bench, and the smallness of the salary will not be a hindrance. But we have not as yet a sufficient number of men of means, as well as fitness, from whom we can expect to fill our judicial offices without paying them an adequate remuneration for the labour and experience those offices demand. And it must be known that a Judge in this country is debarred from many avenues of speculation and financial adventure which are open to all other members of the community. Besides having regard to the character of our institutions, it is not a sound public or national policy to keep judicial salaries at so low a rate that the bench must in time come to be filled either by men who have means, or else by incompetent men who have no means, and who may be prolific in "miscarriages of justice." The position of Judge is one of great responsibility and usefulness, and it is for Parliament and the public to say whether it is wise to pay them so poorly that they cannot discharge the functions of their judicial offices free from pecuniary cares, and perhaps embarrassment.

It has been contended that the judicial salaries in other Provinces should be the same as those in Ontario. If that argument be sound, then it might be urged that the rate of judicial salaries in England or India or Australia should govern us. The true rule for regulating such salaries is the average value of fairly good professional incomes. Where localities practically fix the value of professional incomes, the judicial salaries should be regulated accordingly, taking into account also the question of the cost of living, leaving time and public opinion to work out a fair equalization.

The justice of the claim of our Judges to a better remuneration was, we believe, conceded by the Dominion Government some years ago; and in 1883 the First Minister admitted that "a strong feeling existed in the Province of Ontario that the Judges of the Superior Courts were insufficiently paid," and he further stated that the Government intended to address themselves during the recess to studying the reasons of the pressure that existed in the Province of Ontario and in Montreal, and would come down with some general scheme the next session (Commons Debates, 1883, p. 1,314). We look with hope for the fulfilment of that promise to the Judges and Parliament, and we have every reason to believe that Parliament, if asked, would be found ready and willing to do justice to our hard-worked and ill-paid Judges.

COMMENTS ON CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

The Law Reports for March comprise 24 Q.B.D., pp. 269-360; 15 P.D., pp. 25-36; 43 Chy.D., pp. 185-315; 15 App. Cas., pp. 1-51.

PRACTICE—INTERPLEADER—GOODS TAKEN IN EXECUTION—ASSIGNEE OF EQUITY OF REDEMPTION IN GOODS.

In *Usher* v. *Martin*, 24 Q.B.D., 272, the point raised was whether the transferee of the equity of redemption in certain goods and chattels, could maintain title to them as against an execution creditor under whose execution they had been seized. It was contended that he could not, under the authority of *Richards* v.