was prevented from reaching an acute stage by the impugned member declaring that he had declined a brief in the matter because he thought its acceptance might interfere with his freedom of action in Parliament. We almost regret the honourable and learned member's innocence, because had the charge been founded in fact its exploitation might have resulted in some specific rule being formulated in reference to such cases, which would conserve at once the etiquette of the profession and the independence of Parliament.

* * *

BOOTS IN ELECTRIC COACHES.—When John Davis recovered a verdict for $200 damages against the Ottawa Electric Railway Company for being forcibly ejected from a street car because he insisted upon keeping his feet, proudly encased in "new and rare-glistering boots," upon an empty seat opposite to the one on which he was sitting, the defendants, evidently agreeing with Milton where he remarks:

"What boots it at *one* gate to make defence?"

carried the case to the Divisional Court, the learned Judges of which decided, on the 5th instant, that Mr. Davis had put "his foot into it," so to speak, and set aside the verdict, with costs—

"And all appliances to boot."

Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis! In old days it was quite the proper thing to have boots piled high in coaches; nowadays to have them too much *en evidence* is a justification for summary eviction. Mr. Davis' varnished boots may not have been so altogether lovely as Trilby's bare feet, but nevertheless they have won quite as enduring a fame.

CHARLES MORSE.