

declining to surrender so effective an instrument for attracting and retaining voters may possibly prove to be an adverse influence too powerful to overcome. It remains to be seen whether the obvious propriety of this amendment of the law, and the reflection that its adoption would unquestionably subserve the ultimate interests of the predominant party, will supply motives sufficiently cogent to induce the majority to sanction Mr. Alcorn's bill.

LAW REFORM.

We are glad to note that the Attorney-General of Ontario has agreed to the suggestion that the subject of law reform should stand over until next session so that it may receive full consideration before any change is crystallized by statute.

It is well to quote for the benefit of those concerned any suggestion which would seem to be helpful in the consideration of this important subject. To this end we make the following extract from the *Ottawa Citizen*. The writer evidently takes very much the same view as we have expressed in reference to the re-construction of the Court of Appeal. His words are as follows:—

“The Court of Appeal for Ontario is and has been for many years one of the most satisfactory in the Dominion, and it would not be in the public interest to substitute for it a Court without any continuity or cohesion, where personelle would vary from day to day, and from which uniformity of decision could not be expected. An alternative plan has been suggested by high authority, which it appears to the *Citizen* would be found to work much more satisfactorily. It is, in brief, as follows: Appeals from a High Court judge to the present Divisional Courts would be abolished, and the present Court of Appeal retained, but as it would be obviously impossible for the latter, as at present constituted, to deal with all of the work thus thrown upon it, three High Court judges would be assigned to it, to serve for a year, and then to be replaced by another three for a similar term. The Court would sit in two divisions, one