

judges and of the body empowered to make orders and rules of court are one and the same thing. This is certainly not correct. They are three entirely different things. From time immemorial meetings of the judges have been held for the transaction of matters too numerous to detail, and at these meetings it has been customary to discuss disputed questions and to pass resolutions thereon. These resolutions, although of imperfect obligation and wanting the force of judicial 'decisions' or 'rules of court,' have nevertheless been found of great practical value as guides for future action.

The council of judges and the body empowered to make rules of court are entirely different from the first and from one another. They are created by statute. Their resolutions and rules and orders respectively, assuming them to be *intra vires*, are binding to the extent and in the manner provided by the statutes.

Your obedient servant,

January 11.

WATKIN WILLIAMS.

### THE MANITOBA LAW REPORTS.

*THE Canadian Law Times* suggests that the Manitoba Law Reports are occasionally "a faithful reproduction" of cases reported in its columns. We did reproduce one case, *Reid v. Whiteford*, but we carefully added "Above case and note are taken from *The Canadian Law Times*," This case was of importance to the profession here, and as our omniverous friend had secured the manuscript prior to the commencement of our reports, in a weak moment we determined to steal. The fact that having many sheep of our own we took the poor man's only lamb, of course adds heavily to the offence. Our contrition requires more than printer's ink. Pitiful reader, kindly imagine the writer prostrate on the ground, overwhelmed with sorrow, dust, ashes, and sarcasm.