

conduct of the judge referred to in the above remarks. We now give his name (Mr. Justice Palmer, Judge in Equity, residing in St. John, N.B.), as we have already given the name of the precious specimen of a trustee, Mr. Grant, of the same place. There is no reason why we should withhold their names, as their conduct is the subject of public comment in their own city. Probably the one will never be a trustee again, and the other is not likely to be a judge very long, if the statements which appear as to his conduct in the newspaper referred to are true. If these charges are not true (which, for the credit of the Canadian Bench, we would be glad to be assured of), the editor of the *St. John Globe* has laid himself open to a criminal information for libel, which, of course, the judge is now bound to prefer against him.

The charges made are those of gross, unblushing nepotism, much worse than those which drove Lord Westbury from the woolsack; also that, to ensure success in this judge's court, it is necessary to employ his son as counsel; and the further charge is that the judge received a large sum of money under circumstances which seemed to require an explanation, which we trust can be given.

It is stated that an effort was made recently by a number of prominent lawyers to have a representation made to the Government in regard to certain courses pursued by this judge in discharging his judicial duties; but this fell through, it is said, because some of the movers feared to take any action which might bring upon them the wrath of the judge. We confess that if this be so, we have very little sympathy with the profession in that Province. However, we presume the matter must by this time have reached the ears of the Minister of Justice, and it is his duty to take such action in the premises as may be necessary either to vindicate the character of the judge, or to remove him from the Bench.

---