

of Corpus Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford University, having held it continuously since 1903. He was born at Kostroma, Russia, in 1854. While acting as Chairman of the Educational Committee in the City of Moscow he came into conflict with the governmental authorities, and resigned his post. Soon after his resignation he went to England where he continued studies which he had some time before begun in English social and legal history. He was the author of many books chiefly dealing with subjects on the more recondite side of the law, but his little work entitled "Common Sense in Law," published in the Home University Library, brought him into touch with the general run of readers who do not confine their mental exercise to the perusal of fiction. Sir Paul delivered a course of lectures on legal subjects in certain Universities of the United States some two years ago.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The Editorial Advisory Board of the Canadian Bar Association does not hold itself responsible for the opinions of Correspondents. Contributions to this department of the REVIEW must be accompanied by the genuine names of the writers, to be used in the discretion of the Editor.

ONTARIO CHURCH PROPERTY COMMISSION.

Editor The Canadian Bar Review:

SIR,—In the December number of the CANADIAN BAR REVIEW the last item under the heading of "Current Events" is as follows:—

"*Ontario Church Property Commission.*—After an all-day and all-evening hearing the Ontario Church Property Commission at midnight on the 21st instant ruled that it would decline to make any finding or recommend action in the matter of property division as between the non-concurring Presbyterians and those of the church which had voted into union. It is stated there is no appeal from the Commission's finding."

The impression which this bit of news would be apt to convey is somewhat misleading, and I trust that you can find space for a short statement of the facts.

The Commission, consisting of Mr. W. H. Wardrope, K.C., Mr. R. S. Cassels, K.C., and myself, was appointed by the United Church of Canada Act, being chapter 125 of the Ontario Statutes of 1925, with power to hear certain limited classes of applications. The time fixed for making applications expired on the 10th of September last. Prior to that date over 150 applications were filed, and since that date the Commission has held 15 sittings in different parts of the province and has heard 64 cases. Of these cases 40 were disposed of at the hearings. In 24 cases judgment was reserved, but the decisions have been subsequently announced in all except two cases. About 12 applications have been withdrawn.

Whether the Commission has done a useful work is not for me to say. In any event it is of course bound by the limitations of the powers conferred

upon it, and has no right to order or recommend any apportionment or division of property between the non-concurrent Presbyterians and the United Church of Canada, except in the particular classes of circumstances specified in the Act.

The case which seems to have given rise to the note in the *CANADIAN BAR REVIEW* is doubtless the Port Arthur case, which was heard on the 21st of December. It was merely one of the many cases heard by the Commission, and it seems only just to my fellow-commissioners and me that the readers of the *REVIEW* should not be left under the impression that the sum total of the work of the commissioners has been to hold one all-day and all-evening session and to decide that they could do nothing.


I should perhaps add that the item in question is substantially correct as applied to the Port Arthur case. My only complaint is that, as published, the item would naturally be understood as meaning that the Commission had declined to give relief in any case whatever.

Yours faithfully,

Toronto, 6th January, 1926.

JOHN D. FALCONBRIDGE.

BOOKS AND PERIODICALS.

 Publishers desiring reviews or notices of Books and Periodicals must send copies of the same to the Editor, care of THE CARSWELL COMPANY, LIMITED, 145 Adelaide Street West, Toronto, Canada.

Railroads: Cases and Selections. By Eliot Jones, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, Stanford University, and Homer B. Vanderblue, Ph.D., Professor of Business Economics, Harvard University. The MacMillan Company. Price, \$5.00.

This is a most interesting and useful volume for men concerned with railway problems—and who in Canada should not be interested in railway problems just now? It is a compilation of pivotal decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the U.S. Railroad Labor Board, and the Supreme Court of the United States, with review articles and chapters from authoritative books, making a mass of well selected material on different phases of the transportation question,—history of railway development, rate making, rate regulation, valuation of railroads, safety and adequacy of service, science and economy in management, control of railway securities, wages, strikes, combinations and consolidations of railways. It deals with the situation in the United States, but there is just enough similarity and just enough difference between conditions there and in Canada to make such discussions very useful to us. For instance, the fourth chapter is "Reasonable Rates," a paper by G. C. Henderson, reprinted from the *Harvard Law Review*. It deals with the right of the State to regulate rates and with the methods and principles determining what rates are fair and reasonable—a vital question in Canada at the moment. Obviously, though the rate problem is much the same with us as with our neighbours, the powers and methods of public commissions must be different, owing to differences in charter rights, in legislation, and in the very constitutions of the two countries. But the discussion goes below these differences and deals with common principles. Another valuable chapter is that on the Plumb Plan, containing a statement of the Plan, a