

of him as follows:—"We regret to be compelled to call attention to one difficulty which has made our task a most unenviable one. We refer to the behaviour of the chairman. He has throughout acted in an arbitrary and overbearing manner both in his personal relation with individuals of the Commission and in his conduct as chairman." Whether there was any cause for this complaint or not is immaterial, but such language shews that it is extremely undesirable that any one holding so high a position as does Lord Justice Vaughan Williams should be placed in such a position as to allow him to be open to such a charge. We have had similar experiences in this country and the dignity of the Bench—a most important asset in any country—has been thereby lowered. Moreover there is no need for it. There are plenty of men at the Bar as capable of doing efficient work on Commissions as any judge on the Bench. A criticism which would be hurtful so far as the Bench is concerned would only be a helpful advertisement to a man at the Bar. It is most undesirable, and it is so admitted by everyone, that a judge should be taken away from his court duties to do extra judicial work. It is only the exigencies of party politics that demand this objectionable practice.

THE CREATION OF PEERS.

The proposed exercise of the prerogative of the creation of peers in the event of a deadlock between the Houses of Parliament will render it of interest to recall the principal cases in which there has been recourse to this method of bringing the Houses into harmony. Towards the close of the reign of Queen Anne the creation of a batch of twelve peers simultaneously was advised in order to secure the assent of the Lords to the Peace of Utrecht. This was the first case in which the prerogative of the Crown had been used in the House of Lords to secure a majority for the Government. In Ireland, in 1776, eighteen Irish peers were created in a single day. The peerages were known to be the result of an engagement to support the