

of it. Some of your committee are opposed to allowing the papers to be given back under any circumstances, feeling that no good is likely to result from such a practice, either to the student or to the Board.

There is not so much objection to informing the student as to the particular subject in which he has failed.

4. "That all papers on certain subjects only, be examined by special committees, to the end of bringing about a uniform system of correcting papers; and that the present system of submitting papers to the sub-committees be abolished."

In this suggestion a distinction is made between "special committees" and "sub-committees." This distinction, as well as the suggestion itself, is one which has commended itself to many of the present members of the Board of Examiners, several of whom at least, are in favor of dividing the work of the Board into parts,—assigning "special subjects" to "special committees," and abolishing the system of sub-committee as heretofore has been found necessary.

This suggestion is somewhat favorably considered; but before making any decided recommendation as to its adoption, your committee are of the opinion it would be wise that the Board of Examiners should be asked to express their formal opinion respecting it.

A fifth suggestion is as to the length of time allowed candidates in which to answer questions.

It is quite possible that in some cases the time allowed has been scarcely sufficient, but in this matter a change in the direction desired would also have the effect of prolonging the sitting and increasing expenses;—an effect which ought to be avoided if possible.

A sixth suggestion has been made to the effect that the examinations should be annual instead of semi-annual;—the January examination to be dispensed with;—retaining only the July examinations, at which time the Board could have a longer sitting.

It is doubtful whether this suggestion would prove satisfactory. A candidate who has failed to obtain admission, either to study or to practice, would thereby be thrown back another year, which would be felt to be a great hardship.

The seventh, and perhaps the principal objection, is to the effect that the composition of the Board of Examiners should be changed.

This suggestion was discussed at the conference held after the last January examinations. It was suggested that the Board should be composed partly of members of the Bar appointed by the sections as at present, and partly of members of the Faculties of the Universities:—practically that the Board should be composed of nine members, two from the Faculty of the University of Laval, two from the Faculty of the University of McGill, and five from the Montreal and Quebec Sections.

Your committee is averse to having any changes at present in the composition of the Board. They would require to be sanctioned by the Legislature, and it is quite probable that any such would be opposed as infringing to some extent upon the privileges of other sections as they at present exist. Your committee do not consider that there is any necessity for such a change.

Whatever defects exist, or whatever complaints have arisen, do not flow from the manner in which the Board of Examiners is composed. Your committee feel satisfied that the members of the Board as composed since the changes in the Charter of the Corporation effected in 1886 by the 49-50 Victoria, chapter 34, have administered justice in conducting examinations as well as would have been possible under the same system, however the Board might have been composed.

The defects, if any, arise rather from three causes:

1. That there is a large number of candidates to be examined;