

## THE REVISED STATUTES OF ONTARIO.

To the Editor of THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

SIR,—Were it not that from the earliest moment of our student days we had become accustomed to look at the price of law books with a degree of awe, and calculated how many weeks' salary (did we get any) it would take to purchase those necessary ones which we could not borrow, we would probably consider it a fraud to be compelled to pay for a law text-book from three to five times what it ought to cost. But what I am aggrieved at is that, notwithstanding the great principle which meets us at every turn, that "*Ignorantia legis neminem excusat*," we have, in order to be able to peruse the Statutes of our land to pay the sum of six dollars. But to whom goes this amount extracted from the not over-filled pocket of the impecunious student, or the barrister or solicitor as yet not overburdened with this world's goods? It cannot surely go to increase the revenues, either directly or indirectly, of a Province boasting of its surplus. It cannot be that the aforesaid Province gets a royalty on the law of the land. Perish the thought! But, then, where does the profit of four dollars go, on books costing about two? We are again reminded of the Roman Emperor who engraved the laws in immense characters on the top of a lofty pillar. The pillar undoubtedly could be seen, so could the laws—if they had had telescopes. Could they complain? Can we?

LAW STUDENT.

## IMPRISONMENT FOR DEBT.

To the Editor of THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

SIR,—The letter of Mr. Durand in your last number having called my attention to the subject of judgment summonses in Division Courts, it has occurred to me that perhaps a discussion as to the advisability of revising, if not repealing, the enactments referred to might now be opportune. The imprisonment of a debtor, provided for by sec. 240, is in *theory*, as you say, for *fraud*, *contempt*, etc., and not for *debt*. But it is, I believe, generally understood, and sec. 244 would certainly give countenance to the idea, that "imprisonment for debt" is in reality the term best applicable in the premises. I think I may safely say that in nine cases out of ten, the examination of a judgment debtor under the enactment in question results only in annoyance, irritation, or humiliation of the debtor, and waste of time and money on the part of the creditor, besides a useless occupation of the time and attention of the judge, for which matters of more importance seem never to be lacking.

Apart from all considerations as to whether this method of applying legal "thumb-screws" to indigent debtors smacks of barbarism, would not the well-known uselessness of the proceedings in most cases suggest the advisability of repealing the enactment, and thus freeing our Province (the Banner Province of the Dominion!) from the stigma of "imprisonment for debt" in reality as well as in name?