

elected a jury, B. wished to be tried by the judge. Both were remanded for trial by jury. Subsequently A. applied for and obtained bail, while B., unable to find sureties was compelled to remain in "durance vile." When A. was called at the trial, it was found that he had absconded, and the case being sent to the grand jury, they ignored the bill as against B., who, an innocent man (it may justly be presumed) was thus compelled to serve a term, because guilty A. was not willing to be tried by the judge as B. was.

The judge in this case inferred, perhaps, that, did he try one prisoner alone, his finding might have an effect on the other prisoner's case when it came before a jury, and wished to avoid the possibility of such an anomaly as one being convicted or acquitted by him—the contrary in the jury case. It would seem to be necessary that some definite course should be laid down, in a case of this kind lest the "discretion" of the judge should eventually prove injurious to an innocent man. Doubtless the Minister of Justice, desiring to give every attention to the suggestions of those who are entrusted with the carrying out of the Code, and whose practical familiarity with the working of its provisions enables them to speak as it were *ex cathedra*, will make provision for this difficulty.

---

On another page will be found a notice from which it appears that the Honourable Edward Blake has ceased to be a member of the firm of Blake, Lash & Cassels, with which he has been connected for over forty years. For a number of years owing to Mr. Blake's residence in London, England, his connection with the firm has been but nominal. Mr. Blake will continue by himself to practice before the Privy Council and elsewhere as he has done since he took up his residence in England. We understand that he may be communicated with either at his London address, 20 Kensington Gate, London, W., or through Blake, Lash & Cassels, who will act as his Toronto agents.