

Charges against high judicial functionaries in England are so rare, that when a journal as careful and guarded in its statements as the *London Law Journal* made serious allegations against the Lord Chancellor, the article at once attracted considerable attention. The specific charge was that the Lord Chancellor intended to remove Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams permanently from the position of winding up judge, and to replace him by Mr. Justice Romer, and that the real reason for the transfer was the annoyance given in high places by the firm and independent manner in which Mr. Justice Williams discharged his duty in the case of the *New Zealand Loan and Mercantile Agency Company*, and the apprehension that in other pending matters he would act with equal courage and decision. The *London Times* and other influential journals took the matter up, and the result was to force Lord Chancellor Herschell, on the 5th February, to deny in the House of Lords that he had acted either from resentment at what Mr. Justice Williams had done, or that he desired to screen anybody. The Lord Chancellor, however, admitted that he had contemplated the removal of Mr. Justice Williams, but at the last moment he had changed his mind. The *Law Journal* claims to have rendered the threatened removal impossible, "and to have called forth such an unequivocal expression of public opinion against the interference of government departments with the judiciary, that in future conflicts between the Board of Trade and the winding up judge are not likely to recur."

---

The last number of the bar reports contains several points of interest. In *Chandonnet v. Chandonnet* the Court of Review, at Quebec, maintained an evocation from the Circuit Court where a condemnation against a garnishee for \$160 was prayed for. The authorities, which are conflicting, are cited in the report. In *Masson v. Jeffrey* the Court of Review, at Montreal, held that interrogatories on