

THE SESSION—THE BAR.

by custom house inspectors which has proved exceedingly offensive to European travellers, and which it is not supposable that the law ever contemplated.

AN old friend, from whom we are always delighted to hear, writes us, from Ottawa, as to the work of the Session. There has not been much that is of interest to lawyers; what there is, we may refer to hereafter. At present, we are concerned to give our readers a sugar plum to relieve the dry solidity of their fortnightly food. After speaking of a bill of the Postmaster-General's which died unborn,

"And closed its little being without light,"

our old friend discourses on the bills that did see the light, but then came to an untimely end, and thus invokes the muse *in memoriam cædis innocentium*:

"Poor innocents, loved offspring of the heads
Of legislative sires, who fondly dreamed
They'd blossom into Acts of mighty power
To work great marvels for our country's good,
To make her statesmen incorruptible,
Her laws so clear that doubtful points no more
Should trouble puzzled judges, and her chest
So full that deficits should be unknown.
Fond hopes destroyed by fell Herodian sword,
The glory and the praise they might have won,
The well-planned good they might, perhaps,
have done,
And all their promised blessings to the nation
Cut off by fate's sharp shears and—prorogation!
They died by Parliament's remorseless rule
And joined the martyr band of St. Ursule."

No tear, however, rises unbidden to our eye as we think of these slaughtered innocents—quite the reverse—all tears are gone, the last drop shed in bemoaning the rabbit-like productiveness of the Attorney-General of Ontario and the other fruitful mothers who have a yearly deliverance in the council chamber of our Legislative Assembly. When we think of these busy and expensive beings we are tempted to use the father's touching prayer as the olive branches came with annual regularity: "Oh, that Providence would only send them once in *two* years."

WE shall not now consider whether the charges that have recently been made, one against a solicitor for rendering fraudulent and excessive bills of costs, and the other against a Queen's Counsel of unprofessional conduct, are or are not well founded. We assume both persons to be innocent until proved guilty. The charge against the former is said by him to have been made for a contemptible political purpose, whilst the friends of the latter say that the charge against him was trumped up by way of retaliation. If there is any truth in any of these statements it is very discreditable to the parties concerned, and we trust the Law Society will make a full investigation, and will, so far as it has the power, see that justice is done in the premises.

But there is one feature of the case which is very important to the well-being and credit of the Bar, and being general in its character may properly be referred to now. It is quite inexcusable and highly improper for one barrister to make charges against another by an appeal to the public through the lay press, rather than to the Society of which they are both members, in the manner in such cases made and provided. We need not enlarge upon this; it has been alluded to before in these columns, and must now receive due attention no matter what may be the result of the present charges. Even assuming for the present that the utterances in Parliament were not justified, gentlemen of the profession should remember that two wrongs do not make a right. The gross injustice of thus publishing hearsay charges in the lay press is apparent to any one who sees the way in which the country papers twist things to suit political purposes or personal dislikes. In one now before us one of the accused persons, who we presume is waiting the proper time to make his denial or explanation, as he has as yet said nothing on the