

afflicted by quintuple repetitions? It is high time that private enterprise should take hold of this standing necessity. And if it is done, I for one will not disturb anybody by obtaining a copy of the authentic reports.

D.

[We have not verified the percentage mentioned by our correspondent, who is a senior Queen's Counsel, with a large practice before the Supreme Court; but we are under the impression that the Province of Quebec cases before the Supreme Court are especially in arrear as far as reports are concerned.—ED. LEGAL NEWS.]

THE COURT OF REVIEW.

To the Editor of THE LEGAL NEWS:

SIR,—It has been evident for some time past, that the system adopted by the Court of Review, with regard to hearing country cases, is working an injustice to the advocates practising in the city, and to the litigants before the Courts here: and as the result of this term's work has brought this out more glaringly than ever before, it may be useful to call the attention of the Bar and the Judges to the matter more forcibly by publishing the actual figures.

In this month of October the Court has sat four days, nominally devoting two days to country cases and two to those of this district. This, to begin with, gave an undue proportion of the time to the country cases, as there were only 22 on the roll out of a total of 65; one being an election case. But as we come to examine the working of the system, the disproportion appears more and more abnormal. On the first day of the Court, the election case, and one privileged case, were heard. The second and third days were devoted to hearing cases from the rural districts. On the fourth, two Montreal cases were heard, and then the insatiable country litigants claimed the privilege again, as having been represented by city advocates, who had the day before yielded their place to their rural confrères. The result of the term's work stands as follows: 1 election petition; 1 privileged case; 1 motion; 3 Montreal cases, and 11 country cases heard. In other words, half of the country cases on the roll were disposed of, and only one-thirteenth of the city cases. It

is well for us to be courteous to our country brethren, and for the Court to be complaisant in its arrangements for their convenience; but we must not altogether forget the interests of our clients and ourselves, nor fail to remember that complaisance may degenerate into stultification.

If we turn to the September list we do not find much comfort, but only indications of the October fiasco. Out of 80 cases on the roll, 27 were from the rural districts, and there was one election case. The Court sat longer than usual in the attempt to diminish this heavy list; five or six days, if I remember rightly, devoting three days to country cases. Five motions were heard, one election case, and one motion in a jury case; 10 city cases were heard on the merits, and 14 country cases!

I have not sufficient spirit left to proceed further with this investigation; enough has been said to show that some radical change is needed in the system upon which this Court is managed.

I would humbly suggest that the Court should adopt some system, as to country cases, like that which works so well in the Court of Appeal:—taking them in their turn upon the roll as far down as the Court might expect to reach; or devoting only one day out of the four, and that the last, to these cases. Taking them last would relieve the Bar here from much uncertainty as to their cases being called;—and would cause no inconvenience to our confrères; but, on the contrary, would make their day fixed, instead of uncertain as at present.

It would relieve the roll very much if the election cases could be heard on a day set apart, and not in the regular term. They are invariably lengthy, and generally take up at least one of the days set apart for city cases.

The roll is not made up on a logical system. Cases called and not argued should go to the bottom of the list, and lose their turn on the roll for the next term. To give an instance of how the present system works, I may mention a case which was reached in September, on the last day at 3.30 p.m. The Court adjourned without hearing the parties, who were ready. This term it was the 9th on the roll instead of the first! and it has not yet