

rules of grammar. It cannot be argued that the form of the expression is correct, or incorrect, because we do, or do not, say "Lords Chancellors" or "Chiefs Justices." As a statute cannot determine what is good English, neither can it be determined by analogy to the structure of similar expressions. We must be guided by the mental conception imparted by the expression. The "Lords Justices" are a body of men created for the purpose of sitting as a body, or a certain number of them as a body, for a certain purpose. We say "their Lordships decided" so and so. If asked by a layman to say more definitely who decided so and so, we should answer, without thinking of the name applied by statute, in language indicating that a body of men styled Lords—not the peers—but the Lords "Justices" decided so and so, the appellation "Lords" being the most prominent word and indicating that they were one body, the term "justices" being added when the position and title were created, to indicate what Lords as a descriptive appellation. We say "Lords Commissioners" for the same reason, that is, to satisfy the mental conception of one body of "Lords" acting as Commissioners of the Great Seal, and no rule of grammar as to the plural of compound words or any statute, affects the question, or is ever thought of. We say "Lord Chancellors" because we think of them as isolate individuals each styled "Lord Chancellor," the word "Chancellor" being the principal substantive word, and there being no two "Lord Chancellors" at once, no body of "Lords Chancellors." We say "Chief Justices" for the same reason, and though there may be more than one in existence at the same time there is no body of "chiefs." We say "Masters of the Rolls" though there is only one at a time—no body like "Lords Justices"—because the mental conception is of a "Master" of something, referred to as "the Rolls," and "of the Rolls" is thought of as descriptive, and not like "Chancellor" as the distinctive part of his title. Besides, euphony would not permit us to pluralise "The Master of the Roll" as one word or appellation. The case is the same in both respects with "Barristers-at-law." No technical rules of grammar or the authority of any statutes applies to any of these questions.

The statute says "Lords Justices" because it is right for the above reasons. It is not because the statute uses the expression in that form that it is right.

Edmonton, March 6, 1917.

A.S.