Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXIII. MARCH 15, 1887. No. 6.

DIARY FOR MARCH.

17. Thur.....St. Patrick's Day.
18. Fri.....Arch. McLean, 8th C. J. of Q. B., 1862.
19. Sat.....P. M. Vankoughnet, and Chancellor, 1862.
20. Sun.....*4th Sunday in Lent.* Lord Mansfield died, 1775, æt. 89.
27. Sun.....*5th Sunday in Lent.*
28. Mon .....Lord Romilly app. M. R., 1851.
30. Wed.....B. N. A. Act assented to 1867. Reformation in England began, 1534.

TORONTO, MARCH 15, 1887.

OUR correspondent in "Our English Letter" makes some sensible remarks on the treatment of counsel by the Bench. What a pleasant thing it must be to argue cases before the House of Lords. Judicial experience is a good thing and this journal has recognized it before now; but we see no reason why it should go hand in hand with that irrelevant talk and distracting and irritating interruption which so often wastes the time of the public at Osgoode Hall. We refer especially to that class of questions and remarks which would not be made if the Judge had patience to listen attentively to the whole argument of counsel without interrupting them. We cannot, on this subject, improve on the remarks of our correspondent, to which we refer the reader.

THE world moves, and modern improvements meet us at every turn. Not the least important time-saving machine (if we may so call him), which we meet with nowadays, is the ubiquitous stenographer, and his attendant satellite, the type writer. He has turned up, however, we must confess, in a somewhat unexpected quarter. In a recent case he was summoned to a certain learned judge's private room, and into his listening ear was poured for half an hour or more, the strains of judicial eloquence, which being duly indited in the hieroglyphics peculiar to the craft, a notification was made to the solicitors for the parties that judgment had been delivered.

Thus, in an easy and expeditious manner, the judicial soul unburthened itself of reasons—but here comes the rub. The suitors, naturally enough, were curious to know the reasons which had been given for the judgment, but on application to the depository of judicial wisdom, that functionary failed to see any obligation on his part to make a transcript of his notes, except at so much per folio. This method of delivering judgment, while it has its advantages, so far as the judicial and reportorial side of the question is concerned, may possibly be viewed with different feelings by those who were wont to enjoy gratis a treat for which they must now, perforce, either dance attendance on the reporter or shell out hard cash. We presume a judge is not bound to give reasons for his decisions. But if he does, it is generally understood that he should give them in open court. It is possible that in the particular case referred to there may have been some reason for this mode of procedure. We have heard, however, that this is not an isolated case, and for fear of its becoming a common practice we have thought proper to refer to it.