investigated the accusations and had found them "sufficiently sustained and of sufficient moment to require judicial investigation." This as an instrument of public good is likely to be much more effective than any Court which could be formed entirely of provincial officials. I speak of this tribunal in the present tense because I do not believe it to be merely a thing of the past. If my arguments are sound, it follows that it has not been destroyed by the local legislation to which I have alluded. However, all that can be said of the Court of Impeachment does but beg the question, for, assuming that it met the requirements of the Imperial Legislature, and was therefore not disturbed at Confederation, that fact would not solve the problem. What authority can to-day make or unmake a Court of Impeachment? I do not rely, therefore, on the existence of this court as a positive answer to the right claimed by Ontario to make laws concerning the removal of a County Court Judge, but I do submit that the substance of the British North America Act shows this Province to have no such right, and as a consequence that the portion of the Revised Statutes which purports to deal with this subject is a dead letter.

Mr. Todd's valuable article on "Complaints against the Judiciary," published in this journal, (*ante* p. 400), certainly throws a strong light on a broad matter of which I touch but a part. However, neither in this communication, nor in the last chapter of his celebrated work on "Parliamentary Government in England," where he treats still more extensively of "The Judges in relation to the Crown and to Parliament," does he seem to lead away from the conclusion which I am pointing out as the proper one to arrive at concerning the authority of one of the confederated provinces of Canada in regard to the subject here discussed. From these, his writings, I extract this as a cardinal principle—the enjoyment of his office by a judge, may not be effectually interrupted, unless it be done at or near the fountain head from which that honour flows.

The first statute of Ontario alluded to by our valued contributor in the above article, stated the tenure of a County Court Judge to be during pleasure, removable for specified causes established to the satisfaction of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council.

Soon after it was published it became an open secret that the Dominion Government objected to its becoming law, and that disallowance was averted only by an understanding that it should be altered in the ensuing session. We see that it was accordingly altered by making the tenure during good behaviour, but subject to removal by the Lieutenant-Governor under certain circumstances without the intervention of the Court of Impeachment.

The fact that this Act (the one which our correspondent attacks in its revised shape) was not so interfered with might seem to suggest that it was free from all the objectionable features of the first one. There may, however, be a better explanation than this for the difference in the attitude of the Dominion Government on the two occasions, if we accept the conclusion of the writer that the amended Act was also invalid.

A report of the Minister of Justice in June, 1868, submitted rules for adoption concerning the review of provincial legislation. These were adopted by the Governor-General in Council. Mr. Todd, in his able work on "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," page 361, thus summarizes two possible grounds of objection noticed in that report.

(1.) "Where exception might be urged to the law itself as being in excess of the constitutional powers of the Local Legislature or at variance with Dominion legislation." (2.) "Where it might appear that proposed enactments were contrary to the policy which in the opinion of the Governor-General in Coun-