

# LEGAL POST *Know the Law*

TRENDING [FP 500](#) | [BlackBerry](#) | [Northern Gateway](#) | [Loonie](#) | [Housing Market](#) | [Bank of Canada](#) | [Family Finance](#) | [Keystone XL Pipeline](#) | [Energy](#) | [E3 2014](#)

## End barriers to foreign lawyers



VERN KRISHNA | April 3, 2013 9:18 AM ET  
[More from Vern Krishna](#)

[Republish](#)  
[Reprint](#)



It's easier for a Canadian lawyer to work in many countries than it is for a foreign-educated lawyer to work here.

Allen McInnis/Postmedia News files

### Foreign lawyers key to dealing with demand for legal services

“Access to justice” three little words that are the repeated theme of speeches by legal luminaries and politicians to bar association meetings bemoaning the high cost of legal fees that make justice inaccessible to middle-income Canadians.

The conventional solution proffered is that lawyers should reduce their fees and governments should increase legal aid, neither of which is likely to occur in the near future. I think that opening up the profession may better serve the public interest.

The price of legal services in a market economy is a function of the demand and supply of such services. Both of these variables pressure legal fees in Canada.

The demand for legal services is escalating as governments become more intrusive and churn out complex legislation covering just about every aspect of one's life. The doctrine that everyone is presumed to know the law is intellectually stimulating, but does not help ordinary Canadians. The Income Tax Act, for example, is probably the extreme of volume and complexity. At 3,000 pages and expanding annually, the law changes rapidly and affects 16 million taxpayers, who are all presumed either to know its intricacies, to pay professionals for help and advice, or to pay penalties for non-compliance.

### Related

[Head of the Class: Chambers now fully recognizes Canada's class action bar](#)

---

## Law 'lite' no more: Procurement law gets its due

Procedural complexity, oppressive presumptions, prolonged litigation, and concerns of professional negligence contribute to advancing legal fees and the increasing number of self-represented litigants. It appears difficult for governments – the culprits in escalating the demand for legal services – to digest that self-represented litigants increase the cost of administration of justice, which taxpayers ultimately pay. Thus, whether directly or indirectly, taxpayers pay the price of complex and voluminous legislation.

Consider the case of the Toronto citizen charged in 2011 with swinging a shovel at a raccoon rummaging through his garbage. His trial was rescheduled 18 times between his scheduled appearance and mid-March 2013. Nevertheless, the prosecution presses on in pursuit of absolute justice regardless of the cost to the individual and to taxpayers. Let them eat cake! Only the raccoon is amused.

Things are not much better on the supply side of legal services. The legal profession is self-regulated and controls the admission of lawyers to practice. Law societies say that they regulate legal services in the “public interest” and must ensure the competence of lawyers. The argument is valid, but it is not sufficient to control the supply of competent lawyers.

Canadian law schools are constrained by government financing and fee restrictions from increasing their intake of law students. Canadians shut out of domestic law schools must go elsewhere to obtain a common law degree. Australia and England, for example, have opened their doors to Canadian students, but at a price: they must pay foreign tuition fees, which can be as high as \$30,000 per year, plus living and travel expenses.

Foreign-educated graduates face increasing barriers upon their return to Canada. Graduates with a first-class degree (top 2%) from the University of London, for example, have to write seven additional examinations and have had some of their graduate courses from Canadian law programs discounted for accreditation purposes. Similarly, graduates from American Ivy League schools, with three years of experience on Wall Street and jobs with prestigious firms on Bay Street, have had to struggle with the Law Society of Upper Canada’s rules on admission to the bar.

In contrast, Canadian graduates can go to the United States and enter any state bar simply by passing the same examinations required of all American graduates. Canadian lawyers can go to England and qualify as a solicitor upon writing only two examinations. Here at home, lawyers trained in the civil law of Quebec can move to a common law province in Canada without hindrance, but a Canadian lawyer trained in the common law of England cannot.

Expanding the role of paralegals to provide routine legal services could also help many middle-income individuals manoeuvre the legal maze. Paralegals are increasingly better educated. Some community colleges now offer four-year degree programs in law, which should permit their graduates to expand the scope of legal services that they provide.

Law societies ask governments to provide more money to fund legal aid, particularly in family and criminal matters. At a time when governments face huge deficits (Ontario’s is about \$12-billion in 2013, and expanding), it is unlikely that provincial budgets will be diverted to legal aid. There are few votes in promoting legal aid.

Arizona State University College of Law, which ranks among the top public law schools in all U.S., and 26th overall amongst all U.S. law schools, plans to become the first North American law school offering a three-year degree that will provide substantive education in both U.S. and Canadian law. ASU hopes that their graduates will qualify to practise in both countries. To be sure, they will be entitled, upon passing the requisite state bar examination, to practise in the United States. The Federation of Law Societies of Canada, however, signals that ASU graduates will not have an easy entry into the Canadian legal profession. They will have to restudy Canadian law and have to write multiple substantive examinations.

The battle over constraining the supply of legal services has a checkered history in Canada.

In *Andrews v. Law Society of British Columbia*, for example, the law society tried to make citizenship a prerequisite for entry into the bar. The Supreme Court of Canada held the rule violated the equality provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In *Black v. Law Society of Alberta*, the law society tried to prevent interprovincial law firms from practising in Alberta. The Supreme Court of Canada disagreed. The rule infringed the mobility rights guaranteed by the Charter. In *Law Society of British Columbia v. Mangat*, the society tried to restrict immigration consultants from practising before federal Immigration and Refugee Board tribunals without being called to the B.C. bar. The Supreme Court struck down the rule.

Three strikes should be enough to send the message that provincial self-regulation of lawyers cannot create unreasonable barriers for

access to the legal profession. Enhancing access to the profession will increase the supply of lawyers and promote access to justice.