The Barrister.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY.

All literary communications, exchanges, and books for review, should be addressed to THE BARRISTER, 97, 98, 99 Confederation Life Building, Toronto, Canada.

Address all business communications to The Law Publishing Company, of Toronto, 97, 98, 99 Confederation Life Building, Toronto, Can.

TORONTO, DECEMBER, 1894.

IT is not new to point out that so far as parties in politics are founded on real differences of opinion that the natural division is into Liberal and Conservative. Whenever the choice of party is determined by the point of view, the party chosen is the true sequence to the bent of the mind and mental habit. A curious parallel has been shown to have existed in the profession in former days, between Whig and Tory, and Equity and Common Law lawyer. The great English Common Law lawyers were for the most part Tories; the leaders of the Equity Bar were Whigs. With this fact in mind we can now explain some seeming anomalies in the history of legislation, for we can see that many measures were linked with party objects. For instance, who would have expected, *a priori*, that conservatives should found the new doctrine of employer's liability for accidents to workmen received in the course of employment, or that conservatives should interfere with parental rights by enacting the Factory Acts? The root of such legislation is to be found, perhaps, in the fact that the majority of manufacturers were liberals. Whether it was that these measures were passed, as it were, in retaliation for the unkind treatment of landed interests, which were chiefly conservative, by repeal of the Corn Laws, or because the liberals could not bring themselves to burden their party friends. To the conservatives belongs the honor of first placing this remedial legislation upon the statute book. On the other hand the liberals advanced the scope of their favored jurisprudence. For liberals passed the Judicature Acts which subordinate the Common Law to the rules of Equity. In this view the Judicature Acts might fairly be termed a party triumph over professional as well as political opponents. It may now be found that the party triumph has, in the interests of jurisprudence, been pushed too far. It is not possible that judges can always be selected of that mental habit which takes naturally to indefinite expansion of the principles of Equity jurisprudence. It would seem inevitable that the fusion of law and equity will result in the crystalization of principle and the refinement of practice. Some new liberalizing force will be required to prevent the conjoint product of law and equity degenerating into a code and the subject of technical interpretation by the judges. Will this force come from the Legislature or from the Bar?

*

A CORRESPONDENT, who feels that the time is sadly out of joint, finds the root of all the evil to be in the ever present question of costs. He thus delivers himself:—"What is the reason of the clamour against lawyers to-day? I think the universal answer of all the clamourers would be that the public are being eaten up by law costs. In their heated fancy a lawyer is pictured as a dragon devouring by his bills of costs fields and meadows. Can an older brother tell us whether litigation to-day