"The Advertiser"
4th Nov. 1898

"The Advertiser" 52
4th Nov. 1898.
Law Reform Bill

ever, that it was a case in which the amount concerned was so small that there was no right of appeal. If Mr. Glynn's argument meant anything it meant that a right of appeal must be allowed in any case, however small, so that alleged injustices could not possibly occur. It did not follow either that if the original decision was upset it was a wrong one. He had known cases in the Supreme Court in which he had sympathised much more with the minority on the bench when there was a difference of opinion than with the majority of judges who gave the decision. If they could not trust special magistrates in cases of over £100 they might say the same as to cases under that amount, but these gentlemen had been faithful in small things, and he asked the committee to believe they would be equally faithful in large ones.

Sir JOHN DOWNER said the substance of the argument of the Attorney-General was that the less a judge knew the better he did, and that the higher the tribunal the worse its decisions. He said that the country magistrates had given great satisfaction and therefore asked why not increase their jurisdiction to £2,000. Then why stop at that? Why let there be any limit at all? The expense was not in the procedure but in the trial, and it would be the same whichever procedure was adopted. Whether they called a case a Local Court case or a Supreme Court case the expense of the trial would be high so long as the amount involved was large and could possibly bear the expenditure. The Attorney-General argued that the administration of justice was not a skilled thing at all. It was said by one-half the members of the House that juries were not wanted. He had even heard the Attorney-General say that the administration of justice required experience and common sense, and Mr. Justice Gwynne defined common sense as "what a man applies to every trade except his own, which he thinks requires skill." When times were dull people submitted to injustice rather than go to court or anywhere else. Because the jurisdiction of local courts was increased to £500, and was not availed of, as Mr. Glynn had shown it did not follow that if they increased the jurisdiction from £500 to £2,000 it would not be availed of, but it was an eloquent argument. As to Mr. Peake's amendment, it mattered very little whether they applied the Local Court procedure to the Supreme Court or whether they did not. The Supreme Court procedure was as simple as that of the Local Court so far as it relates to cases which could be heard before the Local Court. The plaint and the defence were both as simple if not simpler. So far as Mr. Peake's amendment applied to the Adelaide Local Court he was with him. The administration of justice was an important and sacred thing and ought to put into skilled hands. He resisted the proposal of the Bill, which would gradually wipe away the Supreme Court.

Mr. HAGUE said this was one of the most important clauses in the Bill, and reaction was on the side of Mr. Peake. If there was a big case in the country the best lawyers in the city would be engaged, and they would ask bigger fees than if the case were heard in town. He would support Mr. Peake's amendment.

Mr. MILLER said the proposal to confine the clause to the Adelaide Local Court was a reflection on the administration of justice in the country. If a man in the country won a case on the decision of magistrates appointed by the Government the Government should pay the costs of an appeal. He knew of a litigant who won his case in all the courts and lost more in costs than the amount involved. He would like to raise the minimum amount in respect to which men could appeal. There should not be so many appeals which were a reflection on the magistrates.

Mr. GILES supported the clause as drafted. He believed in justice more than law, and if a court could deal with a question involving £500 they could do so in respect to a case of £2,000. He hoped the extended jurisdiction would be given to courts in the country as well as in the city. There might be mistakes made by magistrates, but even the highest judges differed on points of law. Most of the stipendiary magistrates also were lawyers. He hoped the Government would stick to the clause.

Mr. PEAKE said it was notorious that most of the stipendiary magistrates were not lawyers. And what was justice? In Plato's republic it was defined as rendering to every man that which is his due, and that was the object of the law. He had heard a stipendiary magistrate declare at one sitting of the court that he would administer law, and at the next that he would not consider legal technicalities, but justice must be dispensed. Under this extended jurisdiction as proposed in the Bill some suitors would really be forced into two trials instead of one, as a country case, which might now be brought direct to the city, would have to be tried in a country court first.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said Mr. Peake's argument amounted to this, that what was good enough for the city court was not for the country courts. He objected to the distinction proposed to be made between the city and country courts.

