

and to the public. "Counsel appeared for the defence of a prisoner. Objection was taken by counsel for the prosecution that the defending counsel was not a member of the sessions mess, whereupon the chairman said that he would adjourn the case for other counsel to be instructed, or for the counsel appearing to put himself in order by having a junior from the sessions mess. We had supposed that the rules of etiquette of a sessions mess or circuit mess were of merely domestic authority, and that judges would not in any way recognize or enforce them, since to do so would be to cut down the theoretic right of prisoners to the selection of counsel."

WE would again call attention to the inconvenient, annoying, and misleading practice of reporting cases on appeal in the Supreme Court by giving the name of the appellant first, whether or not he was plaintiff originally. The names are thus frequently transposed, and sometimes names are introduced which were not given in the title of the case in the court below. We have taken the liberty, in publishing the notes of cases of the Supreme Court in this issue, of putting the plaintiff's name first, so that those who have heard of the cases in the previous stages of their existence may be able to recognize them. It is quite time this stupid relic of a dusty past were shelved. We are, of course, aware that the Supreme Court follow, in this respect, the practice of the Privy Council, and it is possible there may be some slight convenience to the court in being able to see at a glance, from the style of the cause, who are, respectively, appellants and respondents; but this does, in fact, appear by the words "appellant" or "respondent" appearing after the name. The point is that the original style of cause should invariably be retained from the beginning to the end of the case. This would be a distinct convenience, and it is very hard to see why so reasonable a concession to convenience and common sense cannot at once be made, both in our Supreme Court and in the Privy Council.

A CORRESPONDENT, in referring to the Intestates Estate Act (58 Vict., c. 21, Ont.), asks the question: "Wherein is the sense or justice of this latest creature of the Solons of the Local