It had been found in some cases that fees had been paid to the Crown which were not properly recoverable, and that had nothing to do with the valuation of land, yet under the section as it stood the verbal interpretation of an Act of Parliament would come before the court, and no legal assistance would be allowed to a litigant. He did not think the House wanted this, and he hoped the Attorney-General would agree to a recommital for the purpose of amending the section.

(Continued on page .)

"Register"
14th Nov. 1898

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL.

The following members of the Council of the University of Adelaide retired under the provisions of the University Act on November 9:—Messrs. W. R. Boothby, C.M.G., B.A.; E. C. Stirling, C.M.G., M.A., M.D., F.R.S.; D. Murray; J. C. Verco, M.D.; and W. Barlow, LL.D.; and Professor E. H. Rennie, M.A., D.Sc., having resigned, nominations to fill the vacancies were received by the Registrar up till 1 p.m. on Saturday. The nominations included the five retiring members, and Professor W. H. Bragg in place of Professor Rennie. Mr. F. Chapple was nominated again as Warden, and Mr. T. A. Caterer as Clerk.

"Advertiser"
17th Nov. 1898

LAW REFORM BILL.

Third reading.

Major CASTINE said it was difficult for laymen to speak on a Law Reform Bill, and he had listened to the arguments of the legal members with interest. Every layman ought to be in favor of law reform, and though British subjects in going to law often gained their rights they were mulcted in heavy costs. He thought the Attorney-General would have consolidated the law relating to justices' procedure instead of attempting something that would be useless. He entered his protest against this travesty. The Bill was supposed to be in the interests of the public, but it would only facilitate the making of a lot of bad lawyers, who would only make law more expensive and put clients to considerable trouble through the bad advice which would be given them. The Attorney-General had admitted that even under this Bill the costs would not be reduced much. It would be a great pity if the Bill was passed with clauses 46 and 47 in it. He did not think it would get through the Legislative Council, but if it did he would certainly tell his constituents that it was not a law reform at all but quite the opposite.

Mr. SCHERK said he intended to vote against the third reading. He did this after due consideration, and he felt it his duty to give his reasons for his vote. He had listened very attentively to the speeches on the Bill, and he had come to the conclusion that it would do far more harm than good. He did not believe in reducing any educational standard, and instead of being reduced the standard of education for the legal profession should be raised. They should raise as far as they could the standard of any profession or even any trade. Even those who had no trade—and he had as great a respect for a stonecracker who did his work thoroughly as for a professional man—should be as well educated as possible under the circumstances in which they lived. He believed the Attorney-General thought the Bill was a good one, and in fairness to him he would say that he recognised he believed thoroughly in it. He had the highest respect for the legal profession, the members of which always tried to raise the tone of their profession. They had passed Bills to raise professional standards, such as the Pharmacy Bill—and above all they had upheld that grand educational system of which they were all so proud, and now the hard work of ten years was to be all destroyed. The Attorney-General had fought hard for the public educational system, and he was very sorry to see the right hon. member trying to destroy one part of it. If a man had a very important case he would, if he could afford it, consult the ablest man he could find. If he went to a man who was not well qualified he might lose his last sixpence, and then he would be very sorry he did not go to a better lawyer. He had known many lawyers to advise their clients not to go on with a case, and all honor to them. A respectable lawyer would always do this if the case was not a good one. The University was doing a great educational work, and there was no difficulty in the way of a clever pupil in the State schools going right on to the University. He did not believe in too much teaching of languages—he had to learn six, and they had not been much use to him—but the great aim at all the universities in the world was to compel anyone studying for law, medicine, or other professions to learn about all subjects taught at the institution, and unless they passed in a certain number they were not admitted. (Mr. Coneybeer—"Do you think that is right?") Of course. A lawyer ought to know not only about law, but all other things connected with daily life. If the Bill passed many people would be compelled to consult unqualified men to the great detriment of their affairs, and so he would oppose it.

