

Society to take steps to secure authentic copies of all Occasional Rules of Court as soon as they are passed, and have them printed in a uniform style, but separate and distinct from the Reports, so that they could be bound up separately—or interleaved in books of practice; and to distribute them along with the next number of the Reports issued after their passage. Our attention was drawn very forcibly to this matter the other day, when we were desirous of finding a Rule which had been passed under the statute relating to summary proceedings in criminal cases. Application was made to the Registrar of the Court of Appeal, who is supposed to be the officer of the court having the custody of its Rules, but he knew nothing about any such Rule. Application was then made to the Registrar of the Chancery Division, in which the particular matter was pending, and he was equally ignorant of any such Rule. Finally, on applying to the Common Pleas Division, a printed copy of a Rule passed in the High Court on the 17th November, 1886, was produced. We now print it for the benefit of our readers, in another column. This Rule, it seems, had been passed at a session of the judges when the learned Registrar of the Common Pleas Division was the acting Clerk, but strangely enough the other officers of the court, who ought to have been informed of its existence, seem to have been left in profound ignorance of it. We can only say, that if even the responsible officers of the court are thus left in ignorance of the Rules, how can it be reasonably expected that practitioners can keep track of them? Even the consolidators of the Rules appear to have been ignorant of the existence of the Rule we have referred to, for by Rule 3 they have repealed all former Rules passed by any of the Superior Courts of Law or Equity in Ontario, except those mentioned in the schedule, and this particular Rule is neither referred to in the schedule, nor is it included in the Consolidated Rules. This matter is a crying grievance, which the learned judges and the Law Society between them ought to remedy, and we trust they will do so.

COMMENTS ON CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

The *Law Reports* for August comprise 21 Q. B. D. pp. 177-309; 13 P. D. pp. 117-140; 38 Chy. D. pp. 385-506; and 13 App. Cas. pp. 241-505.

PRACTICE—EVIDENCE ABROAD—COMMISSION—DISCRETION.

Taking up first, as is our custom, the cases in the Queen's Bench Division, *Coch v. Allcock*, 21 Q. B. D. 178, is deserving of attention. This was an appeal from the Divisional Court, granting the order for a commission to take evidence abroad.

The court (Lord Esher, M.R., Lindley and Lopes, L.JJ.), though affirming the order, on the ground that the examination of the witnesses in question could be taken under commission at less expense than bringing them to England, and that there was nothing to show that their presence in court was essential, never-