

a thing of the past. We believe the members of the profession will think before they mark their ballots. Our desire is to see the best men elected. The Barrister has no desire to indite the present Benchers for felony or grievous sin individually, nor to find fault with the general administration of the affairs of the Law Society for the past five years. We do not believe that a single appointment in the gift of the Law Society during the last five years has been made upon personal grounds.

On the other hand, we do believe that recent appointments which have been assailed by correspondents in the daily newspapers on the grounds of family and family compact, etc., could not be improved upon. We believe the best and most capable men available have been appointed by the present Benchers.

It is our belief that the evils that exist are found in the Act incorporating the Law Society. It may be said that the Benchers should have taken means to amend the Act. In the opinion of many the term of office is too long, so long in fact that before it has half expired the Benchers are out of touch with the profession. Two or three years would be a sufficiently long term of office.

Again, in the opinion of many, there should be some means of

making formal and official nominations. Every candidate should be duly nominated as in any other election. As the Act stands at present, the existing Benchers are practically the only persons who obtain the benefit of a decent nomination.

It has been said with some force that the Benchers should represent localities or districts, as is the case with the Medical Council. This practice would enable all parts of the Province to be represented. The appointment of Bencher is an honorary one of even greater distinction than the appointment of Queen's Counsel, and we think these honors should in reason and in season be passed around, and be distributed among the leaders of the profession. We do not approve of the present system, which is rapidly becoming that of "once a Bencher always a Bencher."

In reality the Benchers are little more than "bare trustees." They have very little active duty to perform, and outside of legal education and an occasional appointment, they have practically no discretion in administering the affairs of the profession.

The present Benchers cannot be censured for anything that they have done, but might they not have done something in addition to the daily task laid down by the statute which creates them.