

COMPLIMENTARY DINNER BY THE MONTREAL BAR.—On the 25th of September, a complimentary dinner was given by the members of the bar for the district of Montreal to the General Council of the bar for Lower Canada. Mr. DAY, Q. C., presided. Only two members of the General Council were present, and many other distinguished members of the bar, who were expected to be present, were prevented from attending by various causes. The entertainment, therefore, can hardly be said to have met with the success anticipated.

REGINA v. DAOUST.—In the Court of Queen's Bench, Oct. 19, Mr. Justice Mondelet presiding, Mr. Ramsay moved for sentence on Daoust, convicted of forgery. The learned judge said that although the judges sitting on the Appeal side had refused to permit a new trial, (ante p. 29), yet that that part of his (Mr. Justice Mondelet's) judgment which set aside the previous verdict had been left untouched, and therefore there was no verdict. The motion, accordingly, was rejected.

CHIEF BARON POLLOCK.

[The following sketch (from the *Pall Mall Gazette*) of Chief Baron Pollock, who has retired during the present year, will be read with interest. The Chief Baron is the son of David Pollock, a saddler at Charing Cross; and brother of the late Sir David Pollock, an Indian Judge, and of General Sir George Pollock. He was born in 1783; educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was Senior Wrangler; and was called to the bar of the Middle Temple, in 1805. He joined the Northern Circuit; became a King's Counsel in 1827, Attorney-General in 1834 and 1841; and succeeded Lord Abinger as Chief Baron in 1844.]

The judges are probably the best known of all our public men. A great politician addresses the House of Commons a certain number of times in the course of a session; but to the public at large he is but a name, representing particular political opinions. Even when he addresses a public meeting, or makes an after-dinner speech, he is more or less of an actor. A judge, on the other hand, transacts all his business in public. He is one of the shows,

not only of London, but of every country town; and is constantly brought into direct personal relations, not only with every member of a large and most active profession, but with men in all ranks of life and on every sort of subject. He is, moreover, perfectly independent of those with whom he has to deal. His position is as secure as law and public feeling can make it. If he is ill-tempered, lazy, tyrannical, or even merely disobliging, he can indulge his failings without any special risk. No man can with perfect impunity give so much offence, or do so many and such deadly injuries, as an ill-disposed judge; nor is any man so continually on his trial. It is pleasant to reflect that, under these circumstances, the fifteen judges are, with hardly an exception, exceedingly popular, not only with the profession to which they belong, but with the public at large; and we shall doubt whether any one ever took with him into retirement a larger share of hearty, affectionate admiration than the kind old man, who, after presiding over the Court of Exchequer for nearly a quarter of a century, retires into private life, full of freshness and vigor, and surrounded as closely as ever man was by all that should accompany old age. No doubt the Chief Baron had his failings. He had been so consummate an advocate at the bar that he never quite threw off his old habits. He belonged to that class of judges who distinctly take a side in the course of a case, and makes no mystery to the jury of the opinion which they have formed. It may admit of a good deal of argument, whether this habit does or does not favour substantial justice. To hit the exact line between fairly directing and unduly pleading from the bench is very difficult. Certainly the attempt to be scrupulously neutral often ends in puzzling the jury, and in suggesting doubts to them on points which are in reality quite plain. Whether the Chief Baron always hit the golden mean, no one could possibly doubt of the goodness of the motives by which he was actuated. He may sometimes have been a little too much of an advocate, but he was always an advocate for what appeared to him the cause of justice, truth, and good morals; and of these he was no bad judge. There were two characteristics about his behaviour on the bench, which