

Cave's speech, which dealt with facts, not with motives. The public look at the facts, and what they feel is that men occupying those positions ought not to have made those mistakes and walked into those puddles. If they are so innocent and careless as not to know a puddle when they see one, then they ought not to occupy those extremely responsible positions. And similarly with regard to the line of action in the House of Commons last October. No man knows better than the Attorney-General what a suppressio veri is, and that it is extremely likely, if not certain, to mislead, however good the intention may be of the man who practises it. In our opinion a frank acknowledgment of the mistake, with the procedure known as throwing yourself on the mercy of the court, would have made a better impression on the public."

THE TRAINING OF JUDGES.

Fault has often been found, generally by those in opposition to the party in power, with the practice of placing on the Bench members of Parliament who for any reason wished to retire from political life, or whom it was expedient to make retire, and to whom the judicial office afforded a safe and honorable place of refuge. While the proffer of office of any kind as a reward for political service is not an act of corruption, it seems that something may be said for the choosing of judges from the ranks of those who have taken an active part in the work of the House of Commons and that there would be no fear of political animus being imported into questions of a judicial character even where political interests are at stake.

Speaking at a dinner given by the Lord Mayor of London to the judges, the Lord Chancellor said that "in other countries the judge belonged to a profession by itself. With us he was trained at the Bar, in the school of affairs, and often in that most remarkable of all colleges—in which he spent 25 years of his own life—the House of Commons. They might say what they liked about the House of Commons; but it remained the finest school