the leaders of the bar. The result is that the administration of the law—with a few striking exceptions—is intrusted to men who are either influenced by political zeal, or who wish to make a name for themselves. In such hands justice too frequently becomes a farce; and the practising barristers must too often feel, if they do not express, their contempt for the character, learning, and discretion of their own presiding officer.

Our duty as historians is to point out facts, and to let our readers apply the remedy and profit by the moral. Can such a state of things be satisfactory? Does the Republican form of electing by ballot to public offices work advantageously in this direction? When will the last pound break the camel's back? When will the citizens of this great city unite in protecting themselves and their property from the timorous vacillations of the Bench, and the insolent usurpations of the Bar?

AMERICAN VIEW OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

It is true at all times, that a knowledge of law, considered as the science of morals and justice, should be one of the first subjects to receive the attention of those charged with education. We might dwell on this at length, were it not too obvious to need discussion. Circumstances have rendered this duty on the part of the collegiate institutions one of an imperative character at the present time. But a few years since, and the term of seven years was prescribed as the period for the study of the law before the candidate could present himself for admission to the bar. Nor was this time too long, for the experience of the profession abundantly shows that it is not until long after his introduction to the forum the lawyer becomes skilled in professional learning, so wide is the field of research, so numerous are the elementary treatises and reports, and so vast the labor requisite even for a familiarity with the standard authors. The seven years, however, are soon abridged to three, by counting the four years spent in a collegiate course as an equivalent to four of the legal course. Finally the rule itself was entirely abolished, and the path to professional practice has been opened to any candidate who may prove himself able to pass the requisite examination. What tests their examinations are of proficiency is too well known to need comment. The result is, that the bar is flooded with tyros, commencing practice without sufficient previous training and discipline, or even a pretence of that learning which is essential to the formation of a good lawyer. A young man thus thrown into active life, rarely, if ever finds that leisure which is necessary for study; amid the cares of business, the utmost he can do is to prepare himself as well as possible for the particular emergency, and his legal education thus becomes a matter of chance and accident—a result of personal experiences, depending entirely upon the cases upon which he may happen to be employed, and utterly wanting, therefore, in that method and accuracy, and knowledge of principles which long instruction can alone impart. The consequences of such a system are yet only partially felt. Our most distinguished lawyers and judges are the crop of the old planting; but when this seed has run out, and we come to reap the new harvest—when the bar and the bench are to be supplied from men who have approached the profession without sufficient education and learning—then some adequate remedy must be applied, or the very foundations of law and of justice will be subverted. We look for this remedy in the special training and education of those designed for the legal profession, in the college and the law school. The student at law requires as much, at least, of particular instruction in his department, as the student of medicine or divinity. The science of which he should become a master needs methodical and protracted study; it is spread over a wide range of text books; it is multifarious in its details, abstruse and profound in its principles, and to be well taught, demands able, skilful, and learned instructors. In our opinion, no greater boon could be conferred upon the community in which we live than the institution, in connection with one of our colleges, of a course of legal education, under the direction of competent professors, in which the students who throng the law offices of New York might participate whilst learning the practical duties of their profession. The wants of the age demand this, and the want must be supplied.

CHANCERY PROCEDURE.

It has been, time out of mind, the fate of the Chancery Court to be abused by the public, and of the Master's office to be abused by the profession. Here and at home such has been the fact.

Abuse, however, by no means implies a want of cause. It is as notorious that in England the evils of Chancery were as great as modern reforms have been beneficial. It is equally notorious that from the creation of a Court of Chancery in this Province in the year 1837, consisting of one Judge, until 1849, when it was made to consist of five, much cause of complaint existed.

The re-organization of the Court, the appointment of an able and experienced chief, the simplifying of procedure, these and such like steps tended much to alleviate mischief apparently inherent in the system. Still dissatisfaction is felt; still dissatisfaction is expressed. The cause of dissatisfaction is not now so much want of confidence in the tribunal itself as endless and vexatious delays. The hot-bed of delays is the Master's office. We shall not at present undertake to say whether the fault is attributable to the gentleman who holds the office, or to the insufficiency of the law which allows only one master for such an office. Into these matters we are glad to learn it is the intention of those most concerned—the practitioners of the court—to make an investigation with the view of proposing to government some necessary measure of relief. We subjoin an account of the proceedings of a meeting of Chancery practitioners held for the purpose:

OSGOODE HALL, 30th January, 1858.

At a meeting of the profession this day holden in pursuance of the notice for the purpose of taking into consideration the best mode of expediting references after decree: it was moved by Robert A. Harrison, Esq., seconded by Adam Crooks, Esq. That Robert J. Turner, do take the Chair. And on motion of Robert A. Harrison, Esq., seconded by John Roaf Esq., Adam Crooks, Esq., was appointed Secretary.

It was then moved by John Roaf, Esq., seconded by George Morphy, Esq., and resolved: That W. Vynne Bacon, Esq., John Hector, Esq., Adam Crooks, Esq., George Hemings, Esq., and William Davis, Esq., be a Committee to report upon the present state of the master's office, and to suggest reforms—the report to be presented to an adjourned meeting of the profession to be holden at Osgoode Hall on Saturday next at the hour of two o'clock.

ROBERT J. TURNER,
Chairman.

LARCENY AND EMBEZZLEMENT.

In the number of this Journal for September last, we attempted to draw the distinction between larceny, embezzlement, and breach of trust. When doing so we were conscious of our inability to accomplish the object satisfactorily; but rather than abandon our intention, completed the article. The distinctions we drew, though fine as