Common Law as the two other Divisions; and that neither of them is any more nor any less a Court of Equity or a Court of Common Law than the others.

When the judges are thoroughly indoctrinated with these ideas, and have ceased to talk about the "Court of Chancery," and the "Common Law Courts," then it is possible that the various officers of the court may also learn that they have ceased to be officers of different courts, and have become officers of the same court, in the offices of which the practice ought to be identical; and that it is their duty to facilitate, as much as lies in their power, the unification of procedure in their various offices. So long, however, as men have different ideas, and are resolutely bent on maintaining them, and no autocratic power exists by which harmonious action can be enforced, we despair of seeing perfect uniformity of practice, either on the bench or in the offices of the court. Even the self-same rule will be construed by different minds in different ways. The Law Associations, however, by calling attention to diversities where they exist, and pointing out the practice which they think would be most beneficial for universal adoption, would be doing substantial service.

So far as the diversity of practice is the result of express rules of court the course of the Law Associations is plainer, and something may be accomplished by their submitting drafts of rules which would have the effect of assimilating the practice in all the Divisions in the most convenient way. This, we are glad to notice, the Associations propose to do.

It is also proposed that one judge should sit weekly for the disposal of all chamber and court business in all the Divisions. This, as we pointed out in February last (see *ante* p. 61), would certainly be a saving of judicial strength and time, and we should think would be gladly welcomed by the Bench. The proposal to hold four permanent sittings at fixed dates in each county for the trial of actions is a proposition that may prove more difficult of acceptance. In some of the counties we are inclined to think the holding of four courts annually would be a waste of time, and it would probably be found a wiser plan to group some of the counties and provide for the holding of alternate sittings in the counties composing the group. All the advantages of the proposal of the Associations might in this way be realized without unduly increasing the expense of the administration of justice. Another proposal in the interest of country practitioners is to give the power to local taxing-officers to allow increased counsel fees at trials to the amount of $40 for senior, and $20 for junior counsel.

The Associations also suggest that the proposed consolidation of the rules of practice and procedure, as set forth in the printed draft now under consideration of the judges, should be deferred, so that when ultimately consolidated the rules may supersede all existing rules, and form a complete code of practice. But this suggestion, we fear, will not be at present entertained by the powers that be. The necessity of searching orders in Chancery and rules of the former Common Law Courts, together with the Judicature Rules, in order to ascertain the practice, is no doubt an anomaly; but the compilation of a complete Code of Procedure is a very difficult matter, and one requiring more time, and greater care and attention and practical knowledge of the subject, than a committee of judges have in their power to bestow.

We observe that the Law Society has voted a sum of $2,000 towards the expense of drafting a Code of Procedure. This expenditure seems open to serious objection The Law Society is already so crippled in funds that it has for some time past