

he is not bound to rent it at all if he does not want to. He can, on the same principle, charge what rent he thinks proper. If he asks an exorbitant price it will remain unrented. But that is his business; the law of supply and demand should settle the value of rentals. Why not establish a court to fix the price of land, and compel the owner to sell at that price, although such price may be half what he paid for it, or not sufficient to pay the mortgage on it? If such a court had the power to compel some one to buy at that price, many owners might be glad to be brought into court. Equally objectionable is another member's proposal, to give powers to Courts of Revision to fix fair rentals, with various court-like powers. This Act is to apply to cities of not less than 200,000 inhabitants. Why? Does this legislator desire to throw obstacles in the way of house building? We thought the object nowadays was to encourage building.

We are quite aware that rent restriction has been discussed in England and that there is some legislation there on the subject; but changes are in prospect, and it is questioned whether the results are satisfactory. However, what is desirable there may not be desirable or just here. We certainly question the wisdom and fairness of rent restriction in this country.

The Board of Commerce goes far enough in the attempt to fix fair prices under legislative authorization, and so far it has not met with the success that was hoped for.

RIGHT TO BAIL ON COMMITMENT FOR A MISDEMEANOUR.

(ANNOTATION FROM D.L.R.)

The criticism made in *R. v Russell*, reported 50 D.L.R. 633, of the *dictum* in *ex parte Fortier* (1902), 6 Can. Cr. Cas. 191, 13 Que. K.B. 251, appears to have no further authority than *obiter dicta*, for the Court having concluded to allow the bail to Russell and others charged with seditious conspiracy it made no difference in the result of the case whether the Court's conclusion was based upon a judicial discretion under Code, sec. 698, or upon the habeas corpus practice apart from that section under the Habeas Corpus Act, 31 Car. II., ch. 2, and the common law. The difference of opinion between the Court of King's Bench of Quebec