

BOOK REVIEWS—CORRESPONDENCE.

Q. Wherein does this liberty, which you enjoy, consist?

A. In laws made by the consent of the people, and the due execution of those laws. I am free not from the law but by the law.

Q. Rehearse the articles of your political creed, as a citizen of Canada?

A. I believe that the supreme or legislative power of this Dominion, in the subject matters over which it has jurisdiction, resides in the Queen, the Senate and the Commons; that Her Majesty Queen Victoria, is Sovereign or Supreme Executor of the law, to whom, upon that account, all loyalty is due; that each of the three branches of the Legislature is endowed with its particular rights and offices; that the Queen, by her royal prerogative, has the power of determining the time and place of meeting of Parliaments; that the consent of the Queen—that is, of the Governor-General, acting on behalf and in the name of Her Majesty—the Senate and the Commons is necessary to the enactment of a law, and that all the three make but one lawgiver; that as to the freedom of consent in the making of laws, these three powers are independent; and that each and all the three are bound to observe the laws that are made.

Q. What are the duties of your station?

A. To endeavour, so far as I am able, to preserve the public tranquillity, and, as I am an elector, to give my vote for the candidate whom I judge most worthy to serve his country, for, if from any partial motive I should give my vote for one unworthy, I should think myself justly chargeable with his guilt.

Q. You have perhaps but one vote in two thousand, and the member perhaps one of two hundred more—then your share of the guilt is but small?

A. As he who assists at a murder is guilty of murder, so he who acts the lowest part in the enslaving of his country is guilty of a much greater crime than murder.

Q. Is enslaving one's country a greater crime than murder?

A. Yes; inasmuch as the murder of human nature is a greater crime than the murder of a human creature, or as he who debases and renders miserable the mass of mankind is more wicked than he who cuts off an individual.

Q. Is it not lawful, then, to take a bribe from a person otherwise worthy to serve his country?

A. No more than for a judge to take a bribe for a righteous sentence; nor is it any more lawful to corrupt than to commit evil that good may come of it. Corruption converts a good action into wickedness. Bribery of all sorts is contrary to the law of God; it is a heinous sin, often punished with the severest judgments; and is, besides, the greatest folly and madness.

Q. How is it contrary to the law of God?

A. The law of God says expressly, "Thou shalt not wrest judgment; thou shalt not take a gift." As to the wicked it says, "His right hand is full of bribes;" the righteous "shaketh his hands from holding a bribe;" "that God shall destroy the tabernacle of bribery," etc.

Q. What do you think of those who are bribed by gluttony or drunkenness?

A. That they are viler than Esau, who sold his birth-right for a mess of pottage.

Q. Why is my taking a bribe at an election folly or madness?

A. Because I must refund tenfold in taxes what I take as a bribe, and the member who bought me has a fair pretext to sell me; nor can I in such a case have any just cause for complaint.

Q. Who is most likely to take a bribe?

A. He who offers one.

Q. Who is likely to be frugal of the people's money?

A. He who puts none of it in his own pocket.

While some might cavil at some of the propositions laid down in Mr. Wicksteed's Catechism, it would be well that it should be widely read as well by the juveniles who are to be the men of the future as the children of larger growth, who are ignorant of what law and freedom really mean.

CORRESPONDENCE.

RECENT LEGISLATION.

To the Editor of the LAW JOURNAL,

SIR,—I have just been looking over the April 15th number of the C. L. J., and notice the comments on the O. J. Act, 1885, in which reference is made to a case or two aimed at by the Act. My vanity prompts me to tell you that two other cases are distinctly aimed at in two other Acts of the same session. Cap. 26 sec. 2 is intended to set at rest a much vexed question under our R. S. O. cap. 118, namely, whether an assignment which has the effect of hindering or delaying, etc., a creditor, must be taken to have been executed with that intent. This point was decided in the affirmative by the C. P. and Court of Appeal in the case of *McLean v. Garland*, which was recently argued before the Supreme Court. Then cap. 27 aims at another decision of *Re Lyons*.

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A BARRISTER.

ENFORCING JUDGMENTS OF FOREIGN BRITISH COURTS.

SIR,—The suggestion that some method of procedure should be devised whereby the judgments of the Queen's Courts in one part of her empire may be enforced in the Courts of any other part is a very reasonable one, and well worthy of consideration.

With a view to carrying out such a scheme of judicial reciprocity, I would suggest that it