

We have yet to learn that there is any rule of etiquette, or propriety, which demands that such criticism should be withheld until it is ascertained whether all possibility of appeals have been exhausted.

It is also to be remembered that solicitors are officers of the court, and have a duty in that regard as well as a duty to do the best they can, within professional limits, for their clients. They should, at all times, aid the court in coming to a proper and fair conclusion, even though in so doing they might seem to be disloyal to their clients. If this be so, surely it is proper and right that a legal journal should act as an *amicus curiæ*, and we venture to think that this is in the nature of a duty, rather than something to be deprecated. We are sure judges are always glad of any light that might be thrown on any difficult point of law.

In conclusion, we need scarcely remind our readers that judgments of trial judges as well as of Divisional Courts are constantly criticized in the English legal journals, and no objection is taken.

THE LIBERTY OF THE SUBJECT.

The opponents of vaccination and inoculation are up in arms over a bill introduced into the Ontario Legislature, which contains some very stringent and most objectionable provisions. Not being a medical journal it is not in our province to discuss medical matters; but the proposed interference with the liberty of the subject makes us free to refer to the bill.

By one section the father and mother of every child born in the province is at some appointed time within three months after its birth to take the child to a proper medical practitioner for the purpose of being vaccinated. The father or mother not complying with these provisions incurs a penalty not exceeding \$25.

Another provision is that in every municipality where small-pox exists, or where, in the opinion of a local board of health, it is in danger of breaking out, all inhabitants, who have not been