

ments which Lord Justice Lindley very correctly lays down. The index, one of the most important parts of any work, has been faulty and defective. Again, many cases that should have been reported have been omitted: for example, in 1 Ch. (1892) some twenty-three cases, and in 2 Q.B. (1892) some twenty-nine cases are cited, but are not reported in the "Law Reports." In addition to this, some cases appear which were decided by a judge of first instance, and were either reversed or disapproved by the Court of Appeal, and yet the decision in appeal is not reported.

The same writer also states in the same article that "the multiplicity of Law Reports is a great evil." Sir Frederick Pollock confesses and avoids the charge of multiplying reports, and admits that the burden of proof is on the new series to justify their existence. He has set himself a hard task, but he sets out with a clear idea of what is needed, with the failure of others before him, and with full confidence that what ought to be done in this regard can be done, and is determined to do his best to succeed.

The Council of Supervision for the year 1894 is as follows: Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., President; A. V. Dicey, Q.C., Vinerian Professor, Oxford; C. M. Warrington, Q.C., M.P.; Sir W. R. Anson, Bart., Warden of All Souls, Oxford; H. Tindal Atkinson, T. Willes, Chitty, F. W. Maitland, Downing Professor of Law, Cambridge, Thomas Snow, Barristers-at-Law; and G. M. Clements and W. Showell Rogers, Solicitors. This is a list of names that will command confidence; but as the proof of the pudding is in the eating of it, the profession will have to judge of this series of reports on its merits.

Volume I. contains the decisions of the House of Lords, Privy Council, Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, and Court of Appeal therefrom. Volume II., the decisions of the Court of Appeal on appeal from the Chancery Division, and cases in lunacy. Volume III., the decisions of the Chancery Division. Volume IV., the decisions of the Court of Appeal on appeal from the Queen's Bench Division; and Volume V. the decisions of the Queen's Bench Division, including those on Crown Cases Reserved, and of the Railway and Canal Commission.

We are glad to know that the learned President of the Council states that especial attention will be paid to the elimination of irrelevant matter, and the framing of the headnotes. The endeavour will be "to make the headnote a real note of the points of substance dealt with, not a huddled abridgment of the facts, followed by a bald statement of their result in that particular case," and on this point the Council claims the special and critical attention of lawyers. The headnotes of the "Law Reports" have been entirely too diffuse, and seemed to us too often to be the hasty compilation of a lawyer's clerk rather than the studied result of the work of a barrister.