

THE LEGAL NEWS.

VOL. XX.

OCTOBER 15, 1897.

No. 20.

CURRENT TOPICS AND CASES.

In *The Queen v. St. Louis*, on the 14th instant, Mr. Justice Wurtele, sitting on the Crown Side of the Court of Queen's Bench, decided some novel and interesting questions. An information was laid by Mr. Sherwood, Commissioner of the Dominion Police, before one of the judges of sessions, charging one St. Louis with having received various sums of money from Her Majesty the Queen by false pretences. In the information Sherwood took the quality of Commissioner of the Dominion Police, and added to this designation the words "and acting as such on behalf of Her Majesty the Queen." The magistrate found the evidence insufficient and discharged the accused. Thereupon, at the instance of Sherwood, an indictment was preferred against St. Louis in the Queen's Bench, Crown Side, under the provisions of Art. 595 of the Criminal Code. The Grand Jury threw out the bill. The first question was whether Mr. Sherwood was personally liable for the costs of the accused. The Court held that as Commissioner of the Dominion Police he had no legal capacity to act for and represent the Queen, and therefore he merely acted as a private individual in binding himself to prefer an indictment. The Attorney General of Canada, it was declared, in the absence of any express provision of law, is alone authorized to represent the Queen in all matters which concern the government of Canada. It followed that Mr. Sherwood must