

The Lower Canada Law Journal.

VOL. II.

JULY, 1866.

No. 1.

**PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE ACT
RESPECTING THE BAR.**

A step has at last been taken towards amending the Act incorporating the Lower Canada Bar. At a special meeting of the Montreal section, on the 16th May, a Committee was appointed to take into consideration certain resolutions which had been submitted, and to make any necessary or desirable alterations in the Act and by-laws at present in force. This Committee, of which Mr. R. MACKAY was chairman, reported, on the 9th June, to a general meeting of the bar, which was adjourned till the 16th, for the consideration of the report. The gist of the proposed changes may be stated as follows: To raise the standard of qualification for candidates desirous of being admitted to the study and practice of the profession; to increase the fees payable on admission to study and to practice; to purge the bar of felons, criminals, and others, who, by disgraceful and unworthy conduct, reflect disgrace upon the profession; to take away the right of attacking the judgments of councils of sections, by *certiorari*, or appeal to the civil courts, and to restrict appeals solely to the general council; to substitute a semi-annual examination of candidates for a monthly one, as at present; to make the treasurer the direct receiver of all fees payable to the bar, and otherwise to provide checks for the proper administration of the finances.

Some of these changes, it will be perceived, are of considerable importance, and it was, therefore, with regret that we observed such a small attendance of members at the general meetings called to discuss the report. On the 16th June, the only senior members of the profession present were Mr. A. ROBERTSON, Q. C., Batonnier, Mr. DOUTRE, Q. C., Mr. MACKAY, Mr. RITCHIE, Mr. CASSIDY, Q. C., Mr. W. DORION, and Mr. DORMAN. At the adjourned meeting, on the 18th, there were present, during the first half of the session,

only Messrs. ROBERTSON, Q. C., DOUTRE, Q. C., and MACKAY, from among the senior members of the profession. Subsequently Messrs. LAFLAMME, Q. C., RITCHIE, POMINVILLE, W. ROBERTSON, and others, participated in the discussion. We mention these names to show that although there are few members of the bar who have not advocated reform, yet when a move is made in the desired direction, a lack of zeal is manifested in carrying out the projected improvements. There was not much difference of opinion on the changes suggested in the report, with a few exceptions which we shall here notice. First, as to the frequency of examinations, it was represented, and we think with reason, that a semi-annual examination may often subject worthy and thoroughly prepared candidates, whose term of studentship expires immediately after an examination, to a delay of nearly six months, before they have an opportunity of presenting themselves. Besides this, as the time and attention of the examiners are generally fully occupied with their professional engagements, it may be difficult to get gentlemen to sit day after day, perhaps for a whole week, engaged in the tedious task of examining some thirty or forty candidates for admission to practice, and investigating the qualifications of those desirous of being admitted to study. The proposition for a semi-annual examination, however, was carried by 11 to 5.

That part of the report which proposed that the Prothonotary should keep an independent register of diplomas, as a check upon the treasurer, was struck out entirely, but all moneys due to the council of the section are in future to be paid directly to the treasurer, and not through the secretary. As to qualification of candidates, it has been resolved, that students must be articulated to a practising advocate during four consecutive and entire years, and also follow a complete course at an incorporated college or university during three years. This makes the *minimum* term of studentship four years, instead of three, as at present. Some amendments were proposed with the object of fixing a *minimum* number of lectures on each subject, but these stipulations were, by a large majority, voted uncalled for, and derogatory to the dignity of the colleges, which should be