

between England and some of the Australian colonies, and there seems no very cogent reason why Ontario should hesitate to accept a fair measure of reciprocity. There is a large and growing body of Canadian agency work to be done in England, and it would be an advantage to have Canadians there to do it. We need not fear serious competition here on the part of the expensively educated English solicitor, accustomed to a much higher scale of fees than ours, and generally incapable of adapting himself to Canadian methods, and who has, besides, so many newer and less crowded fields open to him? There are always those who are alarmed at any suggestion of change, but this at least is certain, that English doctors have not, as yet, made any great use of advantages similar to those suggested. The sixtieth anniversary of Her Majesty's reign is a fitting occasion for a step tending to bring together the professions in the colony and the motherland.

*IS PERSONATION AN OFFENCE UNDER THE
MUNICIPAL ACT?*

By the repeal of sub-sec. 2 of s. 210 of The Consolidated Municipal Act of 1892, by s. 4 of The Municipal Amendment Act of 1896 (59 Vict., c. 51), a nice question arises as to the real effect of the repealing statute.

Does it revive that portion of s. 167 of the first mentioned Act relating to personation and penalties therefor, (*e*), which was held in *Reg. v. Rose*, 27 O.R. 195, and followed by *Snider, Co. J.*, of *Wentworth*, in *Reg. v. Carter*, 32 C.L.J. 337, to be repealed by the above mentioned sub-sec. 2 of s. 210, of the Act of 1892?

The Chancellor in his judgment in the former case, at p. 197, cites and follows *Martin, B.*, in *Robinson v. Emerson*, 4 H. & C. 352. "When a statute prohibits a particular act and imposes a penalty for doing it, and a subsequent statute imposes a different penalty for the same offence, the latter statute operates as a repeal of the former."