LEGAL LEGISLATION.

In the Dominion Legislature the Statute book, so far as the practising lawyer is concerned, is remarkable for what is *not* there, for which we tender our hearty thanks. The only acts worth referring to at present are, one "to amend the Insolvent Act of 1875 and amending Acts," which repeals sections 15 and 15 of 40 Vict., cap. 41, and revives sec. 58 of the act of 1875, thus bringing back the law of that date, as to the circumstances under which an insolvent can obtain his discharge; also a carefully drawn act establishing the rule of decision in the North-West Territories.

In the Local Legislature the year 1881 will be remarkable for the most important act that has been passed (so far as we are concerned) since the Common Law Procedure Act. Several other important changes in the law have also been made, which it is hardly worth dilating upon, as the acts as passed are given *in extenso* in a supplement to the *Ontario Gazette*, already in hands of most of our readers. These statutes may be shortly summarised as—Acts respecting Interpleader; to regulate the fees of Deputy Clerks of the Crown, and County Court cases, in certain cases, &c; to make provision for the administration of justice in the new county of Dufferin; to amend the Registry Act as to the execution of discharges of mortgages, and to provide further for the release of dower by married women; in reference to chattel mortgages; respecting the appointment of guardians for infants, and lastly, an act to extend the powers of the Law Society of Upper Canada.

ELECTION OF BENCHERS.

The quinquennial disturbance of the serene atmosphere of Osgoode Hall is again upon us. The principle involved in the present mode of selecting Benchers was not originally to our taste, but it cannot be said that it has made any marked difference in the *personnel* of the Bench. There has been much discussion as to those who should be elected on this occasion, the lay press has been filled with letters on the same subject, and various lists have been distributed. A great deal also has been said and written about making an election from the Junior Bar, as such. It is a pity that any issue of this sort should have been raised. The real evil has, we fear, been to a great extent lost sight of in a useless wrangle about the words Senior and Junior. It would be as absurd, (or even more so, as "vidth give visdom,") to select a man simply because he is a junior as it would be to do so because he is a senior. The evil we speak of, and one which we have never ceased urging, is the claims of the profession to protection from an army of unprofessional invaders, both in the matter of Division Court business and as to conveyancing: and we again repeat that these are the main points to which attention should have been directed. We trust that those who wish to see justice done in the premises are keeping this matter prominently in view without reference to class distinctions.

We are glad to know that though late in their official life, and after much urging through our columns and from individual sufferers, the present Benchers awoke to the necessities of the case, and passed a resolution from which we hope to see good fruit. This step, however, must be followed up with vigor. The profession is not as a class alive to its own interests. We move also slowly, but we think *surely* as well; and when once we begin to realize the enormous power we can wield, we shall probably see that things are put right. In the meantime we have great faith in the good sense of the profession, and have good hopes that the selection now to be made will show that an honest independent vote has been given, to result in a choice free from sectional feeling, false sentiment, or the curse of party politics