by order of a judge." For pleadings there was to be substituted a brief endorsement on the writ of summons, indicating the nature of the plaintiff's claim, and a brief notice from the defendant of any special defence, such as the Statute of Limitations or payment. This interesting report, which is signed by Lord Coleridge, James, L.J., Hannen and Bowen, JJ., the Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, and others, may be found in the London *Times* for Oct. 8, 1881.

Two questions of some moment were recently debated before the Divisional Court of the Chancery Division. One was as to the right of the Lieut.-Governor of Ontario to exercise the Royal prerogative of pardon respecting offences against Provincial statutes. This question was formally raised by a suit between the Attorney-General for Canada as plaintiff, and the Attorney-General for Ontario as defendant, instituted under the provisions of sect. 52, s-s. 2 of the Judicature Act, to determine the validity of the Ontario statute, 51 Vict., c. 5, which purports to confer the power in question on the Lieut.-Governor. The case was argued with great ability by Mr. Christopher Robinson, Q.C., and Mr. Lefroy, for the Dominion, and by the Hon. Mr. Blake, Q.C., for the Province. While it would be out of place to attempt to forestall the decision of the Court, we may nevertheless rejoice that a beginning has been made in thus submitting to judicial decision questions in dispute between the Dominion and Provincial authorities. It is far better that where differences do arise they should be properly settled in this way, than be suffered to remain a constant source of bickering and irritation between the two governments. The temptation to Provincial politicians is to stretch their authority at the expense of the Dominion Government, and of the Dominion authorities to stretch their power at the expense of the Provincial Government. But whatever politicians for their own ends may do, the people must ever bear in mind that they are equally interested in both Provincial and Dominion Governments, and that both are intended to promote their welfare, and exist for that and no other purpose, and that all they are really concerned to see is that the power vested by the Constitution in these two governments shall be exercised according to the Constitution, and that neither government shall unduly encroach upon the province of the other. It is not a question whether Mr. Mowat or Sir John Macdonald is best fitted to advise Her Majesty in the exercise of the prerogative of pardon in the cases in question, but in which of the two governments the Constitution has placed this power; and that is purely a question of law. This particular question, we observe, was raised in Nova Scotia as long ago as 1868, and it has been simmering ever since. The other question to which we refer is as to the criminal jurisdiction of the Chancery Division, which arose incidentally upon an application in the case of *Regina v. Burchall* to commit certain newspaper editors for contempt of court in publishing matter calculated to prejudice the fair trial of the defendant, who is in gaol on a charge of murder. The Divisional Court (the Chancellor and Ferguson, J.) were divided in opinion. The Chancellor thinking that the Divisional Court could exercise the general criminal jurisdiction of the High Court; and Ferguson,