

cess of enquiry and selection, and that nothing ought to be taken for granted when important interests are at stake and a responsible franchise has to be exercised by the electors.

The honor of the profession would be best subserved were certain methods, in themselves objectionable, eschewed, and essential enquiries into personal character and gentlemanly instincts and fitness of habits properly and fairly made.

Let us examine what are the methods of some electors. A circular is formulated and forwarded to electors, purporting to give an account of a meeting of a local Bar Association—where, in point of fact, no such association has been formed—or, we will say, from some other quarter a circular is issued by a coterie, presented in the name of the "Local Bar," informing the electors elsewhere, that the choice of the so-called "Local Bar" has fallen upon Mr. So-and-so, who is nothing more than the choice of the clique. At the same time the circulars ask all and sundry, in the other counties, to support their respective nominees, undertaking at the same time in return to support whatever candidate may be nominated and notified to them, as the choice of the persons receiving the circulars.

In a few days another circular is received by the same electors contradicting one of those first sent, whereby it is announced that two other persons have been nominated and their names forwarded as the choice of the "Local Bar!"

The effect of these and the absurdity of this perversion of the objects of the election law of the Law Society, and the consequences they might lead up to, are only too obvious and deplorable to need elucidation.

Let me give you, sir, a practical example, which I refer to with reluctance; but it is, nevertheless, my duty to state a fact, *i.e.*, that in the county in which I reside, nothing short of a political canvass has been set on foot to ensure the election of an old practitioner, who has, I frankly acknowledge, merits which I will mention, but whose demerits, such as want of dignity and intemperate habits, totally unfit him for so honorable and responsible an office. He stands fairly in his profession; under ordinary circumstances he is a good, clever lawyer and has a good repute abroad (where his habits are not generally known), but whom, in other respects, such as infirmity of temper, intemperate habits, and ungentlemanly instincts, it would be hard to beat, and would be no honor to the Bench of the Law Society. If drinking in low dives; if becoming occasionally saturated with whiskey; if pettifogging and bullying before Justices of the Peace, as a means of "shining as a whale amongst minnows" for the edification of the unwashed million; if abusing, in the lowest, meanest language, the counsel opposed to him; if "spread-eagleism" and bombast and vulgar arrogance; if superficial coloring and gloss, as a make-believe for profundity; if performing unprofessional pranks before a petty Magistrate's Court in the country—which he would not dare attempt in a regular Court of Justice—afford an outfit for the position, then he is the man, and he ought to be elected.

All I can say further to the members of the profession abroad who think otherwise, is to enquire into the pranks that some men "cut up" at home,