

these four gentlemen themselves should be apprised of the fact, the secretary was allowed to tell a representative of *The Barrister* about it. We were then told by the secretary that the Benchers did not allow a report of their proceedings to be given to any paper except *The Canada Law Journal*, and that even that paper could get no report except one made out by the secretary of the society itself. *The Canada Law Journal* are paid for the publication. This, we think, is a matter that the lawyers of Ontario should know of. We had thought that the principle here so grossly outraged was one which men like Hampden had won centuries ago. There is no difference between this and the Star Chamber of Charles the First. The objections to such a state of affairs are so obvious, the principles trampled upon so venerable and so universally accepted, that we will not take up space to argue the question. The question is really not debatable. We simply lay the matter before our readers.

* * *

Settling Criminal Prosecutions.

The case of the treasurer of the city of Guelph brings to mind a subject which the good of this country demands should be given prompt treatment at the hands of the proper authorities. There is a great deal involved in this matter. The treasurer of a

municipality embezzles upwards of \$10,000. He is prosecuted in the usual way, but interminable delays immediately crop up, connived at by the prosecution and defence in order to allow of negotiations to be made for a settlement. Surely there must underlie all this a strange misconception of the object of the administration of justice. However, to return, after many conferences and reports to the City Council, and much straining on their part to frighten the friends of the accused into paying as large a part of the shortage as possible, they succeed in getting back \$10,000 even. Then the learned counsel hie to the Court room, and with much formality the prisoner pleads guilty. Counsel for the prosecution "understand" that the prisoner has made very substantial restitution, and has already been some weeks in jail. A light sentence is humbly asked, and it is piously suggested that the prisoner has had a severe lesson. The Court looks severe and serious. There is strength of purpose, not to be swerved by considerations for high social position, written in every line of the Court's countenance. One can feel it in the atmosphere that there is one law in that Court for rich and poor, high and low. Judgment: three months' imprisonment.

We would not make such an outcry in this case were it not