

# *The Canada Law Journal.*

VOL. XXVII.

APRIL 1, 1891.

No. 6.

A BILL, introduced by the Attorney-General, now before the Legislative Assembly, contains a provision for the appointment of a second Junior Judge for the County of York, and also enables the concurrent sittings of the County Court, Court of General Sessions, and the Division Courts. It is also provided that there shall be weekly sittings throughout the year, with the exception of the month of August, of the First and Fifth Division Courts; monthly sittings of the same for the hearing of judgment summonses, and bi-monthly sittings for jury cases. The Senior and either of the Junior Judges together, as also the Lieut.-Governor, shall have authority to appoint other sittings for any of the above purposes. The necessity for more frequent sittings of the "Poor Man's Court" has been so long felt, that this measure affords but tardy justice. That a large increase in the number of suits may be expected can be inferred from the undoubted fact that many just claims are not now pressed owing to the delay so often met with by the debtor being served just "too late for this court," which means the delay of a month before the trial of the case. The change intended by this Act has been long required and demanded by both the profession and the public, and we have good authority for believing that the appointment will be made without delay.

It is too often a characteristic of diseases affecting the mind that they leave the unhappy victim altogether unconscious of the terrible deterioration that is going on; and what is patent to all the world is too often, perhaps in mercy, hidden from the sufferer himself. The comments which have lately appeared in several English papers in reference to one of the English Judges, indicate that the Judge in question has arrived at such a mental condition that he has become quite unfit to discharge his judicial duties, and yet that he is himself, apparently, altogether unconscious of the fact. The tenure by which the Judges hold their office frees them in a large measure from the control of the executive, and this is necessarily so in order to secure their independence; but it also renders it an extremely difficult matter to remove a Judge who has become mentally incompetent to perform his duty. He may, as in the present case, refuse to resign, and unless he commit some positive wrong, amounting to a breach of good behavior, he cannot be removed, except upon an address of both Houses of Parliament, and it is hard both on the public and the Judge himself that he should be exposed to this cruel alternative.