

were impeded by ailments of a more or less serious nature. With better health Mr. Justice Church would have left no faint impress on our provincial jurisprudence. His judgments were usually delivered in a manner which carried conviction to the minds of his hearers, and even where he dissented it will be found, we think, that he was not always wrong.

---

Mr. Justice Denman and the Recorder, of Liverpool, Mr. Hopwood, Q.C., differ somewhat warmly on the question of lenient sentences. The Judge having passed certain strictures at the recent Liverpool assizes on the Recorder for the lightness of his sentences, the latter waited for the opening of his Court, the Liverpool sessions, and in his charge to the Grand Jury asserted his entire independence of the supervision of any other court. As to the matter of the criticism itself, he added that it was impossible to condemn sentences either for being too severe or too light without having the fullest information as to what passed at the trial. Let them take, for example, the offence of housebreaking. That offence might vary between extremes of merely lifting a latch of an unlocked door or effecting entrance with the most elaborate and ingeniously applied tools. No one would deny that the first might be punished with a light sentence, while the latter deserved a heavy one. But in the record of previous convictions all that appeared was 'housebreaking.' Who, then, on such barren information, was justified in authoritatively saying that a sentence of a day was too little, or a sentence of twelve months was too much? Further, in order to be just in criticising, it was necessary to inquire whether the convict had or had not been already before sentence two months or six weeks in prison—a fact which would not appear. It might also be well to have regard to the age of the delinquent; a boy of eighteen might be more leniently dealt with than a man of thirty. 'To put down,' 'To make example of,' were not principles of sentencing which his experience, as long