

appeal the exercise of discretion by the clerk shall be subject to review;" and ordered the Rule to come into force forthwith. Although over a year has elapsed since the passing of this Rule, it has not yet been officially printed or published, and is apparently not known even to some of the officials of the Court, for we find it appears to have escaped the notice of even the Registrar of the High Court Division. For no mention is made of it in his recent edition of the Judicature Act and Rules. We believe at the time of its passage some note of it appeared in the Toronto daily papers. We may say that no notice of it was ever received by this Journal.

When we come to look at page 211 of the Rules, we find that the page selected is not "the Tariff of Solicitors' Fees in the County Court," but the "Tariff of Disbursements in the Supreme Court," with which the amendment has nothing whatever to do, and here again the pin method for finding a place for the proposed amendment, if resorted to, could not have produced any worse result.

Is it not about time that this slipshod method of dealing with the Rules of Court should cease?

JUDICIAL IRONY.

The judicial mind is always supposed to be calm and equable, but unfortunately being encased in a human body it is sometimes apt to be tempted to betray a passing irritation and to vent itself in ironical remarks on the failings or what it may think to be the failings of suitors, learned counsel, or even of those exalted beings whom fortune has called to a higher place in the judicial hierarchy. Take for instance the following from a recent judgment of a learned County Court Judge:—

"The almost absolute certainty of counsel in this case (as it is in fact in almost every case) that his particular view of the law is correct is somewhat shaken by a perusal of the various cases passed upon and reported in the February number of the Ontario Law Reports. I find that out of the ten cases reported