



TRUTH FOR THE PEOPLE

OLD SERIES.—17TH YEAR.

TORONTO, ONT., JANUARY 30, 1886.

NEW SERIES.—VOL. VI. NO. 278.

IMPORTANT.

January 31st, the date announced for the closing of Bible Competition No. 15, falling on Sunday, all letters post marked February 1st will be eligible for entrance in that competition.

THE NOISE ABOUT THE FISHERIES.

Professor Baird has no enthusiasm for the proposed fishery arrangements for Canada and the United States. There is much talk in the newspapers now, and if one were to believe all that is said, and all that is hinted, the only conclusion he could reach would be that the Yankee people don't want our fish or our fishing privileges, and that, if we offered them for nothing, they would not be worth the acceptance. Several "representatives" and others have spoken, and as this is an international question there seems to be a strong desire to "talk" loud about it. But the loud-mouths that figure in the newspapers are not the American Government, nor the American nation, and in spite of all the verbiage hostile to a treaty arrangement, such arrangement will there be. It is a pity, however, that a man with a good reputation like professor Baird should make himself absurd about the matter. He can surely be loyal enough to the republic without making a fool of himself. He has reported to his Government, showing that the value of the privilege of fishing in Canadian waters has declined greatly within a few years, owing, first, to the fact that the habits of the fish formerly caught in great numbers near the shore have changed, and that they are now found further off shore, and second, that, with the new and improved appliances now in use, deep water fishing is more profitable and generally followed. If absurd theories are confined to pamphlets they are not of much consequence, but it is a different matter when they are dragged into an important international question as a basis of settlement. The theory that the fishes in coastal waters have changed their habits to a degree sufficient to affect this question, is the most ardent nonsense; and professor Baird cannot bring any respectable evidence of his contention into court. About twenty-five years ago the mackerel suddenly left the waters of the Newfoundland coast, and have never come back; but this is the only fact known to observers of the habits of our coast fishes that would fit itself to Prof. Baird's theory. There is something, though not very much, in his contention that certain fishery operations are carried on more extensively in deep waters of later years. But the statement rests chiefly upon the fact that within the past few years a larger class of vessels proceed from the Newfoundland coast to the Banks, instead of the operations being confined to coastal waters. This, however, does not prove that the coast fisheries have become less valuable; but that the Bank fishery has grown more popular. Hitherto fishing had been almost entirely confined to heavy vessels sitting out from France and St. Pierre in the early spring. The islanders

at last, stimulated by the example of the French, began to send ships of their own to the fertile plateau and year by year the English fleet there increases. But this, we repeat, is not proof that either the fishes, which come to shallow water to spawn, have changed their habits, or that the coastal fisheries are less important now than hitherto. The only coast fish that is falling off is the lobster; and that is chiefly due to the almost criminal indifference of the proper Department to the production of that valuable fish. Mr. Foster did not come to Marine and Fisheries any too soon.

THE FUTURE OF OUR LAWYERS.

Mr. Harold George writes in reply to an article in *TOWN* wherein the attention of the Minister of Education is called to one of the chief evils wrought by our present Educational System. Mr. George misses our point and raises the whole question again; and this is the reason that we decline publishing his letter in full. Mr. George, from his own statement, is a "rising barrister," and he considers that such an occupation as cutting cordwood and that sort of thing is not nearly so productive of coin as legal operations. We quote: "No change or expansion of the curriculum of schools will fill the 'empty farm houses' or cultivate the 'neglected fields.' True, the common weal must suffer if the farms run to weeds, and 'the professions' become too full; but agriculturists have the same right as others to acquire wealth, influence, and commanding positions by the minimum expenditure of energy and mind. At this season I might be now cutting and piling two cords of wood in each day of ten hours, thereby earning \$1.50 per diem. But by the exercise of the energetic mind accompanying the healthy body, I shall soon be admitted to the Bar, where money can be made *ad libitum*. That I do not make assumptions or deal with hypothetical cases, I need but mention some of the details of the charges made for legal labour by a young lawyer of Toronto. Here they follow:

To Drawing a Deed.....	\$34 00
"Reading over Do.....	10 00
"Certifying to Title Do.....	40 00
"Journey from Toronto to Hamilton and back.....	180 00
"Interviewing Chief Justice Moss.....	40 00
"Passing Title.....	300 00
"Drawing up brief.....	17 50
"Interviewing Mr. Langton.....	50 00
	\$740 50

This bill was paid, and it is in no way exceptional, for scores of others like it are paid weekly. Is it any wonder that the sentence of agriculture lags when tempting wages like this is to be obtained in 'the professions?' We certainly agree with Mr. George that it would be very foolish to bother with cordwood when there is such a harvest to be made at the law. We ought to point out, however, lest any young agriculturist reading the above might be lured away to so promising a profession, that there is many an industrious, capable and honest lawyer in the city of Toronto, who doesn't even earn \$740 in the whole round of the year. It is a fact that "fortunes" are made now by very few in the le-

gal profession; and that there is no more difficult road to affluence than that of law, especially if the beginner has no friend already in the profession.

