

The Legal News.

VOL. VII. FEBRUARY 2, 1884. No. 5.

A NAIVE EXPEDIENT.

One of the most curious suggestions made for the relief of the New York Court of Appeals emanates from a Mr. Gebhard, and appears in a communication to the *Albany Law Journal*. It is—Codification!—"A hastily prepared Code," says Mr. Gebhard, "would at least let us know what the law is; when we know what it is, we have removed the necessity of asking the Court to tell us, and to that extent lessened the burdens of the judges." It is refreshing to meet with such childlike faith. In this part of Canada we have been enjoying the advantages of a Code for seventeen years—not "a hastily prepared Code," but one compiled with great deliberation by jurists of eminent standing and long experience; but we do not think the necessity has been removed of asking the Court to tell us what the law is, nor have the burdens of our Court of Appeal been sensibly affected by its existence. In fact, we cannot imagine anything that would be more fruitful in litigation than "a hastily prepared Code." If Mr. Gebhard's suggestion were acted upon, we fancy some of his clients would soon be inclined to spell in a different way the epithet by which we have described his scheme.

THAT STRANGE PORTRAIT.

The *American Law Review* candidly discloses the sources of its information respecting Canadian affairs. It was gathered "from the stories told by Canadian *émigrés*, of whom there are a good number in this country, and whose ranks are receiving daily accessions. These *émigrés* are among our very best citizens." Our contemporary goes on to state that one of them, who migrated to St. Louis seven years ago, has prospered so mightily that "he is now achieving distinction as a legal author." Another, from Nova Scotia, has been for

many years a prominent figure in public affairs, and has been "a Senator of the United States!" He might possibly, adds the *Law Review*, have become a Justice of the Peace in Nova Scotia!

These are more startling sources of information than we imagined. Twenty, or ten, or even seven years ago, may be considered ancient history as to many branches of Canadian affairs. The stories of the *émigrés* are as accurate as the old maps of the British Provinces which are in vogue in some New England schools. And because Canadians have prospered abroad is it to be inferred that they would not have succeeded at home? How will this logic work? Our cities are full of American *émigrés* from Vermont, from New Hampshire, Massachusetts and other States. Many of them have prospered and grown rich. Some of them are counted among "our best citizens." As well might we contend that Mr. Blank, from Massachusetts, instead of becoming a millionaire in Canada, would never have risen above the proprietorship of a peanut stand in Boston.

Our neighbours are great enough now to be able to dispense with unjust depreciation of Canada, for the purpose of exalting themselves. We are sensible that there is vast room for improvement among us in very many particulars. Our spirit is daily vexed by the presence of abuses which few have the courage to assail. But apparently, even in the eyes of the *Review*, society in the United States is far from immaculate; for, on another page, referring to the pardon of Mason, our contemporary candidly admits that "in Canada, society is better governed than in the United States."

LEGAL AUTHORSHIP.

After all, the lot of the Canadian gentleman in St. Louis, who is "achieving distinction as a legal author," does not seem to be one of unadulterated bliss, for in another article the *Law Review* laments over the small rewards of legal authorship. "There is no money, as a general rule," says our contemporary, "in writing original articles for legal periodicals"; and he adds: "It is believed that the *American Law Review*, under its former