as a testimonial of superior knowledge.

In the second year none of the candidates for a degree—there were six of these—passed. The course for this examination is naturally more comprehensive than for its predecessor. Men have to know a certain amount of jurisprudence, constitutional law, and the law of obligations if they are to succeed. Three only went up for certificates in one or more branches of this course, but we do not know whether the two gentlemen who secured certificates in constitutional law belonged to this triumvirate or to the others studying for a degree. In the third year eight gentlemen went up for their final examination. They had to pass in international law, the law of wrongs (civil and criminal), and the law of procedure. Of the eight only three passed the examination and secured the degree. None of the successful candidates were good enough to pass in the first or second class, but doubtless the LL.B. after their names will look as well as if they had been pronounced prodigies in the knowledge of law. Certificates were given in two branches of the course to four gentlemen, two of whom passed in both the law of procedure and the law of wrongs. Thus, of thirty-three candidates six gentlemen passed their respective academical examination for the University degree, and besides these ten secured certificates. More than half the students were unsuccessful, and those who were successful were relegated to the lowest rank possible. Perhaps the examiners think that there are enough lawyers in Adelaide already without encouraging more to begin practice. With this view, whether it is entertained by the examiners or not, the public fully sympathize. Added to this, it must be borne in mind that if the University wishes to gain a name for its degrees it is essential that the examinations shall be conducted strictly.

It is a common complaint amongst students that the ordeal through which they have to pass now is more severe than that which their predecessors had to pass through a year or two ago. They urge that the examinations having been made stiffer they are less likely to pass at all, and when they manage to get through they have to be content with a lower position than a corresponding success would have secured for them if they had been fortunate enough to go up when the papers set were not so difficult. It is not surprising that this should be regarded as a grievance, but the University of two evils has to choose the less, and it is not inexplicable, even at the risk of displeasing some students.
placing the student at a disadvantage as compared with the student of previous years, to make the examination more severe when it has been proved by experience to be too simple, than to go on retaining an old standard, under which passes may be obtained by mere dolts. As long as the examinations are conducted fairly and without favouritism; so long as the papers set are intelligently directed to testing the general knowledge of the student and his grasp of the subject under consideration, not chiefly to try his skill in unravelling conundrums and answering catch questions, the stiffer within reasonable limits, the examination is made the better. This is especially true of examinations for the LL.B. degree, which here can be obtained without reference to the Arts course. Seeing that the distinction of LL.B. can be secured by attention to the study of the one subject law, it is important that the man who gains the title should prove himself proficient in that subject.
THE UNIVERSITY LAW EXAMINATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—The letter of your correspondent, "Student," and the comments in your issue yesterday thereupon will, I venture to believe, be in the main endorsed by all of us who have gone through the law school of the University. You very properly speak of the law lecturer as a man of "conspicuous ability," but we who have attended his lectures were painfully conscious that while he exhaustively treated parts of the course each year the bulk of the subject was in almost every instance left to be mastered by the students unaided. It is to this cause, I am sure, that the absurd preponderance of "plucks" is to be traced, for while the undergraduates were obliged to give close attention to the lecturer as week after week he worked through the intricacies of some particular branches of the curriculum, they were neglecting the major portion of the text-books, and so reducing their chance of success when the dreaded examination days came round. It seems to me, sir, that the remedy for what must be admitted to be the present unsatisfactory condition of the University law school is to adopt the system of other universities and have different sets of questions for honor and pass-papers. The former might fairly cover the whole of the subject, and success in honors might be reserved for those few men who have both the industry and ability to master difficult subjects under unfavorable conditions. The pass papers ought to be set on the lectures alone, supplemented of course by the necessary reading from the text-books to fill in the outline which the lecturer has covered. There must be many men who would feel that their reading and capacity could only justify a hope of success in the pass list, and it seems unfair to set them down to papers which are intended to tax to the full the powers of their abler confreres. The necessary consequence of doing this is that the weaker vessels go hopelessly to the wall. I know that the principle for which I contend is practically recognised at the University already in the arts course, for one of the undergrads told me that last November a paper was set on about half of the text-book, because the lectures had only gone thus far. But my chief purpose in writing, sir, was to show that you were not only expressing the views of those who were "ploughed" in your remarks about the law school, for I have the great relief of being able to sign myself—

LL.B. ADELAIDENSIS.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir—"Student's" letter and your sub-leader—by their truth and justice—call for the thanks of all lovers of fair play. It has been a subject of remark that of the few who pass in law a rather large proportion are sons of well-known men, almost leading to the conclusion that there is something in a name. Would it not be a source of amusement to have—by the University calendar—the former records of those who have passed in law, and
Sir—Professor Kelly has stated that the University of Adelaide should be regarded as an examining board, and correspondents are at present engaged in discussing in your columns how the University is performing its admittedly vital duty in the department of law. It may be useful to enquire whether its action is satisfactory or the reverse in other branches of knowledge. I have before me the classical (Latin and Greek) papers set at the recent matriculation examination. In Latin candidates are examined in Virgil’s “Sixth Æneid” and in Cicero’s “De Amicitia,” prepared subjects, their efficient knowledge of which is tested by their being required to translate a certain number of selected passages, as well as two passages from the “De Officiis” with which they have not necessarily any previous acquaintance, while a few lines of English prose are set them at the end of the paper for translation into Latin. In the Greek paper the prepared subjects are Plato’s “Crito” and “Apology;” two passages are given for translation from the “Crito” and two from the “Apology,” and these latter have suggested certain questions to Professor Kelly, for his name stands at the head of the paper, and he is therefore, I presume, responsible for