

there are no counterparts or prototypes in English legal or social life; and these great possessions of the English Crown are entitled to claim a voice in the ultimate decision of the issues to which they give rise. The bold and statesmanlike precedent set by Lord Rosebery of appointing a colonial clergyman to an English bishopric ought to be followed on the earliest possible occasion by the transfer of an Australian judge to the Privy Council. The Australasian colonies have the first claim to an appointment of this kind. But the turn of Canada and South Africa will come next. It is to be hoped that this desirable reform will not be prejudiced by the foolish suggestion that colonial judges should occasionally be promoted to the Bench of the English Supreme Court. It will be time enough to embark on an enterprise of this kind when colonial lawyers are willing to see their English brethren appointed over their heads to vacancies on the colonial Bench. And apart altogether from such considerations, English practice is too technical a science to be mastered by a judge after his elevation to the Bench. There is, however, an unanswerable case for the main demand which our greater colonies are now putting forward; and while the reform of the Privy Council is in the air, we hope that the need for a revision of the absurd practice by which one member of the Judicial Committee pronounces the decision of the whole body, and no corroborating or dissenting voices are heard, will not be ignored. The effect of this procedure is to detract from the authority of the Judicial Committee without adding anything to its dignity.—*Law Journal (London.)*

#### QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

LONDON, Oct. 29, 1894.

TAYLOR v. REGINAM (IN ERROR.) 29 L. J.

*Writ of Error—Indictment for Obtaining Goods by False Pretences Counts for Receiving the Same—Omission of Particulars of False Pretences—7 & 8 Geo. IV. c. 29, s. 55; 24 & 25 Vict. c. 96, s. 95.*

A writ of error having been issued in this case, on the application of Taylor to the Recorder of the borough of Portsmouth, a return was made from which it appeared that at the borough quarter sessions, held in January, 1894, an indictment had been found against one Farrell for obtaining certain pieces of meat