

Society, which Mr. Read says was in effect a Law School, or a *quasi* Law School, met on the 20th of January, 1823, and cases were argued and decided by the presiding Bench; the counsel engaged on the day alluded to being the Hon. Robert Baldwin, Attorney-General of Canada, Mr. Notman, and Mr. Richardson.

Mr. Read then carries us down from that time until the present, giving a full account of the various changes made from time to time. *En passant*, he refers to his recollection of the lectures given to their pupils by the late John Hillyard Cameron and ex-Chief Justice Sir Adam Wilson; and, previously to that, of having attended the lectures of the late Hon. William Hume Blake, then Professor of Law in King's College and afterwards Chancellor of Upper Canada—lectures which, he says, in point of matter and delivery, were not surpassed by a Story or a Kent.

As we know, the Law Schools which were opened in October, 1873, and again revived in 1881, both came to an untimely end. The need, however, for a Law School of some sort was so apparent that, in 1889, it was reorganized in its present form. We trust that it may be a success, and that the pen of the veteran writer, whose article we have been reading, may not have the opportunity of preaching its funeral sermon, even should he happily outspan the allotted "fourscore years."

We are glad to see in a recent number of the *Indian Jurist*, of Madras, some remarks which appeal to us most strongly, in reference to the so-called right of the parent to the custody and mismanagement of his offspring. It takes a long time, and perhaps we should be glad that it does so, for a Britisher to free himself from the prejudices and habits of thought of a bygone age. Dr. Barnardo, that most enterprising and devoted philanthropist, in his very clever and sensible defence of his conduct in the *Roddy Case*, has opened the eyes of many to the position of things in England in reference to the question of the custody of infants. The *Indian Jurist*, in reviewing his speeches before the judges of the Court of Appeal in the case referred to, uses the language quoted below, which must appeal to the common sense, if not to the hearts, of many readers. It is simply iniquitous that immoral parents, utterly regardless of their duties to their offspring, should, under nearly all circumstances, be allowed to keep the control of them as against those who, from the very highest motives, and in a common sense, practical way, seek the moral and temporal advancement of children who, but for their philanthropic efforts, would either perish miserably, or eventually become pests of society, hateful to themselves and injurious to the commonwealth. Our contemporary thus speaks:—"The ancient superstition in favor of leaving every precious infant to the tender mercies of ignorant and careless fathers and mothers tends, of course, to the destruction, year after year, of the bodies of numberless human beings, and in the cases of those whose natural guardians happen to be idle, dissolute, wicked, or more than ordinarily foolish, tends also to the destruction of their immortal souls; whilst in all but a very few exceptional cases, the work of rearing the young is badly done by amateurs, instead of being well done (as it might and should be) by professionals and experts. During generations to come, probably, great difficulty will be ex-