

guilty (an assumption we neither make nor suggest), from the penalties of the laws of the lands of his birth, adoption, and offending. The present state of the treaties and our law makes England a sort of asylum for the astuter criminal.—*The Law Journal* (London).

IMMUNITY OF JUDGES.

In the House of Lords (August 10), the Earl of Stamford asked whether the attention of Her Majesty's Government had been called to the case of *Anderson v. Gorrie et al.*, the defendants being judges of the colony of Trinidad, tried in London in May, 1894, before the late Lord Chief Justice and a special jury, when, notwithstanding that the jury found a verdict in express terms that one of the defendants oppressively and with malice overstrained his judicial powers to the prejudice of the plaintiff and the wilful perversion of justice, and found a verdict for the plaintiff for 500*l.*, the Lord Chief Justice directed judgment to be entered for the defendant on the ground that such an action did not lie against a judge, which judgment has been upheld by the Court of Appeal; and whether the Government was prepared to initiate or support legislation with a view to rectifying or declaring the present state of the law upon the points involved in these judgments.

The Lord Chancellor said no one could complain of the noble lord in bringing forward the question or of the kindly and judicial spirit in which it had been treated. He had some difficulty in answering the specific matter of the question, for the reason that the decision of the Court of Appeal was still open to appeal to that House, and he therefore did not want to express an opinion judicially upon it. But, speaking generally, an action did not lie against a judge at the instance of a suitor who thought himself injured by the judgment of the judge. The immunity of the judges from such actions was of great importance in the interest of justice. For centuries judges had been appointed in this country against whom no imputation could be made, and their high character was due in a great measure to their independence, not only of plaintiff and defendant, but their independence of the Government also. There was no pecuniary remedy for a suitor against a judge, but any judge could be removed from his office by an address from both Houses of Parliament.