

prosecutor. We then intimated that the nuisance was not unknown here, and we suggested that perhaps the *Kelly v. Archibald* verdict would have a good effect. It seems, however, that no such effect has yet become apparent, but quite the contrary is the case. It has been the practice in this Court to refuse to hear law students, but these police inspectors have been admitted to practice, as it were, and enjoy all the privileges of members of the Bar, though upon what they found a better right than law students we are not aware. Last 12th May the moral inspector was prosecuting, while a member of the Bar was acting for the defence. Both these persons soon commenced making uncivil remarks towards one another, and both certainly acted in very bad taste, indulging in coarse Billingsgate. In this discreditable contest the honors were nicely even when the inspector turns upon the barrister and—as reported in three different newspapers, published simultaneously—said: “See here, if you give me any more of your impertinence I will have you put out of this Court.” The lawyer uttered defiance, when the inspector pointed to a constable and roared “Remove that man.” Throughout all this and much more disgraceful dialogue, described above in general terms, Acting Police Magistrate Millar sat on his magisterial throne,

raised high above the contending parties, but he did not assert himself. Of course no one dared remove the lawyer. It is outrageous that a member of the Bar should be liable to such treatment.

*

We have been reading an article on the practice of counsel humbugging juries in the *Chicago Corporation Reporter*, and we regret to have to say that there is a little too much of it even among our own model Bar. It is only about five years since we saw what we thought a hardly creditable exhibition by a great Queen's Counsel, who is more of a criminal than a civil lawyer. His opponent was a popular Q.C. of but little legal inferiority. The judge was Chief Justice Galt. Toronto was where the venue had been laid. During his address to the jury the first-named gentleman reached on the table for a book. Opening it in the most innocent way, he turned to the jury and said, “Now, gentlemen, my learned friend has been talking to you a lot about the law. He tells you that he has the law on his side. But I am now prepared, gentlemen, and I am just going to read you what the law really is on the subject.” The opposing counsel rose and objected and was, of course, sustained; whereupon the greater Q.C. assumes a theatrical attitude. He had previously been cautious enough to have a