

There are few legal publications known to us a constant reference to which will better repay the practising lawyer. In fact he will do well to make as often as possible long extracts from its pages. It appears compiled with all the care and thoroughness of its predecessor in the same department. We cannot refrain from one observation, however. For a long time past an advertisement of this work has appeared on the back of our reports in which it has been stated that "in order to ensure complete accuracy, J. H. Thom, Esq., one of the taxing officers at Osgoode Hall, has kindly undertaken to personally peruse the proof sheets." This statement still continues to appear in the advertisement referred to. Nothing, however, appears in the preface of the book as issued to show that this revision by Mr. Thom, is a fact. If it is a fact it will be useful to call attention to it; if it is not a fact it is a pity Mr. Ewart's attention is not called to the continuance of a misleading assertion.

THE dinner of the Osgoode Legal and Literary Society at the Walker House on Wednesday last was an unmixed success, and the committee of management may fairly be complimented thereon. The dinner was good, and there was not too much of it. "The rosy," as Dick Swiveller would say, was allowed to pass in moderate quantities. Distinguished guests graced the festive board, and the President discharged his hospitable duties in a manner which left nothing to be desired. More than one excellent speech was made, and Mr. Edward Blake, Mr. Goldwin Smith, Mr. B. B. Osler, Mr. Charles Moss, Mr. Huson Murray and many others, expressing much interest in the existence and the working of the society. In fact a society such as this, which not only affords the members an opportunity of practising the art of public speaking, but which also,

and this we take it is far more important, encourages and fosters *esprit de corps*, and a high tone of professional feeling must command the sympathy of all who have the highest interests of the profession at heart.

We cannot refrain here from giving our readers the benefit of a witticism which emanated in our hearing from one of the junior members of the bar at the dinner on Wednesday. One of the gentlemen present, seeing his partner immediately opposite him at table, expressed in an audible voice his gratification at finding himself opposite to "so distinguished a lawyer," to which the other replied that he had been on the point of making a similar observation. "Ah," said the third overhearing the conversation, "then each of you is the opposite of a distinguished lawyer!"

A CONTROVERSY has been raging in the legal body in the United States on the gown question. The Judges of the New York Court of Appeals have taken to wearing robes. *The Central Law Journal* has been very strong against this action, and thus comments:—

"They will be held responsible for this arrogant assumption of superiority and contempt for the people, and the day may come when they will repent that they have heeded the counsel of those men who have but used this movement to demonstrate their influence."

*The Albany Law Journal* approves of the change, and earnestly "hopes that the *Central* will forgive the Judges before the next judicial election. But the new Judges, whoever they may be, will go into the gowns all the same, unless a statute or constitutional amendment shall forbid it. To be consistent, the *Central* should never again use the phrase, 'soiling the judicial ermine.'"

*The Washington Law Reporter* has the following sensible observations:—