

alluded, even though, in this case, no great harm may have resulted. And further it may be remarked that if no protest is entered (and as yet we have heard nothing of any motion to quash this by-law, probably because it is not thought worth while) the action of those occupying these high positions might be looked upon as a precedent for further breaches of a very important Act, which, as we have already stated, for certain purposes, creates a new judicial forum or Court having very extensive powers, of the extent of which no one can at present form an opinion.

It ought not to be necessary at this time of day to re-assert the proposition that no circumstances or motives of expediency or alleged benefit of the public should be permitted to form an excuse for those clothed with judicial powers or statutory authority as makers of the laws or administrators thereof to aid in the breach of any law; especially in a case of this kind, where the enactment was evidently intended for the protection of the community by requiring information to be given without which no intelligent vote could be cast.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR ON JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS.

In England the selection of men to hold the position of justices of the peace is of much more importance than it is in Canada, their jurisdiction and duties being more extensive, and a greater responsibility being thrown upon them. In that country the Lord Chancellor acts for the Government in appointing its justices of the peace as well as the other judges of the land. The exigencies of party politics are detrimental even in said old England. Here appointments have been made, more especially of late years, at the instigation and demand of party men, which have brought discredit upon the Government making them.

The evil in England is considered to be so great that recently sixty-eight Liberal members of the House of Commons pre-