Mr. BATCHELOR said no one doubted Mr. Scherk's enthusiasm in the cause of education. He also was anxious to increase the standard of education, but he did not think that any reason for opposing the Bill. He thought Mr. Scherk had mistaken the reason why the standard of examinations for the legal profession was reduced. It was that persons shall qualify themselves principally for the subjects which would be useful to them in the practice of the law. When Mr. Scherk talked about doing justice all round he ought to be on the side of those who voted for Mr. Peake's amendment to throw the profession open to all. Very few professions were protected by law. (Mr. Wood—"Have they a union in all professions?") No. (Mr. Wood—"Don't we protect our unions?" Mr. Grainger—"Yes, by force." Sir John Downer—"Hear, hear.") Sir John Downer could not give many instances of force. There was not much difference between the force of some and the cunning of others. There was not the analogy Mr. Wood suggested between a profession protected by law and a voluntary union. (Mr. Wood—"If you put a number of half-skilled men in the engineering trade would it not reduce wages?") Not if they were only half-skilled. He did not anticipate there would be any gain to the public from that point of view, for people would always pay for the best advice they could get. (Mr. Wood—"Do the best men here get on best?") Not always. The hon. member had got on well. There were some parts of the Bill he did not know much about, and he was not certain whether they would be effective in bringing about the results expected. On those points he was prepared to let the Bill have a trial, and he had to choose between the Attorney-General and the leader of the Opposition. (Sir John Downer—"You might refer it to the head of the Government, (the Chief Justice). The Attorney-General—"The Chief Justice is not an active politician.") He had not heard his opinion on the Bill. (Sir John Downer—"He gave a report on the same question.") As to those things of which he knew nothing, he would prefer to take the statement of the Attorney-General, for it was was one of the legitimate functions of the leader of the Opposition to oppose the Government. He could not see that they would reduce education, as Mr. Scherk said. If the legal profession were thrown open would it not increase the number of aspirants. Mr. Scherk would not say that no one should enter the profession of a carpenter who had not studied the dead languages and other matters. The hon. member was not prepared to put an educational test on members of Parliament. He wanted to prevent anyone invading the domain of lawyers. If they gave protection to lawyers they should insist on a high standard of education, but he (Mr. Batchelor) did not believe in protecting the legal profession more than any other. They should pull down the fence. (Mr. Scherk—"Do you believe in a man who has not learned the trade interfering with the carpenter's trade.") He did not believe in preventing a man wanting to become a carpenter from becoming one. He hoped that the Bill when put into effect would be of some real benefit in the direction of improving the procedure of the law.

Mr. HUTCHISON said he could not agree that this Bill was a particularly far-reaching measure of law reform, but it was something that would be of benefit to South Australia. It was the result of an earnest endeavor on the part of the Attorney-General to do something that no one had done in the shape of law reform. He did not agree with Mr. Castine that it would turn out bad lawyers. The standard would not be lowered. He was sorry his colleague, Mr. Scherk, differed from him, for he did not think it would lower the standard of education. It did not prevent anyone from acquiring all the information that could be imparted to him at the University. Mr. Scherk also said something about a stonebreaker, but he would not insist that before a man should be able to crack stones he should learn Greek. If students wished to acquire other knowledge than that which was necessary for their profession the doors of the University were open to them. With regard to Mr. Wood's interjection about half-skilled workmen he would like to ask if half-skilled lawyers lowered the wages of the profession. Undoubtedly they did not. If those who had graduated from the University were among our leading lawyers to-day he might have said it would be wise to retain the present curriculum. The most experienced lawyers were those who had not attended the University, and that was entirely in favor of the Bill. He had a high opinion of the capabilities of the Attorney-General in this direction, and was prepared to take his opinion that the measure would be of benefit to South Australia. He would point out to Mr. Scherk that the Bill provided that every student must serve a term of apprenticeship. If he was not a particularly brilliant student he would be a bad lawyer. (Mr. Scherk—"Would he qualify in three years?") They had had instances of it, but some would not qualify in 20 years. No sensible man would go to an inferior lawyer. Mr. Scherk had acquired six languages, but had found that most of them were of no use to him, and it was the same with lawyers. He had heard the Bill denounced by those who pretended to know what was wanted, but they did nothing to get a measure of law reform. They were only misleading the House when they said they ought not to do what the Attorney-General wanted. He challenged the members who had found fault with the Bill to bring down a more useful measure, and it would have his support. Until then he would support the measure before the House.

