

was in reference to the salaries of men employed in the street cleaning department of that city, the wording being as follows :— " Of section foremen, \$1,000 each ; of the assistant stable foremen, \$900 each ; of the hostlers, \$720 each, and extra pay for work on Sundays." The plaintiff, who had been a section foreman, performed certain work on Sundays for which he claimed additional compensation, on the ground that the words "and extra pay for work on Sundays" applied to him as well as to the hostlers. The Court of Appeals held that he was not so entitled, the position of the semi-colons indicating that the extra pay referring only to the hostlers. The Court said : " The punctuation of a statute is of material aid in learning the intention of the legislature. While an Act of Parliament is enacted as read, and the original rolls contain no marks of punctuation, a statute of this State is enacted as read and printed, so that the punctuation is a part of the Act as passed. . . . The punctuation is, however, subordinate to the text, and is never allowed to control its plain meaning ; but when the meaning is not plain, resort may be had to those marks which for centuries have been in common use to divide writings into sentences, and sentences into paragraphs and clauses, in order to make the author's meaning clear." So far as the revised statutes of Canada and Ontario are concerned, the "printed roll," properly attested as by statute provided, is the law of the land.

A correspondent writes as follows : " When we see High Court judges persistently violating the law requiring them to reside in Toronto, one is tempted to wonder whether there is no authority to compel obedience, or whether those who transgress herein consider themselves above the law. The example at all events is not edifying, and may, on occasion, well provoke a retort, of which it would be difficult to deny the justice."

In reference to which we may observe that we have heard it said that the learned judge, who apparently pays the most conspicuous disregard to the statute referred to, claims that he is not bound by its provisions because he was appointed before June 29, 1897, the date of its passage. We assume this must be correct, for although the statute enables the Governor-General in Council to permit a judge to reside elsewhere in the Province for a specified time, yet we presume if such a permission were granted it would be made