

P. 120.09.224

4779

## TO THE PEOPLE OF ONTARIO.

The tools to those who can handle them.

—CARLYLE.

I am no Cheap Swell. No codfish Aristocrat.

Put me down with Bill Blades, the bricklayer, every time, and all the time.

Bill and I may be rough and the like o' that,

But we ain't no bloomin' fools. And this is what we say:—

"Tis the moke as draws the Truck about,  
As ought to get most greens."

Kind friends, a word with you, if you please. I have twice applied to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario that they be pleased to pass a Bill to enable me to practise as a Solicitor in the Supreme Court of Judicature on my passing the usual final examination, but without having to serve an apprenticeship of five years to a member of the Law Society in Canada. My reasons for asking that I should be exempt from serving the said apprenticeship are fully stated in the papers sent you herewith. But as you may not have the time to spare to peruse the same, I shall state to you as briefly as I can what those reasons are:—

1. I studied in a Scotch University the following branches:—Latin, Greek, Mathematics, Logic, Moral Philosophy and Scotch Law and Conveyancing.

2. I served an apprenticeship of five years to a Scotch Lawyer.

3. I was admitted and did practise as a Lawyer in Scotland for five years.

4. I served as a Clerk in Toronto Lawyers' offices for over three years.

5. For the past four years I have been constantly engaged in the study and the practice of the Law, so far as I could do so without being a Solicitor entitled to practise before the Supreme Court of Judicature.

6. And lastly, I am about 40 years of age, I have the care, maintenance and responsibility of a household, consisting of my two sisters, one of whom is a widow with four children, the other is associated with me in my business as a lawyer, and acts as my book-keeper.

So much for the merits of my case. Now you may wish to know if there are any precedents for such an application. In reply, I would say, there are many precedents. From the papers sent herewith you will see that the Legislature has, in 15 cases, passed Acts of Parliament on behalf of applicants who made somewhat similar applications. *The Law Society never opposed these applications.* What I ask is nothing new. The Legislature, when asked by the rich and powerful has, from time to time, as occasion required it, passed just such Acts as the one I now desire them to pass, and *the Law Society never opposed those applications.* With your leave we will examine a few of these Acts, and I think you will agree with me that on the whole the merits of my application are at least as good as in those applications which the Legislature has acceded to, and granted the required Acts, and in some instances, I think at least, you will agree with me that my claim is much more deserving than many of those herein cited. For example, take the case of "Peter Taylor Pousett." It would seem that he was an English Attorney, but does not appear to have served any apprenticeship to a Canadian Lawyer, or even to have clerked in a lawyer's office in Canada. But still the Legislature passed an Act in 1863, whereby Peter was admitted to the privileges which I ask. Then in 1864, the "Hon. Michael Hamilton Foley" was admitted to the Bar, because being a member of the Legislature he was unable to comply with the terms of the Law Society. Then we find that Mr. Joseph Robins Bawden, of Kingston, was admitted to the same privileges that I ask by 29 and 30, Cap. 175. The excuse there being that Mr. Bawden's health had failed him, and he had been unable to serve his full time. James Fleming applied for admission. It seems that this gentleman did not serve the usual apprenticeship, although he was actually a lawyer's clerk, but the Legislature admitted him by 35 Vic., Cap. 119. Mr. William Henry Lockhart Gordon was also in considerable luck. The Legislature, overcoming his not being apprenticed to a Canadian lawyer, gave him the same privileges that I ask. See Act 35 Vic., Cap. 118. Mr. Charles Greane also received an act of grace for the following reasons: He was an English Attorney and came to Canada in 1852; he filled in his time for some months by clerking in a Canadian lawyer's office and thereafter practised as a Conveyancer, and was appointed a Commissioner and a Notary Public in the village of Madoc, and it would seem varied the monotony of existence in a quiet country village by condescending to act as advocate in the Division Court. He was admitted to the same privileges. See 36 Vic., Cap. 160. The case of Mr. Benjamin Vallick Elliott: he was an English Solicitor, came to Canada in 1856, clerked a year in a lawyer's office and practised as a Conveyancer.