The young man who tells you that he finds the law profitable now is one whose father is a judge or whose brother is a Q. C. Even profound ability has to bide its time; to be content to mount the stairs at an almost disheartening pace.

The reason is, as we have said before, that the learned professions are becoming crowded to very death. There are at this day in the city of Toronto three lawyers for every one that is needed, and every lawyer's office is full of students. If this swarming condition, certain young men with a "legal turn of mind" might do worse than cut and pile cordwood "at \$1 50 per diem."

Of course there is a lot of territory yet which the lawyers have not taken possession of. When the city is literally full of the learned gentlemen they may move out into the country, and that such a plan would not be a bad one will be apparent from the following fact:

About five years ago there came to Fredericton, in New Brunswick, a lawyer from the courts of Maine. His personal property consisted of a carpet bag in which were stowed some biscuits and cheese. He went to the police court, observed that it was "slow" there, and came to the conclusion that there was nothing to be done in the law line at Fredericton. He then enquired where lay the most fertile and populous district in the province, and being told that the stretch of territory along the St. John River answered his description, he set out for that place with his carpet bag. He selected the centre of the territory and arranged with a farmer about his board. He then found that the people were prosperous and peaceful, and that they had not the knowledge of such a thing as a lawsuit in their midst. On the following morning the lawyer began operations. He called upon every farmer in the place, and impressed one and all with his lucidity, and with the quickness of his insight into questions.

In a little while a slight change could be noticed in the general tone of the community, to a careful eye. There was less of brotherly love. Deacon Gunther began to complain to his wife that Deacon Brown did not keep up his share of the line fence, and that the fence, at any rate, gave too much land to Brown. Some other neighbor complained that Alex. Laug's sheep had been "pastured" free on his land for years; "and I have it on good authority that I could collect damages." The wives sought to soothe their husbands; but it was no use. The legal spirit had taken hold of the community. In six months from the arrival of Mr. Perrigo with his carpet bag there was not a man in that whole district who was not "at law" with his neighbor. As for the lawyer himself, his condition, too, was changed. He had acquired a pair of horned oxen, a cow, and several hundred sheep. He offered pointed out to his neighbors that their "doctrines" would

ed "half dead and alive" if he had not come in their midst.

To follow in the footsteps of Mr. Perrigo is all that we can see in the future for the surplus membership of the legal profession; unless, indeed, they should prefer the cordwood occupation at \$1.50 per diem.

CHRIST AS A DRINKER OF WINE.

A number of persons, many of them of high repute, and others without much character, have been declaring upon the platforms, and writing in the press, that it is an impertinence to condemn the use of alcoholic liquors on moral grounds, because Christ himself was known to have drunk fermented wine. One of the number says that the Saviour not alone drank wine Himself, but that He performed "a miracle in order to furnish others with the means of sinning." This may seem to be an overwhelming argument, till the other side of the case is heard. We are all aware that excessive use of wine is not a characteristic of eastern nations; and we learn nothing in the history or the poetry of the past to teach us that the nations of old suffered much from the practice of drunkenness. The truth is that in the time of Christ the owner of a vineyard pressed his grapes and drank the juice just as the owner of an apple orchard does now in Canada. It was reserved to the later generations to pervert the grains of the earth towards producing brandy and whisky. It is doubtful if such liquors as rum, gin, brandy, whisky and the other kinds which kill were known at all in those days. There were "publicans" and other "sinners" in Judea, but it would be as difficult to determine exactly what the business of the publican was, as it would be to describe the sort of beverages that he sold. This much is tolerably certain, that the Jews were not then addicted to intoxication, they never have been slaves to stimulants, and when Christ preached, intoxication was not a vice of the land. For this reason, it did not come under His ban; and He addressed himself only to the evils that were apparent. Wine was afterwards to stalk through the land, an insidious and inexorable destroyer; but as it was an evil yet unborn when the marriage feast was celebrated at Cana it was no more inveighed against, my friend, as it is now. Life's III.

But supposing intoxication had been rampant in the days of Christ, and that then were aware of the danger, and with the allowance of the law, wine by Christ was not brought into weight in the scale of sin.

The drink, however, was known to be a moderate one, and the law was not broken. The drink, however, was known to be a moderate one, and the law was not broken. The drink, however, was known to be a moderate one, and the law was not broken.