

cases. Mr. Robert Baldwin (whose name is revered by Reformers in politics) comes next with 45 cases. He is followed by Mr. Washburn, who appeared 35 times. These appear to have been the leaders of the Bar, and the other names, which I am about to mention, seem widely removed from the higher class. We find these names figuring from 10 times to once: Ridout, Rolph, Small, George S. Boulton, Cartwright, Taylor, Jones, Dixon, Bethune, George Jarvis, Beardsley, Smith and Elliott. And this completes the list. These men were the pioneers of legal counsel work in Ontario, and the names, though without the Christian names or initials, will easily be recognized as great men of those times, or as the fathers of men high up in the country's annals of more modern days.

It will be remembered in the last paper an account was given of the case of *Brock v. McLean*, sheriff. As there shewn, the sheriff had to pay the amount due to Brock by a debtor whom the sheriff had released from custody on the order of a clerk in the office of Mr. Daniel Washburn, an attorney of the Court. Now, the sheriff felt that he was a very much aggrieved person, and he seems to have decided that the last should not be heard of the matter in settling the case of *Brock v. McLean*. We accordingly find further on in the pages of this volume of reports that the case again came before the Courts under the style of *The King v. Bidwell*. The defendant is none other than the clerk, who had on the instructions of his principal, Mr. Daniel Washburn, ordered the release, and the proceedings were for an attachment

for having practiced as an attorney without being authorized so to do. But the unfortunate sheriff was not destined to get relief. The Court seemed unanimous in laying all the blame on the solicitor who had instructed the defendant, and as Bidwell swore he was not a partner, they could not bring it home to him that he had practiced as an attorney.

The writ of attachment was a mighty weapon in old legal warfare. It was a sort of legal dragnet from which there was no escape once it fastened around a transgressor. It only issued, of course, out of the Superior Court, and it was not infrequently directed against officers exercising inferior jurisdiction, where there was misbehaviour of so flagrant a kind as to warrant it. Such a case we have in this volume, which has an additional interest from the fact that it has about it a flavour of "Drumtocty" and "The Briar Bush." The case, unfortunately, is a tale of a family quarrel in the kirk. The Committee of the Presbyterian Church at Williamstown, in the County of Alexandria, in Upper Canada, determined to have a minister straight from "the land of the mountain and the flood," and Alexander Wood and many others, signed a subscription paper, or agreement, to pay so much per annum for the clergyman's support. Now the terms of this agreement were not complied with by the elders and committee of the church, inasmuch as the clergyman, it was alleged, did not answer the proper description. Notwithstanding this, so it was alleged, Wood was sued in the Court of Requests, and two of the magistrates, John McIntyre and Alex. McKenzie, were