Les notes du sténographe devraient être déposées au greffe, et transcrites seulement lorsqu'il y a révision ou appel. Le juge rendrait son jugement sur ses notes, et s'il a besoin de référer aux notes des sténographes, il pourrait le mander et lui faire lire la partie de la déposition dont il a besoin.

Pour la transcription, lorsqu'elle a lieu, il ne devrait être exigé, dans aucun cas, plus de dix centins par cent mots.

Quelques unes des recommandations qui précèdent exigent une législation nouvelle, d'autres, l'action du gouvernement ou des juges de la Cour Supérieure. Celles qui suivent peuvent être adoptées de suite par les juges de la Cour Supérieure, si elles rencontrent leur approbation.

[The suggestions which follow the Report are those which were published in our last issue.]

TREATMENT OF PRISONERS ON TRIAL.

The trial judge in the Guiteau case has been blamed in some quarters for not resorting to sharp measures in order to restrain the torrent of vituperative eloquence flowing from the prisoner. Even if it were proper to gag a person undergoing his trial, it is clear that such a course would have been bad policy in this case, because the prisoner's sole defence has been effectually rebutted by his own showing, and the jury can have little difficulty now in estimating the plea of insanity at its proper value. But an article which we copy elsewhere, from the *Irish Law Times*, shows how irregular would be any interference with the prisoner's freedom of utterance while on trial for his life. It appears that English judges have refused to allow an unruly prisoner even to be manacled while undergoing his trial. Some of the cases referred to probably go too far. Take the case of a powerful ruffian—a bushranger—who knows that his life has been forfeited half a dozen times over, by the most brutal crimes, and who has at last been apprehended by the police after a bloody struggle. Is he to be allowed a chance to commit fresh crimes in an effort to escape prompted by the removal of all impediments? A man may be restrained from violence to others without sensibly diminishing his personal ease or interfering with his liberty of defence. See also, in connection with this subject, 2 Legal News, p. 337.

NEW BOOKS.

DRINKS, DRINKERS, AND DRINKING; or the Law and History of Intoxicating Liquors. By R. Vashon Rogers, Jr., of Osgoode Hall. Albany, Weed, Parsons & Co.

This book, though published in the United States, is from the pen of a Canadian barrister, Mr. Rogers, of Kingston, Ont. We have already had occasion to notice one of Mr. Rogers' works —The Law of Hotel Life—(2 Legal News, p. 353), and we then indicated that we were favorably impressed by the ability with which the author, though treating a legal topic in an unusual vein, handled his subject. This impression has been in no respect weakened, but rather confirmed by an examination of the present production. Though "Drinks, Drinkers and Drinking" may suggest broad comedy, Mr. Rogers is more serious than usual in his essay upon the law as involved with the use of intoxicating beverages. But to compensate for this, he has given us some chapters which express in the purest English the result of considerable research into a not uninteresting branch of law. The historical chapter will well reward the reader. The lawyer who needs some light reading at Christmas time cannot do better than send to Albany for a copy of this work. We could easily find some good passages for quotation, but we do not like to spoil the feast.

THE RIGHT TO MANACLE PRISONERS.

The question of the right to manacle prisoners, which arose before the commission of Oyer and Terminer on Wednesday last, is one that has not frequently been the occasion of controversy in modern times. It may, however, occur at various stages of the prisoner's custody, —at the time of his arrest, of his committal to jail, and of his appearing at the bar; and a few words upon the law applicable to each of those contingencies may here be useful.

In the first place, as regards the arrest, we consider that ordinarily, and not merely when the apprehension takes place on mere suspicion (as laid down by Mr. Levinge, Justice of the Peace), an unconvicted prisoner ought not to be manacled, unless there is reasonable ground to fear an attempt at escape or rescue; and if without reasonable grounds the prisoner is manacled, the constable would seem to be