

# Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXI.

MARCH 1, 1885.

No. 5.

## DIARY FOR MARCH.

1. Sun.....*and Sunday in Lent.* St. David's Day.
3. Tues.....County Court (York) sittings. Osler, J., appointed 1870. Court of Appeal sittings begin.
6. Fri.....Name of York changed to Toronto, 1834.
8. Sun.....*3rd Sunday in Lent.*

TORONTO, MARCH 1, 1885.

THERE is a matter of some little moment which, we think, should be called attention to, viz., the practice springing up among certain of the short-hand reporters of the courts of attending when written judgments are delivered, and taking them down in short-hand, with a view of afterwards supplying what they are pleased to call copies. This is not only a usurpation on the province of the regular court reporters, whose duty and perquisite it is to supply copies of all written judgments, but it leads to exceedingly inaccurate versions of the judgments being circulated, to the perplexity of counsel and the vexation of the judges. The *fons et origo mali* no doubt is that students, when told to go to "the reporter" and procure a copy of such and such a judgment, do not understand that it is the reporter of the court who is intended, but straightway seek out one of the official short-hand reporters, and the latter, finding this the case, have, we suppose, devised the somewhat nefarious scheme above mentioned, and thereby put into their own pockets the fees which of right belong to the reporter of the court, and in return give, not a correct copy of the judgments delivered, but so much thereof as they have succeeded in taking down in short-hand.

WE have before us what appears likely to be the commencement of a most valuable addition to periodical legal literature in Vol. I. No. 1 of the *Law Quarterly Review*. The fact that it is edited by Mr. Frederick Pollock is itself sufficient guarantee of its character. The first article in the present number is on section 17 of the Statute of Frauds. It comprises some interesting introductory remarks on this section by Mr. Justice Stephens, followed by a digest in which the effect of the decisions upon it from 1676 to 1878 are given. To excite interest in the remarks of Mr. Justice Stephens, it may be sufficient to say that the conclusion he comes to is that the 17th section should be repealed, and the cases upon it consigned to oblivion. This article is followed by articles upon the Franchise Bill, by Sir William R. Anson, the King's Peace, by the editor, Homicide by Necessity, by Herbert Stephen, Federal Government, by Professor A. V. Dicey, and a number of other articles by distinguished writers. This is a new departure in periodical legal literature. We know of nothing of the same character as this *Review*, which has preceded it, and we feel sure that all who appreciate the intellectual side of the most intellectual of professions will welcome it with great rejoicing.

LORD COLERIDGE recently made some strong observations on what, he said, was a growing fashion of litigants conducting their cases in person which he considered in many ways open to objection. *Pump Court*, in referring to this, says it probably arises from the idea that the litigant will be allowed to state his case at greater length than would be permitted to counsel