

LAW EXAMINATIONS—ITEMS—FEES OF ATTORNEYS IN DIVISION COURTS.

“(2.) Provided that if any one or more of the parties requires such issue to be tried or damages to be assessed or enquired of by a Jury, he shall give notice to the Court in which such action is pending, and to the opposite party, *by filing with his last pleading and serving on the opposite party* a notice in writing to the effect following, that is to say,” &c.

How, it may be asked, can this notice be filed, &c., with the last pleading in cases when, under the former practice, issue has been joined, and perhaps notice of trial given, or a case being made a remnant?

LAW SOCIETY, HILARY TERM, 1869.

CALLES TO BAR.

During this term the following gentlemen, having passed their final examination, were called to the Bar:—Alfred J. Wilkes, Brantford; Henry H. Strathy, Toronto; W. R. Squier, B.A., Goderich; Wm. G. McWilliams, B.A., Toronto; Colin McDougall, St. Thomas; George Taillon, Ottawa; W. M. Merritt, St. Thomas; E. C. Campbell, Newmarket; N. M. Monro, Toronto; John H. G. Hagarty, Toronto; John O'Donohoe, Toronto; A. G. Brown, St. Catharines; J. Dunning, Ottawa. The four first-named gentlemen passed without any oral examination.

ADMISSIONS TO PRACTICE.

The following gentlemen were admitted as Attorneys:—Charles Moss, Toronto; John Muir, Grimsby; Alfred J. Wilkes, Brantford; Wm. G. McWilliams, Toronto; Henry H. Strathy, Toronto; A. G. Brown, St. Catharines; John H. G. Hagarty, Toronto; S. M. Jarvis, Cornwall; John R. Dixon, London; Robert C. Henderson; William A. McLean, Toronto; E. S. Essery, London; Joseph Ryan, Kingston. The first four gentlemen passed on the merits of their written examination, and had not therefore to be examined orally. Mr. Charles Moss was especially complimented by the Benchers on the thorough knowledge he evinced of the subjects for examination.

Some alterations have been made in the room wherein Chancery Chambers are held by the Judges' Secretary. Changes are generally supposed to be for the better, and in the matter of arrangement they are probably so in this case; in other respects, however, the Government have not much to be proud of. Their selection of some bare, unhappy looking pine tables, with splits between the

boards, would do discredit to a third-rate solicitor's office. We are not aware of any necessity to “nip in the bud” any incipient symptoms of luxury or extravagance on the part of the Secretary, who was himself, we believe, at the expense of laying down the matting thought unnecessary by the authorities.

The depreddators at Osgoode Hall have not of late confined themselves to the west wing, as some nights ago the vault of the Queen's Bench office was broken into and some money, fortunately only a small sum however, was found and carried off, belonging to Mr. Baldwin, of the Stamp office. There have been, in addition to these burglaries, many minor pilferings at Osgoode Hall, but it is hoped that the authorities are on the track of some of the guilty parties.

FEES TO ATTORNEYS IN DIVISION COURTS.

At the close of our last volume we published a letter criticising the soundness of a decision by a County Judge on the payment of fees to attorneys for work done by them, as such, in Division Courts. A letter was written in answer to this, which, however, did not throw much light on the subject, and “An Attorney,” in another letter published hereafter, again returns to the charge.

We have taken the trouble to find out exactly what the learned Judge did say in his judgment, which appears to have been a written one. We allude to the case in which he lays down the rule which should, in his opinion, govern cases such as that spoken of by our correspondents. We do not gather from this judgment (which we apprehend “An Attorney” could not have seen), that the Judge entertained the opinion which the letters of “An Attorney” would lead us to suppose. With the details of the cases neither we nor our readers are at all interested, but it is a matter of simple fairness that the views of the Judge should be given in his own words; the subject, moreover, is of some importance, and worthy of discussion.

The part of the judgment touching on the point before us was as follows:—

“It is difficult to arrive at what is a fair and reasonable or proper allowance to make for services as an Attorney in the Division Courts, for the Superior and County Court tariffs are fixed,