Mr. SOLOMON said the present jurisdiction of the country courts was sufficiently large. He had seen enough blunders made by these magistrates in the country, most of whom had not been trained as lawyers. Why not, if the jurisdiction in the country were to be so increased, propose to extend it to cases of misdemeanor or felony, cases anything short of murder, thus saving great expense to the colony? That was the logical outcome of the clause. He had practised at the Port Darwin Local Court for nine years by consent of the magistrates, and his experience showed him the necessity for giving a larger amount of discretion to the presiding magistrates in this respect in some country towns. He remembered taking part in one case involving £5,000, and they got a verdict for the amount, while he had also successfully defended innocent men and women who had been unjustly accused. The extension should not only affect the amount, but also the discretion of the courts in outside districts to employ other than trained lawyers. All his constituents were satisfied with the manner in which Mr. Justice Dashwood had discharged his duties in the Local and Criminal Courts of Port Darwin, but few of the stipendiary magistrates had the same abilities. In some cases there was no doubt the position had not been made sufficiently attractive for good lawyers, and there were instances in which their want of legal training had undoubtedly produced mistakes. Legal training was required to distinguish between the real facts and the apparent truth of the evidence tendered. The whole object of country Local Courts was to save litigants who lived at a long distance from incurring tremendous expense in having to journey to Adelaide for a settlement of their claims. They did not want to extend the jurisdiction of the courts which would have the effect of inducing people to make their claims high. With regard to stipendiary magistrates he reminded the House that they had to travel very long distances at times; Mr. Stow went tremendous journeys at certain periods of the year. No one would trust a man with no legal knowledge and with no extended experience to arbitrate in a case in which a large amount of money was involved, but he would not be so particular where only a few pounds were concerned. They would want a specially-trained man, and would be perfectly willing to pay well for his training and business experience. So he thought that Mr. Peake's argument was a good one. The stipendiary magistrates were not trained men, and the jurisdiction was wide enough now. An extension of it would not only not reduce the cost but would mean that there would be more appeals. He did not wish to say anything against the integrity of the stipendiary magistrates, but their jurisdiction was great enough now, and he hoped the committee would not extend it.

Mr. O'MALLEY said Mr. Solomon had laid a great deal of stress on the necessity for trained men, but he was prepared to keep by the Premier in the bold stand he was taking, and he advised the laymen of the House to do so also. Mr. Solomon said a trained mind was needed to discover whether a man was telling the truth or not, and yet a judge of the Supreme Court said to a blackguard "I can look into your face and see you are a bluff British soldier. (Mr. Price—"Who was the judge?") Sir. Forty-bob Boucaut.

The CHAIRMAN—Order; the hon member is out of order.

Mr. O'MALLEY said for nine months he was stigmatised by a judge of the Supreme Court as a thief, because a scoundrel came here to blackmail him. The same astute judge did not believe in his (Mr. O'Malley's) reputable witnesses, who had been years in the colony, and he got forty bob for his character—which he did not collect. (Mr. Solomon—"Why didn't you collect it?") Because the drunkery keepers sent the bluff old soldier out of the way. A man did not need much training to know whether a witness was speaking the truth or not, and he hoped the House would support the Attorney-General. He would not detain members then, though he felt warmly on the subject, but he had a two hours' speech ready for next week.

The amendment was declared negatived.

Mr. PEAKE called for a division, which resulted as follows:—

AYES, 8—Messrs. Batchelor, Copley, Glynn, Hague, Handyside, Solomon, Wood, and Peake (teller).

NOES, 15—Messrs. Brooker, Butler, Cock, Coneybeer, Grainger, Hourigan, Jenkins, Miller, Morris, O'Malley, Poynton, Price, Randell, Shannon, and Kingston (teller).

Majority of 7 for the Noes.

PAIRS.—Ayes, Sir John Downer, Messrs. Archibald, Gilbert, McGillivray, Darling, McDonald, Duncan, Mortlock, Caldwell, Castine, and Homburg; Noes, Messrs. Roberts, Dumas, Hutchison, Blacker, Landseer, Moody, Cummins, Holder, MacLachlan, O'Loughlin, and Giles.

The clause passed.

Clauses 14 to 16 passed.

Clause 17. Preliminary hearings—Accused may plead guilty.

Mr. GLYNN said this clause affected neither lawyers nor laymen, but it affected the general community. He did not, however, want to go into the clause at that hour of night.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL—Let us get to clause 22. (Mr. Glynn—"That means the whole of this part.")

Mr. SOLOMON said it was a quarter to 11, and these important provisions should not be disposed of in such a thin House.

The bells having been rung and a quorum obtained,

Mr. SOLOMON said he did not intend to call attention to the state of the House. The Attorney-General should show some consideration to members and allow them to catch their 11 o'clock trains. Some of the country members were allowed to go on Thursdays, and the work fell on the city members.

Mr. MILLER—Some of the country members are here.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said they had taken eight hours over 12 clauses, and to ask honorable members to make a little more progress was not unreasonable.

Mr. ARCHIBALD urged the Attorney-General to report progress. If he wanted to get through, and told them so, he would come prepared to sit all night.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said it was not worth while arguing over 10 minutes, but he would ask the House to finish the Bill on Tuesday, whatever time they had to sit to.

Progress was reported and the committee obtained leave to sit again on Tuesday next.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.48 p.m. the House adjourned till Tuesday next at 2 p.m.

