

"ruffians," and charged them with making "coarse and insulting innuendos," indulging in "indecent cross-examinations," and with "brow-beating honest witnesses," etc. We are not unaccustomed to such choice language on the part of a certain class of newspaper writers, and the profession can afford to ignore that feature of the article. We apprehend, however, that our judges are sufficiently alive to their duties to prevent any such unprofessional conduct when counsel are guilty of it; but, as such breaches do not exist, except possibly in some isolated cases, they are not called upon to interfere. This is a sufficient answer to those baseless charges against a Bench and Bar which, as a whole, is justly entitled to the respect of the community. There is too much pandering in the daily press to silly prejudices which only please the lower stratum of their readers.

---

The text taken by the writer in the article referred to was a paper read at a recent police convention by one of the force, who stated that, in the detection and punishment of crime, the officers found it difficult to secure the testimony of self-respecting citizens, as they declined to submit themselves and their affairs to the insinuations and impertinences of counsel. We are rather inclined to think that the police officer would have been more accurate if he had stated that this difficulty arose mainly from the natural disinclination of citizens to spend, and too often waste, their time within the unpleasant and unsavoury precincts of a Police Court. We would venture, moreover, to suggest that the excellent police officer referred to would have been better employed in discussing the iniquities of the "sweat box" system, which has from time to time received severe criticism, both in the lay and legal press.

---

Speaking of these matters brings up a journalistic excrescence which may be worth referring to. Another newspaper writer recently, and properly enough, referred to some of the