may now be presented in the most effective and convincing manner. It is, of course, understood that the making of such illustrations would accompany a detailed exposition of the reasons for the opinion expressed. This is certainly a long way from mere opinion evidence of the old days.

On the general question of allowing experts to give reasons for the opinion expressed the Court of Appeals of New York has said very clearly in *People* v. *Faber* (1910), 199 N.Y. 256 at 268:—

"As has already been expressed by others, from which expressions we have quoted, it is competent for a person offering an expert as a witness for the purpose of shewing the strength of the opinion which he is about to express to specify in detail the observations upon which the opinion is based."

When these new revolutionary precedents, established, as it will be seen by unanimous courts, are compared with the old rulings on these subjects it can be understood what progress has been made, and the result of this progress is shewn by numerous surprising verdicts in cases of this class. Two recent New York cases will serve as conspicuous examples. In the first, six witnesses testified that they saw a certain contract signed, and a jury decided that the document was a forgery, and, in the second, a jury convicted a distinguished member of the bar of a forgery of two words in typewriting that by comparison were connected with his own typewriter.

With the use of the microscope and enlarged photographs (*Frank* v. *Chemical National Bank* (1874), 5 J. & S. 26, 34; affirmed 84 N.Y. 209); the assistance of the chart or blackboard (*McKay* v. *Lasher*, 121 N.Y. 477; and with the help of these new precedents, quoted above, an intelligent counsel and a competent witness are able, in most cases, to prove the facts, and the truth will often prevail against what may at first seem to be great odds.

Numerous lawyers and judges know that important cases of this class have been discontinued and hastily taken from court calendars before trial, but not till after the documents had been photographed and the physical evidence had been arranged in a formidable and conclusive manner for presentation in court. A few years ago many of these cases would have been won against the facts and in favour of fraudulent claimants.

As in all classes of cases, there of course continue to be decisions against the facts, and there are still cases in which it is impossible to prove with sufficient force, against sympathy and prejudice, what is undoubtedly true, but in very many cases involving disputed documents the old despair has passed away. With the new precedents and the practices a practically new profession has arisen, devoted to the investigation of documents and the photographic illustration and scientific proof of such cases in court.

Another definite forward step taken by the courts is in connection with the proof of disputed typewriting. The New York Court of Appeals in a recent case has definitely settled the question as to the admissibility of other typewriting merely for comparison. The court says:—

"I think it may well be doubted whether typewriting can be deemed handwriting within the meaning of the existing statute. Nevertheless, I think the law sanctions the reception of the evidence in question, substantially on the theory adopted by the trial judge. If the impression of a seal were in controversy, it would surely be competent to shew by other