

The Barrister.

VOL. II.

TORONTO, FEBRUARY, 1896.

No. 2.

EDITORIAL.

The Benchers and the St. Mary's Solicitor.

IN view of the fact that every lawyer in Ontario has had sent to his address a copy of "*The Brotherhood Era*" containing two leading articles dealing with this case it is impossible that a publication like the BARRISTER could avoid referring to the subject. We speak of *avoiding* the subject as we are at no pains to conceal the fact that we have no relish for it. The fact is that it is a case with some painful phases that would have prompted us were it not for *The Era's* article to have left the affair severely alone. Our feeling in this regard is, of course induced by a sympathetic regard for the unfortunate individual. And, on the other hand, as to the corporate body of Benchers we have no desire to enter on a course of antagonism like that which we have found signs of in not a few quarters. Looking at the results and for the moment shutting our eyes to the causes it is apparent that an extreme course involving very disastrous results to a Solicitor has been pursued by the Benchers. A Solicitor of the Supreme Court of Judicature for Ontario has been stripped of his professional attributes and

in a large measure crushed down into other walks of life. After years of toil and considerable expenditure of money his professional extinction is brought about in one short moment and, for one cause only—his inability to raise a paltry few dollars for fees. These, according to *The Era*, were the bald facts unrelieved by any extenuating circumstances, and as it did seem to us a most monstrous case we were inclined to feel very strongly and were prepared to break a lance in a cause that seemed founded in justice. Besides this, *The Era* had given the impression that the Solicitor in question was snuffed out for but one year's arrears of fees, and we were prepared to contrast his case with that of arrears of taxes where four years of arrears can accumulate before the law reaches out its arm to inflict any extreme penalty. We were also inclined to think that the impecunious Solicitor could bitterly revolve in his mind that his way was harder than that of his sinning brother, who had not been particular about distinguishing *meum* and *tuum* when dealing with client's moneys, inasmuch as the clever scalawag is generally allowed to continue to prey again so long