

legislation altered the laws so as to nullify or change the effect of legal decisions, or has declared that what the judges held to be the law was not the law, or was not what Parliament intended the law to be. Still, in this, as in all constitutional questions, the rule must not be pressed too far, and cases may be imagined of so gross a character as to make them the exceptions which prove the rule.

We think also that the rule that the integrity and independence of the Bench must be sacredly preserved must not be held to absolve a judge who has manifestly violated the principles that should govern his conduct; and, in reference to this point, while condemning a resort to Parliamentary or newspaper criticism, except in cases of grave necessity, we by no means agree with Mr. Weldon that such criticism should not be entered upon unless it is intended to follow it by a motion for impeachment.

The distinction which Mr. Mills draws between Parliamentary criticism and Parliamentary inquiry is well worthy of attention, and his letter will be read with the attention that should be paid to one so competent to express an opinion on constitutional questions.

SIR THOMAS GALT.

The retirement of Sir Thomas Galt is no longer a rumour. That which was thought possible when he was granted six months' leave of absence has taken place.

His withdrawal, after a career of twenty-five years on the Bench, marks an era in our judicial history. Sir Thomas Galt was the seventh Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and was a not unworthy successor of Macaulay, Draper, Richards, Hagarty, Wilson, and Cameron, who preceded him in that high position.

Sir Thomas had, prior to his appointment as Chief Justice on the 7th of November, 1887, been already eighteen years on the Bench as a Puisne Judge, and there are few judges now on the Bench of this Province who have had so long and so varied a judicial experience as he has had.

Prior to his elevation to the Bench he had acquired a distinguished position at the Bar, where his reputation as one of the leaders of the common law Bar was unquestioned. His almost exclusive devotion to the common law, however, was not