

left to govern these matters as in their wisdom they see fit. Indeed, for our own part, we are disposed to go farther, and say that it is injudicious to define too strictly the courses and lectures to be followed by young men preparing for the bar. For there are some who, with the most ample opportunities and the greatest amount of 'cramming', will retain their original stolidity, while others, with the most scanty opportunities, and attention distracted by other occupations, are, nevertheless, of such intellectual calibre, and are possessed with such an insatiable and devouring thirst for the acquisition of knowledge, that in solid results they will far outstrip their contemporaries. Holding these sentiments, it was with no little astonishment we observed in the report, an affidavit to be made by every candidate for admission to practice, to the effect that during the four years of his studentship he had pursued his studies *jour par jour*, without interruption, and "*que pendant les quatre années de sa cléricature, il ne s'est pas occupé d'autre objet soit lucratif ou gratuit qu'à l'étude de la profession d'avocat.*" There is an old saying, 'that all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy,' and, according to the foregoing affidavit, the luckless student could not absent himself for a day from the office, could not relieve the tedium of legal study by improving his acquaintance with classics, with modern languages, or with science, nor could he divert his mind with music, or drawing, or painting, nor, which in many cases would be more important, do anything towards earning his own livelihood, during the entire period of four years. We have no doubt that the affidavit was drawn up with the best intentions, to prevent students from acting (as it was stated that they sometimes do) as *recors*, or in other unworthy capacities. But it is necessary to take heed, in framing rules, to keep up the *dignity* of the profession, that we do not degenerate into what is snobbish and ridiculous. It is well known that many of those who have cast the brightest lustre on the English bar, have won their way from low estates. Take, for instance, the following paragraph, which sometime ago went the round of the press, and which, with some

inaccuracies, is, we think, substantially correct:—

"Lords Eldon and Stowell—sons of a barge-maker and small coal dealer at Newcastle. Lord Tenterden—son of a barber at Canterbury; he received a very poor education, but obtained the means to go to college; while there, he enjoyed, from a company in the city of London, an exhibition of £3 per year until he took his degree. Lord Gifford—prior to his being called to the bar, was many years a poor clerk to a solicitor near Exeter. Lord Langdale, the master of the rolls, was many years a poor practising surgeon. Sir John Williams, one of the judges of the Queen's bench—son of a very poor horse dealer in Yorkshire. Lord Truro, son of a very poor man in Cornwall, married a first cousin of Queen Victoria. Mr. Baron Gurney—his mother kept a small book-store for pamphlets in a court in the city of London. Lord Campbell, the present Lord Chancellor, was for many years reporter to the *Morning Chronicle*. Lord St. Leonards—son of a barber, and was formerly a clerk. Chief Justice Saunders, whose precepts to this day form the best text book to pleaders, was a beggar boy, first taken notice of by an attorney, who employed him in his office. Lord Kenyon—boot black and errand boy. Lord Hardwicke—an errand boy. George Canning—son of a poor strolling player."

And the same is true of American and French lawyers. This view of the case was endorsed by the meeting, which rejected the part of the affidavit cited by a large majority.

As to the fees payable by candidates, the fee for admission to study was increased from *five to twenty* dollars, and the fee for admission to practice, from *fourteen to fifty* dollars. This is a good change, not because it is desirable to open the door of the profession only to the rich, but because the increase is not sufficient to be any real impediment to those seriously bent on following the law as their profession, while it will be sufficient to bring in a large addition to the revenue available for the purchase of books, &c. Thus every *fifty* candidates admitted to study, will add \$1000 to the fund of the section, and every *twenty* admitted to practice, a like sum.