ablest or most experienced member. The theory and the fact also are, that in each firm are contained all the elements for the due adminstration of any kind of legal business. By these measures the ordinary requirements of all classes of suitors may be satisfied. But it may, and often does occur, that a client of a firm becomes involved in a suit demanding the advocacy of the best man in the profession. At the same time the client is, of course, anxious not to desert the firm with which he has been all his life connected. This contingency is amply met. On this state of things being communicated to the firm, the client proceeds to retain the advocate required. The advocate according to an invariable rule of courtesy, communicates with the firm, so that all parties consent to the arrangement. In such case the advocate obtains his instructions from the firm, and argues the case, and there his duty begins and ends. His charges are paid by the client who retains him, and not by or through the firm.

Let us here pause a moment, and see how the change into such a system could be accomplished in England. Suppose that for the future every person desirous to practise as a lawyer, is 'called or admitted to the Bar.' proper examinations, proper periods and methods of study could be instituted, and the societies of the Inns of Court could undergo such a change as would very greatly enhance the value of their efforts as law universities. No difficulty would be found in meeting the exigencies of legal preparation both in the metropolis and in the provinces. While the new school of practitioners was being formed, the present generation of lawyers could adapt themselves readily to the new order of things. Once break down the artificial barrier, and firms would spring up in every direction, consisting, for example, of one counsel at the common law bar, another cousnel at the chancery, and of a solicitor. Who doubts that such an arrangement would best meet the wants of the public? A man of business, or of fortune, upon whom a sudden legal difficulty has come, does not, in the emergency of the moment, care to be told that a case will be prepared, laid before counsel, and an opinion obtained at the end of a week. He goes to his physician, and gets a prescription *eo instanti*. Why cannot his affairs be tended with equal celerity? Again, there may be a line between the duties of an advocate and an attorney, but it certainly is not a sharp one; and it may occur to some candid persons that it is the system, not the nature of things, that has manfactured the line. The existence of the line is scarcely perceptible in America or in our colonies. Here we have adjusted our lens so that it has become a gulf rather than a line. Again, the argument, if it is to be so called, is put forward that the honour of the Bar is maintained by the existing arrangement. We never have quite understood this expression. But it must mean one of two things, either that a barrister will be demoralised by pursuing the great principle that governs the universe of labour, namely, by getting pay for work done, or that if a barrister could only get at the original client, he would plunder the unfortunate victim. The first notion is contrary, not to all experience, but to all human action whatever, and is based on the monstrous fiction that a barrister is not paid now. The second is met by the suggestion that the barrister is not more likely to abuse his trust than the solicitor. There is one thing further, that in some few cases a barrister is retained in a rascally transaction, and the attorney acts as a veil between the advocate and the client, so that the Court is addressed by an honorable man, in valuable unconsciousness of what is behind. If any person thinks that this constitutes a proper argument, he is at liberty to do so, but we content ourselves by saying that we should be delighted to do anything to confound utterly such methods of action.

To proceed, however, with our comparison. In America, lawyers are liable in actions for negligence. In England, barristers are not so liable, because, as there is no contract to pay the barrister, there is no consideration to support the contract. Once sweep away the dogma that a barrister shall not recover for work done, and of course the corresponding obligation to perform work with a reasonable degree of skill and care arises. In reality the Bar would sustain no damage. English barristers do neglect their duties, and are most rarely, if ever, incompetent. They would have nothing to fear, while the client would enjoy his right, under protection of the law, to have that done for which now he pays just as much as he ever will pay in the future.

It is clearly impossible that, after an amalgamation of the two branches has been consummated, the law of costs can stand for an hour. We never heard any man, except a law-accountant, say a good word for costs. They are based on no intelligable principle: they plunder the client in a trumpery case, and let him off much too easily in an important case. It is not in human nature for a man who has only 500*l.* at stake in a cause or other legal matter to pay willingly a large bill, because his attorney has been put to considerable trouble. On the other hand, a matter involving many thousands of pounds may be finished at a lower figure, to the unfair detriment of the attorney's pocket. In America the system is simple enough. The firm send in their bill, assessing the amount to some extent with reference to the trouble and expense incurred, but more with reference to the value of the property recovered or dealt with. In the long run the lawyers are amply remunerated, and the clients are satisfied. If a dispute arises upon the charges of the bill, and an action is brought by the firm, the plaintiffs call the evidence of other lawyers to show that the charges are customary and fair, precisely