

committee lay considerable stress upon the fact that inconvenience is caused by the number of candidates to be examined. But an inconvenience of this nature—of the precise extent of which we are not able to judge—does not appear to be a strong reason for so radical a change in our system of admission to the profession. The acceptance of a degree from the law faculty of a university as equivalent to an examination would seem likely to re-introduce the inequality of standard which was removed some years ago by the law which enacted that there should be but one general examination for the whole province, instead of the old system under which there was a separate examination in each district. Again, will the bar be able to maintain efficient control over the curriculum of every law faculty, present and future? The change suggested has really the effect of making the various law faculties equivalent to so many sub-committees of the General Council. Will they be content to assume that position? If but one university existed, or could legally exist, in the province, the matter might be easily regulated. But three law faculties already exist, and the number may be indefinitely increased. Our impression may be ill-founded, but we are disposed to think that undue importance has been attached to an inconvenience, perhaps temporary in its nature, in the present system of examinations, and that further investigation of the subject will disclose some less revolutionary method of meeting the difficulty. Both the majority report and that of Mr. Languedoc indicate a careful examination of the subject, and these documents merit the serious attention of the profession.

---

The resignation of the Hon. Mr. Justice Fournier, as a Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, is announced. The learned judge has been a member of the Supreme Court since its organization in 1875. He was called to the bar of Quebec in 1846, and appointed a Q.C. in 1863.