

Chicago such things seem to be accepted as perfectly normal methods of behaviour. We only hope that the quality of the justice administered in the dirty, grimy Chicago courts is better than these externals would lead one to expect.

There are a few Canadians who have, we think, an undue admiration for the material progress of our cousins across the border; but we think that they would be forced to admit that in their manner of administering law we have nothing to learn from them, and that, on the contrary, we have every reason to be thankful that we have adhered to British precedents in this important matter.

In the concluding paragraph of Mr. Field's interesting address, he bewails the excess of legislation to which his countrymen are subjected. This is an affliction with which Canadians are also too familiar, and which in these columns we have often protested against. For this he declares that there is no remedy but in restraining the scope of legislative power, supplemented by self-restraining legislators. The limitation of the scope of legislative power seems a drastic and dangerous expedient, not likely to find favour here, and we can only hope, therefore, that, in time, our legislators may learn that they display greater wisdom by leaving the law alone than by continually contriving new patches.

CONTRACTS FOR INTEREST.

A case was decided in Ireland some little time ago which has raised the righteous wrath of a writer in the *Irish Law Times*. His remarks are appropriate to some decisions in this country, on the subject of interest, and we certainly agree with his very pertinent observations. There, as here, the courts have been led away by a desire to checkmate the greed of unconscionable money-lenders, and have assumed to make laws instead of expounding them. The following is the article alluded to:

"The decision of the Court of Appeal in the very important case of *Rae v. Joyce* must necessarily attract the attention of all lawyers. The facts are simple, and may be said to be undisputed. Joyce, the defendant, lent Mrs. Rae £100 on a mortgage of her reversionary interest in a sum of £2,050, charging interest at the rate of sixty per cent. When the time came for paying the