

ralized Hanoverians with as little scruple under King William as it refuses it them under Queen Victoria, if the law were now freshly to be framed. As it is tied by judicial acts, it follows them to the exact length they go, and no further. No real injustice is done, though possibly a little violence to scientific consistency with ancient precedents. Hanoverians at the East End who possessed and exercised the franchise, whatever it was, fifty years ago may thank Lord Coke and his brethren for the privilege while it lasted. In the absence of letters of naturalization there is no abstract reason why they should have had it more than Brunswickers. Queen Victoria's Bench does not gainsay their former legal title to the privilege. It respectfully registers the fact of their possession by virtue of the decision in Calvin's and older cases. When it is asked to make precedents itself, it refuses to assert that several foreign-born generations of one small section of Germans derive from the accident that fifty years ago Hanover and Great Britain had the same Prince an hereditary right to perform functions denied to the rest of their diffused race. The decision may be approved on its own merits. There is danger in contending that no other conclusion would be legally possible because any other would clash with common sense. A good deal in the laws of allegiance, both in this country and elsewhere, is amenable to that animadversion. This protracted Stepney Election petition will have answered one useful national object if it should draw attention to the expediency of putting that and the naturalization law in general on a more intelligible footing. The borough of Stepney is to be compassionated on the sudden curtailment of its electorate. But Stepney has survived the dissipation of the time-honoured superstition that everybody born at sea belongs to Stepney parish; and it will survive as happily the discovery that every parishioner of Stepney is not necessarily an Englishman and a voter. — *London Times*, April 7.

#### THE VICE-ADMIRALTY COURT.

To the Editor of the LEGAL NEWS:

There has been a good deal of talk lately in Quebec, over the fact that Mr. Irvine, the

Judge of the Vice-Admiralty, continues to actively practise his profession. The Court of Vice-Admiralty in Quebec has to deal with most important interests, and as there is only an appeal to the Privy Council, a very expensive proceeding, the decisions of the Court are in most instances practically final. Unless therefore the Government raises the salary to that of the Judges of the Superior Court and of the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, no prominent lawyer would take the situation. When Mr. Irvine accepted the position it was well understood he was to continue to practise. The position of a Judge-Advocate is of course an anomaly, but it is not easy to find in an habitually impecunious profession men possessed of the large independent fortunes of the late Judges Black and Stuart. So far we do not think anybody has been hurt, and no insinuation of partiality has even been whispered against Judge Irvine.

X.

Quebec, May 12.

#### BAR ELECTIONS.

The practising advocates of the Bar of Quebec, to the number of 100, met on 1st. May at the Court house for the annual elections. The following were elected:—Batonnier, Hon. D. A. Ross, Q. C.; syndic, C. A. Morriset, Q. C.; treasurer, D. J. Montambault, Q. C.; secretary, R. J. Bradley. Council—Hon. F. Langelier, Q. C., Hon. G. Irvine, Q. C., Hon. J. Blanchet, Q. C., J. Malouin, Q. C., Dunbar, Q. C., Bossé, Q. C., C. N. Hamel and W. J. Miller.

The annual elections of the Bar of Montreal took place on May 1st, and resulted as follows:—Batonnier, Hon. H. Mercier, Q. C.; treasurer, M. M. Tait, Q. C.; secretary, H. Lanctot. Council—Lafamme, Q. C., Robertson, Q. C., Geoffrion, Q. C., Pagnuelo, Q. C., Green-shields, Beaudin and Martineau.

At the annual meeting of the St. Francis section of the Quebec Bar the election of officers resulted as follows, Batonnier, H. B. Brown; syndic, J. A. Camirand; treasurer, H. W. Mulvena; secretary, C. A. French. Council—W. White, Q. C., L. E. Panneton, and A. S. Hurd.

The first meeting for the election of the officers of the Bar of the district of Bedford was held at Sweetsburgh, on Monday, 3rd May. Balloting for the officers gave the following result:—Batonnier, John P. Noyes, Waterloo; syndic, E. Racicot, Sweetsburgh; treasurer, T. Duffy, Sweetsburgh; secretary, T. Amyrauld, Sweetsburgh. Council—S. Constantineau, Bedford; C. Foster, Knowlton, and D. Darby, Waterloo.