

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXII.

MARCH 1, 1886.

No. 5.

DIARY FOR MARCH.

2. Tues...Sittings of Court of Appeal, and Sittings C. C. of York for trials begin.
5. Fri.....Holt, C. J., died 1710, æt. 68.
8. Sat.....Lord Chan. Hardwicke died 1764, æt. 74.
7. Sun.....Quinquagesima Sunday.
10. Wed.....Ash Wednesday. First day of Lent.
13. Sat.....Lord Mansfield born, 1704.
14. Sun.....1st Sunday in Lent.

TORONTO, MARCH 1, 1886.

WE publish a letter in another place in reference to the recent Bar dinner. It needs no comment. We have not the pleasure of knowing the writer, but assume he is correct in saying that the article referred to was not read to the meeting which undertook to criticise its language. Our correspondent writes over his own signature in a manly, straightforward manner, and with a proper sense of what the profession owes to its own dignity.

WE have seen no reason to retract or alter anything we said in reference to the dinner. We simply expressed the views which later enquiry would seem to shew to be those of all whose opinion is of most value in matters professional. Doubtless the members of the Osgoode Legal and Literary Society have by this time fervently ejaculated, "Save us from our friends." On *its* behalf we protest against the "fiery resolution" which was no doubt intended to put an end to our existence; but which has, we think, in the public opinion of the profession, consumed those men who proposed and carried it. Those who passed it thereby said, "the cap fits," and promptly put it on. For our own part we expressly

said the Society's dinner of last year was not marred by such unseemly exhibitions as were noticed on the last occasion, and we do not believe and never said that its members were in any way, as a body or otherwise, responsible for them this year. As to the American Bar it is very well able to take care of itself. We know that there are many men of high feeling amongst its members, who would not have relished the "joke" of their representative, to which we referred, any more than we did. We feel sure that if our remarks, and not an incorrect summary of them, had been read at the meeting of the Society, that unhappy and most inapt resolution would have been laughed out of Court.

THE Benchers of the Law Society would act wisely if they referred to Imperial Acts of Parliament before drawing up rules, especially any affecting Irish solicitors, or they will get the credit of sympathizing with the extremest type of Irish Home Rulers, by ignoring *in toto* the legislation of the Imperial Parliament for Ireland. In the new rules of 1885, providing for the admission of solicitors in "special cases" (published on p. 42 of the *Law Journal*), they allow "an attorney and solicitor in the Courts of Chancery, Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, or Exchequer, in Ireland," to apply for permission to practise in Ontario; thus virtually repealing or ignoring (as do Home Rulers) the Imperial Act of 1877, 40 & 41 Vict. c. 57, which abolished these Irish "Four Courts," and declared that thereafter they should be consolidated into one "Supreme Court of Judicature"; and which also abolished the title "attorney" and substituted for it