

the physician. The Court held that doctors do not come in the same category as common carriers, inn-keepers, etc., and do not, by reason of their holding themselves out as practicing their profession, enter into any implied contract with those who may require their services.

We are glad to notice that Mr. Tremear, author of "Canadian Criminal Cases," has in course of preparation, to be issued shortly, a treatise on the Criminal law of Canada. From his work in the past we have reason to expect that he will not follow the practice too common amongst editors of annotated Statutes (at least in this country) of "skipping hard places." The honest attempt to throw light on an obscure section, even though the author might arrive at a wrong conclusion, would be much more satisfactory than ignoring the difficulty altogether. We trust also that in the forthcoming book more attention will be paid to criminal evidence and to the practice in the criminal courts than has been attempted by any of those who have hitherto annotated the Criminal Code. In none of them is there any adequate attempt to collect the authorities that are helpful in these matters. There are especially a number of Ontario cases that should find a place in such a book.

The opinion is frequently expressed by the older portion of the Bar that votaries of the "New Learning" which term we understand is to be taken to indicate the Law School, or "Scientific," system of professional training, display an unseemly and splenetic interest in belittling the claim levied upon the veneration of posterity by those giants of the common law, Coke and Blackstone. The profane hand of the latter-day vandal, they say, is busy with destruction in our legal Pantheon—majestic ivory and bronze are being demolished to make room for cheap and tawdry foreign clay! All this is to forget that the belittlement of Coke and Blackstone was not begun by the pupils of John Austin, nor by the adherents of Jeremy Bentham, for that matter. Bacon, his contemporary, impugned Coke's authority. Willes, C.J., (Wilkes, 341) in discrediting one of his legal propositions, says: "Some of them when they come to be thoroughly examined by those who are nullius addicti jurare in verba magistri, will be found not to be right." Buller, J. (3 T.R. 348) says of 4 Inst. 135: "I think that that part of Lord Coke's work has always been received