

had afforded an unobserved moment did the Attorney-General, with his own hand, write in the retroactive words, "have been taken, or." The Attorney-General may plead that the other members should have watched what he was doing. We are inclined to agree with him and to think that when again chairman of a committee he will receive more attention. The members, however, may be excused for not observing the alteration of the bill, for it was so dexterously done that even the clerk of the committee was not aware of the change and reported the bill to the House without amendment. Both bills advanced to and passed their third reading, but it was evidently advisable that one of them should become law and that the other should in some way be strangled. Great genius is never without resource. The Lieutenant-Governor was asked to come down during the session and assent to some bills, the pretext being the boundary bill. *The General Act* (bill number two) *was then assented to and the other was not.* Two scenes more in this precious drama. It was now important that the hearing of the case should be hurried on, for prorogation was approaching and with it the other Act. This was easily accomplished for the defence knew nothing of the plot, and Mr. Justice Taylor when informed by the Attorney-General that he had to leave for Ottawa on the 24th of April fixed the case specially for the 23rd. Prorogation took place on the 29th and the Attorney-General did not leave until the 30th, but, of course, he may have changed his mind about the date. We drop the curtain upon a tableau. The Attorney-General has triumphantly produced his statute and scored his point. Another defect in his proceedings, not thought of and not remedied, has been pointed out, the judge has dismissed the Attorney-General's bill with costs, and the faces of judge, counsel and parties are full of expression.

---

There seems to be no doubt that another provision was smuggled through the House; we refer to the clause as to confessions of judgment. Whether Mr. Justice Taylor's decision in *Union Bank vs. Turner*, is good law or not there is only one opinion about its justice. There can be no doubt