

Judgments had been recovered against him to the amount of £42 2s. Summonses were taken out to examine him as to his ability to satisfy these judgments, and on the 23rd of January he was ordered by Mr. Justice Cook, on an adjournment of his examination, to give his own security in £500 and also to find bail in £500 for his appearance on the adjourned hearing of his examination. In default of giving that security he was committed to prison, where he remained until the 30th of January, when some of his brother medicos came to the rescue. The general impression of the witnesses was that the judge was drunk when he made his astounding order. One witness, however, ascribed the judge's demeanor to his "jovial disposition." The commissioners, in reference to this incident, quaintly remarked, "We do not pause to consider how far joviality may be becoming or tolerable in a judge hearing and determining an application in which the liberty of the subject is involved." This joviality seemed to extend beyond the judge; for in another case it was proved that the bailiff of the court, who sat immediately below the judge, was helplessly drunk, a fact which the judge, owing to a similar condition of things, was unable to recognize; or possibly he thought the bailiff's condition was quite in keeping with the traditions of the court, or perhaps a kindly act of self-sacrifice on the part of a faithful servant who desired in all things to show a practical sympathy with his master.

A CORRESPONDENT calls our attention to the discussion which has recently taken place in the House of Commons and elsewhere in reference to the 51st section of the British North America Act. This section reads as follows: "On the completion of the census of the year 1871, and of each subsequent decennial census, the representation of the four provinces shall be readjusted by such authority in such manner and from such time as the Parliament of Canada provides," subject, however, to certain rules, one of which is that such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing Parliament. Our correspondent urges that the intention must have been to enable Parliament to provide specially for a case which might probably arise if the completion of the census should take place at a time when, by the termination of the five years' life of the House of Commons or its dissolution, there should be no Parliament which could make the readjustment, and when, consequently, as no House of Commons could be elected until the readjustment should be made, there would be a deadlock, which could only be removed by the intervention of the Imperial Parliament, and that there was no intention to prevent the Dominion Parliament from itself making the readjustment if it should think proper to do so. The consideration of this very important provision has been so brought into the arena of party politics that we do not care at present to take it up. The best legal minds in the Dominion take different views of the meaning of the section, one of the speakers, by the way, drawing a distinction between readjustment and redistribution. We notice, moreover, that these views have, generally speaking, been expressed with that diffidence which is consistent with the importance and difficulty of the questions involved. As to the opinion expressed by our