

ments have been advanced in favour of permitting the present practice.

Whatever excuse a judge could find for acting as an arbitrator, there surely can be none for his flying directly in the face of section 7 by sitting on a Board of Directors of a company, and so engaging in an occupation or business other than his judicial duties. And yet we see the name of one of the Justices of the High Court of Ontario advertised as being a director of a large trust company. We hope this is a mistake on the part of some official; if so, the mistake should be at once rectified and the name struck off the list.

The Minister of Justice during the debate on a question as to judges participating in business outside their judicial duties is reported in Hansard as having said in answer to a question by a member, "The Government is of the opinion that the judges ought to obey the Act of Parliament . . . the judges ought to conform to the law." It is difficult to conceive any condition of things that would make such a solemn expression of opinion necessary. Possibly the remark was grimly satirical and intended as a well merited rebuke.

MORE LAW BREAKING IN HIGH PLACES.

In our last issue we gave an illustration of the way in which law makers occasionally become law breakers. A more striking example of this evil tendency is furnished by a recent event in the City of Toronto. On this occasion it was in connection with a change made by the street railway company in certain routes, the legality of which is now sub judice. Whether there was any legal justification for the refusal of the company to comply with the directions of the city engineer to return to the old routes is immaterial. What all law abiding people take exception to is the method adopted by the Council for the purpose of enforcing their claim.

This method was a resolution of the Board of Control instructing the city engineer "to secure from the Board of Police