There were very few questions in the Assembly on Thursday, and members got to work on the Law Reform Bill within ten minutes of the time that the Speaker took the chair. Visitors were very few, but there was a good attendance of legislators, although the leader of the Opposition was not in his place until the committee had been considering the measure for some time. Mr. Jenkins informed Mr. Carpenter that he will again consult the Railways Commissioner as to whether or not fast excursion trains can be run to the southern seaports. Mr. Peake ascertained that Civil Service examinations will be held annually in the country centres if sufficient candidates offer. Finally Mr. Caldwell ascertained that the extended seating accommodation in the four city State schools is as follows:—Currie-street, 884; Flinders-street, 1,234; Grote-street, 778; and Sturt-street, 1,146; or a total of 4,063. The average daily attendance last year was Currie-street, 501; Flinders-street, 991; Grote-street, 554; and Sturt-street, 954; while the roll numbers are Currie-street, 702; Flinders-street, 1,288; Grote-street, 824; and Sturt-street, 1,207; or a total of 4,113. Recently the average attendance has been interfered with owing to the prevalence of contagious diseases. The proportion of children in each school who live within the limits of the city of Adelaide is:—Grote-street, 559; Flinders-street, 1,180; Grote-street, 780; and Sturt-street, 952. The Council, by message, intimated that it insisted on its amendments in the Fertilisers Bill, and that it disagreed with the Assembly amendment in the Affiliation Bill.

The Law Reform Bill was called on in committee at 2.10 p.m. at clause 4, and Mr. Archibald immediately moved that under a penalty of £100 a solicitor shall be prevented from stopping an articled clerk from earning money outside the office. He urged that young men should be given all possible facilities for gaining their livelihood while they are studying law. Mr. Kingston suggested that the amendment should be embodied in a new clause, which he promised to draft, although he did not undertake to support it. Mr. Grainger objected to what he termed the favoritism of admitting judges' associates to the bar as if they had served articles, and he referred to the fact that the Earl of Euston (who will some day be Duke of Grafton) was once associate to the Chief Justice. He thought a litigant should be allowed to choose any friend to represent him in court, and he ventured the opinion that some women could either frighten or coax a jury better than any men. Mr. Hutchison agreed with the principle of the amendment, but advised that the suggestion of Mr. Kingston should be accepted, and Mr. Archibald fell in with that view of the case and withdrew his proposal. Mr. Wood next moved to excise the line directing that in future no examination shall be required before a clerk is articled, but Mr. Kingston urged that none of the South Australian judges had passed the University matriculation examination, and that such a hurdle had not to be leaped by any of the present leaders of the bar. In the old time the judge, by a five minutes' conversation, satisfied himself that a youth was over 16 and of good moral character. "That evidently wasn't a good test," remarked Mr. Glynn, and the Premier replied, "Don't slander the absent." "The absent-minded, you mean," said Mr. Glynn, who predicted that the matriculation examination does not cause the smallest diminution in the ranks of an over-manned profession. In England, he added, the examinations for admission to the bar were until recently merely formal. "They had matriculation examinations at Cambridge 120 years ago," interjected Mr. Mortlock, who is an English barrister and an ex-student of that University. "I don't think the hon. member is 120 years old," commented Mr. Glynn, and Mr. Mortlock retorted, "I don't believe even you are." "No," rejoined the Trinity College man, "only in mind, not in body." Mr. Homburg objected to the clause altogether, and he predicted that the trebling of the number of lawyers would not help towards law reform, but would merely increase the influence of the legal profession. In Germany, he added, the tendency is to restrict the admission of lawyers. He fails to see how South Australia will benefit by increasing its army of lawyers from 130 to 600. If only utilitarian knowledge is to be acquired, he urged, half the subjects should be struck off the State school list. "No, that is an exaggeration," said loyal Mr. Scherk, and Mr. Homburg asked how a boy is likely to be advantaged in after life by knowing the populations of all the countries of the world. "It will stop him from dying or marrying," suggested Mr. Glynn. Mr. Batchelor objected to a bar being placed before a youth so as to prevent him from entering on the study of his profession. Mr. Kingston said there was a wide gap between the fifth class of a State school and the senior public service examination, which was a most mischievous and annoying obstacle. Mr. Ash, he affirmed, injured himself irreparably by the time wasted on the University course. "That would apply to the public schools," ventured Major Castine. Mr. Kingston went on to ridicule the examination papers set by the University papers, and said much of what is taught is rubbish. "I wish I had passed the University examinations," ejaculated Mr. Darling, and Mr. Kingston retorted that he would then have been a professor instead of a corn merchant, and would have lost money by the change. Mr. Wood pointed out that the subjects prescribed for Civil Service examinations are not likely to be very useful to officials afterwards. Lawyers are entrusted with large sums of money, and sometimes preside over matters of life and death, he asserted, and he protested against Mr. Kingston's attempt to make large numbers of lawyers. Sir John Downer eulogised the practical and sensible speech of Mr. Wood. The legal profession, he said, is sought in trouble and adversity, and is consulted on the most sacred and private subjects, so that its members should have some culture. Why not be as careful, he asked, over the training of lawyers as over the making of