

# The Barrister.

VOL. I.

TORONTO, JUNE, 1895.

No. 7.

## EDITORIAL.

WE are being asked on all sides what is the Law Society doing for the profession. We would reply that it is seeing that each and every lawyer in this Province pays seventeen dollars a year for the privilege of making a living or starving as the case may be. That it exacts unswerving professional integrity and honorable conduct from every member of the profession. That for fear the profession should be corrupted by high living it is rushing young men through in shoals so as to keep the average income down to \$500 a year or a \$1.50 a day. A great many members of the profession are grumbling that the bricklayers' union and the stonemasons' union look after their guild much better than the benchers do after the law profession in that the average incomes of bricklayers and stonemasons are \$3.50 a day, or more than twice that of lawyers—but of course the benchers who are making a study of this question know what is best for the profession, and they have undoubtedly arrived at the conclusion that luxuries are bad for the average solicitor and if it is necessary to let five hundred a year through to attain this object it must

be done. Again it is necessary for the dignity of the profession to have a very strong bar, that is to have a few counsel drawing princely salaries and the more lawyers there are the more briefs there will be for leading counsel.

\*

WE were much surprised the other day in listening to a leading Q.C. repeating himself no less than eleven times in an argument of two hours and a half, which should easily have been compressed into forty minutes. It is a great pity that counsel do not take more pains to be alike logical and terse. No wonder that the judges are often irritable.

\*

IT is seriously being considered whether the following should not be deemed a maxim of law: The liar, the d—n liar and the expert witness. There is no doubt whenever expert evidence is called the average layman's nerves are considerably shaken up and he is forced to the conclusion that to succeed with this kind of evidence quantity and not quality is the necessary requisite.