

ence in the custom in the courts in England, in the United States, and in Canada, that in England the judges ruled their courts, in the States the lawyers ruled, but that in Canada it was a sort of joint affair. After some discussion I said, "Well, I don't know much about the other courts, but in mine I am in command."

"I should think you are," said Mr. McCarthy. "Yours is a regular court-martial. I have been there, sometimes, but I don't like courts-martial, so I don't go any more."

"That is where you show sound judgment," said I. "If you cannot obey orders, it is better to keep away."

McCarthy and I were great friends. He was President of the Imperial Federation League for some years when I was chairman of the Organizing Committee, and we often spoke together on the same platform, endeavouring to stir up a feeling in favour of Imperial unity, which is now such a powerful influence in the British Empire. He was one of the ablest men in the Province.

Mr. Fenton was county attorney for a few years and was an able and conscientious representative of the Crown. J. Walter Curry, K.C., was Crown Attorney for a number of years, and a most energetic and efficient prosecutor. He worked with indomitable perseverance and in many important cases showed remarkable ability. He was in charge of the prosecution of the Hyams brothers for murder, and with four exceedingly able counsel against him handled his case most skilfully.

Nicholas Murphy, K.C., was another counsel who did a considerable amount of business in my court. His strong point was his thorough truthfulness. I always felt that I could take his word with confidence.

It is not necessary to say that there have been some practitioners who have not secured my confidence, and often the truth of the old saying, "Honesty is the best policy" is borne in upon me.

In forty years I have seen a great

number of our ablest lawyers appear occasionally in important cases. The men I have named above are a few who have been regular attendants in my court.

The present Crown Attorney, J. Seymour Corley, K.C., is a very capable man, and it has been a great satisfaction to have such men to work with and to assist in the administration of justice. My relations with the various county attorneys who have held office during my time have always been of the most agreeable character, and I have the kindest recollections of them all.

*

The Priestman Case

In the spring of 1899 I was involved in a controversy with the High Court of Justice in a curious way. The law against keeping bucket-shops or places for gambling included among them disorderly houses, and the procedure for enforcing the law in such cases was different from that in all other kinds of criminal prosecutions. In every other type of offence an information has to be sworn to and a warrant or summons asked for, warrants being only issued in serious cases where the defendant would not be likely to appear on a summons.

In gambling houses the law lays down clearly the course to be pursued, and leaves no option. The Chief of Police writes a letter to one of the Police Commissioners, generally the Police Magistrate, stating his suspicion and belief that a certain place is a gambling-house, and requesting an order to permit him to enter by force and take possession of the house and all articles or papers used in the business, and to arrest and bring before the magistrate all persons found in the place. There is no power to summon; the law is mandatory and says all shall be arrested and brought before a magistrate.

I had received a letter in proper form from the chief constable, asking for a warrant to enter the premises of one Priestman, and Inspector