

those who *know it all*, a few in each county, would not be expected to attend. I feel satisfied that such meetings would result in much good even to the wisest of them. Let some of the oldest magistrates move in the matter, and give it a trial. Yours,

S. P. MABEE, J. P.

Port Rowan, April 23, 1869.

REVIEWS.

THE LAW OF RAILWAY COMPANIES, COMPRISING THE COMPANIES CLAUSES, THE LANDS CLAUSES, THE RAILWAY CLAUSES CONSOLIDATION ACTS, THE RAILWAY COMPANIES ACTS, 1867, AND THE REGULATION OF RAILWAYS ACT, 1868. With notes of all the decided cases on these Acts, &c. By Hy. Godefroi, of Lincoln's Inn, and John Shortt, of the Middle Temple, Barristers-at-Law. London: Stevens & Hagues, Law Booksellers and Publishers, 11 Bell Yard, Temple Bar, 1869.

We have to thank the publishers for an early copy of this work. The editors appear to have acquitted themselves well. The notes are terse and yet sufficiently full to give the desired information as to judicial interpretation of the sections annotated. Annotated editions of important acts of Parliament are of great service to the profession, and for purposes of ready reference are preferable to treatises. The aim of an editor of an annotated edition of a statute should be to avoid loading his notes with details as to facts. What the reader of such a work wants is the marrow of the decision, and that expressed in the fewest possible words. The editors of the work before us have not been unmindful of this requisite. By observing it they have succeeded in presenting to the profession a great body of law on subjects of very general importance in a portable form, considering that our Railway Clauses Consolidation Act is in great part taken from the English Act, the value of this work to all interested in Canadian railways is obvious; with many railways constructed, others in course of construction, and yet others projected, there is already much "railway litigation" among us. The duties and obligations of railway companies to "adjoining proprietors," and the public are not at all times easily ascertained or easily defined. The consequence is daily increasing

litigation, and daily increasing necessity for a work like that now before us. Its cost is so moderate as to place it within the reach of all. The facility it affords for reference to decided cases is so great that the possessor of it must save time, and "time saved" to a man of good practice in our profession is "money made." The index is truly exhaustive. By means of succinct notes and an elaborate index no real difficulty can be experienced in finding that which is sought. The volume proper contains no less than 552 pages. Added to this is an appendix, 364 pages, containing all material acts relating to railways and the standing orders of the Houses of Lords and Commons, and the index. The latter alone is so comprehensive as to embrace 80 pages. The mechanical execution of the work by the law publishers, under whose auspices the work is issued is all that could be expected from a firm so well known and so eminent as Messrs. Stevenson & Hagues. Their agents in Toronto are Adams, Stevens & Co. and Messrs. W. C. Chewett & Co. Orders left with either firm will receive prompt attention.

MR. DICKENS AND THE PEERAGE.—It is the privilege of literary men to blunder about legal matters, but Mr. Charles Dickens has abused the privilege. In his speech at the Liverpool banquet he vindicated himself from the charge of disparaging the House of Lords, and explained to his audience that he enjoyed the friendship of many members of that House, not least among whom was *Lord Chief Justice Cockburn*. Now Mr. Charles Dickens has known Sir Alexander Cockburn for many years, and even if for a portion of that time he had imagined that the Chief Justice was a peer, we should have supposed that the truth might have dawned on him in December last, when his illustrious friend was offered and declined a peerage. Up to the delivery of the Liverpool speech we had believed that the celebrated 'Pandects of the Benares' could not be eclipsed; but anything is possible when a *littérateur* of the loftiest pretensions does not know whether the man 'whom he loves more than any other in England' is a commoner or a peer.—*Law Journal*.

What an attorney is, everybody who has got an attorney will no doubt be aware, but those who are ignorant on the point may feel assured that ignorance is unquestionably bliss, at least in this instance. We, however, are far from intending to stigmatise all attorneys as bad—and the race of roguish lawyers would soon be extinct if roguish clients did not raise a demand for them. No man need have a knave for his attorney unless he chooses; and when he goes by preference to a roguish lawyer, it must be presumed that he has his reasons for not trusting his affairs to an honest one.—*Comic Blackstone*.