Mr. WOOD said Mr. Hutchison had complained that no attempt had been made to improve the Bill in committee, but whenever an amendment was moved it was always opposed by the Government, Mr. Hutchison, and other members. Two reasons chiefly actuated him in opposing the third reading of the measure—that it contained clause 28 and that it was a blow at trades unionism. If members agreed that three years' service was sufficient to make a man a full-blown lawyer capable of conducting cases involving thousands of pounds and keeping secrets of the most serious nature, would it not soon be said that three years' apprenticeship was sufficient in other trades? (The Treasurer—"How long were you apprenticed for a member of Parliament?") He did not serve as a journalist, otherwise he would probably have been as crafty as the Treasurer, but at all events he honestly tried to do what he thought was right. This Bill aimed not only at the destruction of the lawyers' union, but at the destruction of other unions. (Mr. Coneybeer—"You know you are saying what is not right.") The hon. member would do his best to protect his own trade, and the lawyers could not be blamed for trying to protect their own profession. Clause 28 would be a blot on the statute-book and a disgrace to South Australia if it were passed. If a man made an agreement to build a house for a certain sum, and it was attested by a justice of the peace, would it not be considered unwarrantable for someone else to step in and say that only a half or a quarter that amount should be paid. He was like his colleague, an independent member, and he had not in any way been approached by the Opposition, but he would not be a party to degrading any class of the community by agreeing to such a measure as this.

Mr. MOODY said it did not matter whether the legal examinations, which were provided, were good, bad, or indifferent, if a layman wanted a lawyer to plead his case he would get the best. On the hustings the legal members of the House always assured their constituents that they would do their best in the matter of law reform. Their promises were not always carried out. Sir John Downer had in effect said that the law at present was almost perfect, and that this Bill was an absurd attempt to reform it. Mr. Glynn while speaking on the second reading had said that it was the law which needed reforming and not the administration. The legal profession was much against the proposed extension of the jurisdiction of Local Courts. But Sir John Downer had opposed the first extension, and Judge Bundey, who was also then in the House, said it was a twopenny-half-penny measure. Yet it had proved a good thing, and he approved this proposal to enlarge the jurisdiction. In some cases he would just as soon trust a clever, intelligent layman as a lawyer—Mr. Grainger, for instance, would make a good job of it if figures and intricacies of that kind had to be dealt with. For fear, however, of jeopardising the Bill he had not voted for Mr. Peake's amendment. He believed that good results would flow from this measure notwithstanding the opinion of Sir John Downer, and he would support the third reading.

Mr. CALDWELL said they had discovered that evening that they had at least one linguist in the House, and he had given an opinion not favorable to the Bill, but he would point out that learning did not always qualify a man to take high positions. A neighbor of his who could speak more languages than Mr. Scherk had been growing cabbages for 20 years. This Bill had serious defects, but at least 50 per cent. of it was an attempt to work out an idea which he had attempted to work out in 1893. (Sir John Downer—"It is a copy of your Bill.") All the more reason why he should support the third reading of the measure, although he did not agree with clauses 4, 5, 28, 46, and 47. The Bill had at least 50 per cent. of honest attempt to do justice to the community. He objected as much as Mr. Scherk to reducing the education qualification, but he trusted to the good sense of the community not to employ indifferent men. There would still be a freefield, and those who are most highly endowed would get the preference. The gentleman whose opinion he would most readily take as an engineer was a man who served his apprenticeship to a shoeing smith—he alluded to Mr. French, and he was one man among a thousand. He respected Universities, but why should they force people to go through them? There was the report of the judges of the Supreme Court on the measure he introduced in 1893, and he believed with all respect to their honors, that some further provision is required, and he believed it was made to some extent in this Bill.

Mr. MILLER was surprised to hear hon. members say there was no law reform in this Bill. He was glad to think it would make it possible for two parties to go before a judge without lawyers and have their case decided for 50s. (Sir John Downer—"It is so now.") He did not know where the practice was stated, and he regretted the hon. member had not made it known, as it would have much enhanced his popularity. It was a most desirable reform.

Sir JOHN DOWNER was glad some of the lay members had departed from the course adopted during the second reading, which was to absent themselves during the discussion and then reproach the legal members with not having been there to instruct them. The case was put in a nutshell by one hon. member, who said, "The Attorney-General says one thing and Sir John Downer another, and I believe the Attorney-General." That was what it had been all through. No one had bothered about anything in the Bill except the title. As regarded Mr. Miller's statement, it was quite feasible now for two men to go to a lawyer and say they wanted their dispute settled in the Local or Supreme Courts. No argument was required if they were willing to lay a statement of the facts before the judge and get his decision. A summons would have to be issued in any form they liked, and they could then agree on a statement of fact and an appearance would have to be entered. The

"The Advertiser"
17th Nov. 1898

5