

EDITORIAL NOTES.

it possible to get an Ontario Bar or the Ontario public or in fact any unprejudiced mind to say that the probabilities are not largely in favour of the view of the nine eminent judges, who have been overruled, on points in which they are specially versed, by three judges of less experience and certainly of no greater ability or research.

The completion of the labours of the New Testament Revision Committee is a matter of national importance and of deep significance to all English-speaking people. There is little doubt that this revision will be accepted and adopted by the public, and if so, it will be the ninth English version which has successively come into general use. It is expected that the University presses of Oxford and Cambridge will issue the revised New Testament in February, 1881. We see it stated in our exchanges that immediately on the appearance of the new version, an eminent firm of London publishers will also issue an edition and contest at law the legal right of the Company of Revisors to the copyright. In our opinion, if it be necessary the right to this copyright should be protected by Parliament, as there is a great outlay of large necessary expenses incurred by the English and American Boards of Revision to be provided for.

The irrepressible Sheriff at Hamilton is out with another pamphlet on the subject of Sheriff's fees, &c. As far as we can judge, from what he states therein, he is so utterly disliked by the profession in his own county that they take every means to "starve him out." There are a few other sheriffs almost as obnoxious, but we are glad to say very few. Those of his cloth who have any regard for their own interests should endeavour to suppress this pamphleteer, for there is no

knowing how he may injure them before he is stopped. We presume the Attorney-General will see to it that the public are protected from his scheme to put money in his own pocket at their expense. Curiously as it may sound to some, the interests of litigants and lawyers are the same in this matter. As the present pamphlet is much the same as the last, the statements therein need not again be refuted.

It has been supposed that the Bar of the United States is peculiar in the laxity of its discipline; but if the following extract from an exchange gives any indication, there is one country we know of, that, so far as the breach of professional ethics is concerned (not now making any comparison as to the ethics alone) has no ground for boasting of being in an advanced condition. We might here, *en passant*, ask what has been done by the Law Society in connection with the treatment of Mr. Hutchinson by a brother member of the London Bar. The extract referred to is as follows:—

"The Supreme Court of Baltimore, Md., after a protracted trial entered an order on the 9th inst. striking from the roll of attorneys of that Court the name of ex-Judge Wm. E. Gleeson. The order of the Court in the case professes to set out the offence charged, and is as follows:—

"Testimony having been argued fully on both sides by counsel, it is therefore, on this 9th day of November, 1880, found and adjudged by the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, that the respondent the said Wm. E. Gleeson, on or about the 4th day of June, 1880, in the case of W. A. Reed & Co. against C. J. Proctor, and which was then being tried in the Baltimore City Court before the judge presiding therein, in answer to an inquiry from the judge why a certain witness was not produced, replied that we (meaning himself, the said Gleeson, and his client, S. T. Proctor), have had the witness, meaning a certain John S. Edwards, summoned but he failed to attend, or words of like import and effect, and that said reply was false, the said witness, as said Gleeson well knew, having on said day attended said Court after having been summoned aforesaid, and having been dismissed by said Gleeson, and that