

yer, and of course have country cases in Review and in Appeal. Now, I have to complain of the present working of the system in both those courts of appellate jurisdiction. I have been in Montreal, from Aylmer, to get a hearing in the Court of Review as many as three times, and my case is still to be heard. In the Court of Queen's Bench it is worse. I have been there four times, and my case is still left to the future. This state of things is intolerable for country lawyers; of course city lawyers can attend to themselves.

Now, what is the remedy? The courts, perhaps, are not subject to reproach. It is the system. The Court of Review, which is only a bastard Court of Appeals, is composed of judges, chiefly of the city, who are crowded by work of original jurisdiction. They cannot do justice to the appellate work. The Court of Appeals is not strong enough in the number of judges to do the work pressing on the Court.

1st. Abolish the Court of Review altogether, and let the judges of the Superior Court do their work.

2nd. Double or treble the number of the judges of the Court of Appeals (Queen's Bench, Civil side), making the quorum four, so that two or three divisions may sit at the same time.

3rd. Let the judges of the Superior Court do the Criminal business, with an appeal to the Queen's Bench.

Why should the time of our judges in Appeal be wasted in running the ordinary Criminal Assizes? The Criminal Court must be presided over by a respectable man who knows some law, and who can guide the jury; but, after all, the matter rests with the jury, and the functions of the Judge are limited to questions of procedure and the admissibility of evidence. Superior Court judges do the work in rural districts, and if a Superior Court judge can hang a man in the country why cannot he do so in the town? All I want to enforce is a uniformity of system. There is no use weakening the Appeal Court by requiring one of its judges to do outside work. The Queen's Bench is an appeal court. Let it be an appeal court only, but let us have its work done, and done up to the handle all the time.

My proposition is to increase the number of judges. Some people will probably object on the ground of economy. What would be the annual expense to increase our present Queen's Bench to three times its present power by having six additional judges? Forty thousand dollars.

Who cares about the expense? The economy of an insufficient judiciary is an economy of candle-ends (*économie de bouts de chandelles*) worthy of nobody.

There is much bad blood made from the delays of the law. Lawyers are blamed, judges are blamed, and in the end they (lawyers and judges) are all set down as humbugs and swindlers, when all the time they are fretting and fuming, trying to get their work in, but cannot because the judging power is inadequate. It is utter nonsense to speak of the arrears of work in appeal, because it cannot be done. If six judges cannot do it, let us have a thousand. With faith you can move mountains; with numbers you can do so too, as witness our Canadian Pacific Railway. Let us have no arrears in legal work. Let people know they can have prompt remedy for their ills, and that lawyers can give relief. Now they are handicapped by the Court of Appeals, and it in its turn is overweighted in point of numerical force.

REFORM.

#### GENERAL NOTES.

One of the society journals has complained that the American chief justice was somewhat scurvily treated by the bench and profession when in this country. Undoubtedly American lawyers are far in advance of their English brethren in the matter of civilities to individuals. When members of their own body die, a funeral oration is almost inevitable, and in the spirit of a young republic, they are always glad to give cordial welcome to eminent strangers. It was hardly to be expected that Chief Justice Waite would meet with a reception in this country similar to that which was accorded Lord Coleridge in America. His name was probably unknown to most, and his presence in England was known only to a few. Lord Bramwell and other eminent men showed him every civility, and perhaps at another period of the year there would have been a combined recognition of his arrival, and a public tribute paid to the high office which he holds, and which has been filled by so many distinguished men.—*Law Times*, (London.)