

LAW SOCIETY—BENCH AND BAR.

him; but the gentleman who now occupies the position may rest assured that he enters upon the duties of his responsible office with the best wishes of his brethren, who accept his election in the belief that an excellent appointment has been made, and that he will fulfil his duties with that conscientious attention and honesty of purpose, which, with his undoubted learning, has gone so far to establish his reputation at the Bar.

CALLS TO THE BAR.

The following gentlemen were called to the Bar this Term :

H. H. Ardagh, J. S. Fraser, (without oral, for merit).

E. P. Clement, H. H. Culver, D. W. Clendennan, J. W. Liddell, J. W. Nesbitt, A. C. Galt, Harry Symons, Albert Ogden, J. L. Whiteside, F. W. Casey, C. L. Ferguson, F. S. Nugent, T. E. Lawson, R. Harcourt, G. A. Cooke, (without oral as being attorney), J. C. Patterson, J. Judd.

ATTORNEYS ADMITTED.

The following is the list of those admitted this Term to practice as attorneys :

John L. Whiting, John Crerar, (without oral, for merit).

A. C. Galt, F. W. Patterson, W. H. Culver, E. F. B. Johnston, C. H. Woodward, C. L. Ferguson, J. L. Whiteside, C. S. Jones, E. Mahon, T. M. Daly, F. S. Nugent, J. J. Creighton, H. A. E. Kent, R. J. Duggan, J. C. Patterson, and R. E. Wood, (who passed his examination last Term).

BENCH AND BAR.

It has been our unpleasant duty, on several occasions, to call attention to the objectionable practice, indulged in by certain newspapers, of discussing cases pending in the courts, and to the freedom with which improper motives are attributed to honourable and upright judges in giving the judgments which

the justice of the case before them seemed, in their opinion, to require. We have never denied the right of the press, and when we thought the occasion offered have acted accordingly, to discuss freely a judgment upon its merits as a matter of abstract argument, though even this has, as far as the lay press is concerned, its dangers. But when this freedom is abused, and abused to the extent that has been seen of late, it is time that some steps should be taken not only to protect the judges from such cowardly attacks, but to repress an evil fraught with the most serious consequences to the welfare of the State. We have had lately an avalanche of libels on the Bench, most of them arising out of bitterness engendered by party politics. But the last case that has come under our notice was subject to no incident of that nature, and was of an especially aggravated character, in that the offender was, and still is, unfortunately, a practising barrister and solicitor.

The offence in the case we are about to allude to, and of which a correspondent speaks in a letter which we publish in another place, is of a twofold character. In the first place there was conduct fraudulent in itself, and there was also a most unjustifiable attack on one of the judges of the Court of Chancery. It is with the first of these two offences, and other matters incident thereto, that we propose now specially to deal.

In the suit of Dr. Pringle against Henry Sandfield Macdonald, a bill was filed to compel the defendant to re-convey to the plaintiff a piece of land in the town of Cornwall; and it was alleged that the defendant had obtained from the plaintiff a conveyance of the land by fraud and deceit. It appeared in evidence that an agreement was entered into between the parties for the sale and purchase of the west three-quarters of the north half of a lot in the town of Cornwall, which agree-