

were employed in the various Legislatures of the Anglo-Saxon world to draft bills. This is especially true in new territories, but also applies to older settled ones. Mr. Jones has done good work by an intelligent discussion of this subject, and expresses his views clearly. The more ignorant a member of Parliament is, using that term in its wider sense, the more competent he thinks he is to frame a statute. It is necessary in new countries to have legislation of a novel character to meet new requirements, and whilst this should be done with boldness, it should also be done with extreme caution with due regard to precedents and examination of all existing legislation affecting the subject. As Mr. Jones says, "Bills are often drafted by men who have not made any attempt to see the proposed measures in the perspective of the general law of the state. As a consequence we have a mass of ill-considered statutes which, by their indefiniteness and failure to observe constitutional limitations, throw upon the courts a burden of interpretation which forces them frequently to resort to judicial legislation and to declare the statutes void. Popular prejudice is aroused against the judges who, because laws well intentioned but poorly drawn are declared void, are charged with being an obstruction to needed social advance. The blame which should fall upon the careless draftsman of the law too often is shifted to the court. But even if the bill stand the test of constitutionality, if it is not well drawn, it fails to accomplish its purpose."

Even in such of our legislatures as have a parliamentary draftsman—under whatever name he may be called—the legislature itself limits the scope of his usefulness: first, by not giving him a free hand in drafting or revising and, secondly, by introducing amendments intended to meet some special point raised in the legislature and which amendments are hurriedly passed without referring them to the officer whose knowledge is wanted at this stage more than at the first.

It seems strange that a little more money is not spent in obtaining the services of competent men to prepare the material for the legislative mill and that, when such men are occasionally obtained, the fullest use is not made of them.

*The Law Quarterly Review.* January. Edited by RT. HON. SIR FREDERICK POLLOCK, BART., D.C.L., LL.D. London: Stevens & Sons, Limited, 119 and 120 Chancery Lane.

This great English law review contains its usual interesting notes on a variety of subjects. The other matter is:—A further