

the parties may have retained a shorthand writer to take a note; but the note is not transcribed unless an appeal is contemplated. Nor can the transcript often be copied, without extensive emendation, into a *Law Report*. Needless repetitions must be excised; while the *ipsissima verba* even of our greatest judges are not always the best of good English. Where there is no transcript, the reporter must needs fall back on his own note of what was said, and as knowledge of shorthand is not made a necessary qualification for a reporter the task is one of some difficulty. But the fact that all the judges revise their judgments for the *Law Reports* ensures the accuracy of what are the best records of English legal proceedings.

1, Brick Court, Temple, E.C.

W. V. BALL.

---

A writer in the *Yale Review*, of some eminence, expressed the hope that Mr. Justice Hughes, of the Supreme Court of the United States, would withstand the allurements of the political leaders of the party with which he was identified before his elevation to the Bench to become a candidate for the Presidency of the United States, and gave good reasons for his belief that a descent from the Bench would be fraught with injury to the State and tend to imperil the usefulness of an important and highly respected Court. But the fond hope of the writer has, as we know, met with disappointment, for Ex-Justice Hughes is now in a stiff partizan fight between the "ins" and the "outs" for the greatest prize held out to the politicians of the nation to the south of us; and the lustre and dignity of the Supreme Court of the United States appears to have suffered, more or less, in the direction spoken of by the *Yale Review*.