

called, not being for the *Parish* of some name or other, has no legal existence; the Law authorizes the incorporation of *Parishes* or *Townships*, but not of *Seignories*." The writer elsewhere complains that the word "Municipality" is not found in the English Lexicon; so of course *he does not understand it*. I know not what "Dictionary" the "Limb" may use; but I find in Walker's Dictionary such a word as *Municipal*, defined "belonging to a Corporation," from which our name *Municipality* is derived; the Latin *municipium* is the *rest*. But the 8th Vic. Cap. 40, Sec. 2 establishes the propriety of our own local arrangement. It says, "that the inhabitants of every *Parish* or *Township*, or *other Territorial Division recognized or DESIGNATED as a MUNICIPALITY*, in the manner hereinafter provided, "shall be a *body politic or incorporate*." It will be seen that any *Territorial Division designated as a Municipality* may be incorporated. Is not the "Municipality of Argenteuil" at least a *Territorial Division*? What an honour to the Profession must be this engrafted "Limb of the Law!!"

The 3d objection respects an alledged nonobservance of the formalities required by law, "that is (to use his own words) the Poll Book or Lists were not kept by such Justices of the Peace, authorized to preside at such election, but by the Parish Clerk." By a reference to the 6th section of the Act, it will be perceived that "the name of each elector voting at such election shall be written in Poll Lists to be kept by the presiding Justice, or *any other person holding the same*." It is absurd, however, to suppose that the presiding Justice shall act as Clerk on the occasion. It is sufficient that the entrances be made by a confidential person *under his immediate inspection*." This was actually done in the present instance.

"A Limb of the Law" further objects to the appointment of the *seventh* person. He contends that the individual who retired in favour of another had no right to do so. On the contrary, I maintain that his retirement was perfectly consistent, and the appointment of "Mr. So-and-so" strictly legal. By the 10th section of the Act, all persons "over sixty years of age" are exempted from serving, unless at their own option. The gentleman who retired belongs to this class. The argument, therefore, must be abandoned. Indeed it seems to have been framed merely to pave the way for a little reflection upon an individual who has not unfrequently called "our champion to order." This will likewise account for the writer's aversion to the "Small Courts."

The concluding paragraph of page 14th, every individual present at the election referred to contradicted. It was designed merely as an attack upon the presiding Justice.