

## EDITORIAL NOTES

"Moved by Mr. Tait, seconded by Mr. Dunlop,

"That inasmuch as Montreal is the centre of the commerce not only of the Province of Quebec, but also of the Dominion of Canada and that in the Superior Court of Montreal, the commercial cases therein tried are of great importance, it is extremely desirable in the interest of the administration of justice that the seventh judge to be appointed to the Superior Court should be an advocate having large experience in commercial cases."

Carried.

It was then moved by Mr. W. H. Kerr, Q.C., seconded by Mr. Burroughs :

"That in the opinion of this meeting, the system of political appointments to the Bench has inflicted great damage on the Province, and that this meeting protests against the continuance of the practice, especially with regard to the Court of Queen's Bench."

Moved in amendment by Mr. T. W. Ritchie, Q.C., seconded by Mr. G. B. Cramp

"That this meeting is of opinion that questions respecting political appointments ought to be considered at a regular meeting of the Bar and not by any section thereof."

Moved in amendment to the amendment by Mr. D. Macmaster, M.P.P., seconded by Mr. J. N. Greenshields :

"That in the opinion of this meeting a representation should be made to the Dominion Government that the judicial appointment about to be made should be without regard to any considerations but personal worth and professional skill, and that in making such appointment the claims of the English section of the Bar should be fully considered."

The amendment to the amendment was then put and carried by a large majority.

Mr. Kerr then withdrew his motion.

Mr. Macmaster moved, seconded by Mr. J. S. Hall,

"That the Chairman name a committee, of which he himself should be one, to lay the views of this meeting before the Dominion Government."

Carried.

MR. JUSTICE BRAMWELL has recently written a letter to the *Times* over the signature "B" on the subject of Law Costs. The remedy he proposes is that "solicitors should be paid a lump sum ; for instance, so much if proceedings stopped at the writ, so much if they stopped at a further stage, so much if there was a trial; and this sum should vary according to the amount at stake and other circumstances."

A writer in *St. James Gazette* takes exception to this suggestion, and after rather cleverly pointing out some objections, takes up the subject of the bench and suggests that judges should be rewarded according to the value of the work they do and not by the year, and that a reduction should be made whenever they refer a cause or wrongly decide points of law. He thus continues :—

"Of course to a certain number of blunders each judge would be entitled without charge, just as men engaged on piecework are allowed to make a certain percentage of 'wasters.' The House of Lords, like the King, cannot err, and needs, therefore, no consideration. To a lord justice I would allow three mistakes per annum gratis ; after that I would charge him £500 for each ; this being, after all, a moderate computation of the damage he has done. To vice-chancellors and 'ordinary judges,' as they call themselves now, I would freely allow ten mistakes at *Nisi Prius*, because of the noise there, and the necessity of humouring the jury ; in *banc* five blunders per annum. If this quantity were exceeded, then I would deduct £100 for each error ; but if more than twenty blunders were made on the whole, I would impose a fine of £2,000 for this number, with exclusion from the Lord Mayor's dinner. To County Court judges I would be more liberal yet ; and to justices of the peace I would concede immunity if they were right one time in five."