Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXXII. DECEMBER 1, 1896. NO. 19.

If legal journals in Canada were to discuss our judges and their peculiarities and weaknesses in the free and easy and disrespectful manner that is becoming the habit of journals, both legal and lay, in England, there would soon be "wigs on the green" at Osgoode Hall. One lay journal starts a crusade against a "Senile Bench," and suggests the prompt removal of such eminent men as Lord Esher, Lord Justice Lindley and Mr. Justice Mathew, and to replace them with younger men. Another writer makes a savage attack on a County Court judge of high standing. In these days of democracy and growing license anything that detracts from the dignity of the Bench and a wholesome respect for the administration of the law is to be deprecated.

In reference to the case of *Baker* v. *Ambrose*, (1896) 2 Q.B. 372, noted ante, p. 704, a correspondent has kindly directed our attention to the recent case of *Canada Permanent L. & S. Co.* v. *Todd*, 22 A. R. 515, where a similar question was before the Court of Appeal for Ontario, and that court determined that an affidavit of a chattel mortgage, sworn before a commissioner employed in the office of the solicitor of the mortgagee, was valid. The matter seems to have been summarily dealt with in the course of the argument, by Osler, J.A., only, the other members of the Court not expressing any opinion, but apparently concurring in what he said. Counsel for the appellant relied on the Con. Rule 613, and *Vernon* v. *Cooke*, (1879) W. N. 132, and Osler, J.A., says: "That Rule applies only to proceedings in an action," and he goes on to say that *Vernon* v. *Cooke* was reversed. (See 49 L.J., Q.B. 767.)