

LEGAL NOTES.—THE REPORTERS AND TEXT WRITERS.

up with a prospect of leading useful lives. A compulsory power of detention in charitable institutions seems to be wanted.

An English statute, which came into force last November, provides for criminals being photographed in prison, and for the distribution of such photographs, with a view to facilitate identification, and thereby prevent crime.

It is perhaps not generally known among the profession in this country, that the late Mr. Justice Norman, acting Chief Justice at Calcutta, who came to a tragic end, having been assassinated by one of the natives, was the author of the well-known treatise on Patents, and was at one time a reporter in the English Exchequer, in conjunction with Mr. Hurlstone. These reports are sometimes erroneously cited as "Exchequer, New Series," and are unfortunately so lettered on the back of the copy in Osgoode Hall library.

The English *Law Journal*, referring to the late case of *Johnson v. Emerson & Sparrow*, 40 L. J. N. S. Exch. 201, says: "We believe no case will be found in the books, occupying greater space." The length is occasioned by the elaborate judgments upon the question whether or not the defendants were guilty of maliciously procuring the plaintiff to be adjudicated a bankrupt. The court was equally divided. One judgment was withdrawn, and the case goes to the Exchequer Chamber. As to the mere length of the report, we think the *Law Journal* will find that it is surpassed by the Admiralty case of *Banda and Kirocco Booty*, L. R. 1 A. & E. 109. The Exchequer case is reported in L. R. 6 Exch. p. 329, and there occupies 74 pages: the Admiralty case was argued by 37 counsel, representing different interests, and fills 150 pages. True, it may be said of this latter case that it is really a consolidation of several cases.

We observe that the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania has suspended an attorney rejoicing in the name "J. Charles Dickens," by reason of his attempting to intoxicate his opponent, in order to take an advantage of him, "until the offence should be thoroughly purged." The unprofessional singularity of the misconduct, and the mysterious duration of the term of punishment, are alike provocative of profound amazement.

THE REPORTERS AND TEXT WRITERS.

An industrious writer for the *American Law Review* has extracted from the judgments and sayings of eminent Judges, and other authorities, the sayings expressed by them with reference to the Reporters and Text Writers to whom they refer. This compilation cannot fail to be of interest to those who are in the daily habit of using these books. We copy the collection in full, and may hereafter add some notes of our own on the same subject:

ABBOTT ON SHIPPING, 542 note *u*, 11th ed. In the preface of this edition the late Mr. Justice Shree wrote: "With the exception of one passage (note *p*, 78) composed by the author, and one, the only one of his composition which the editor had ventured to alter, to be speedily restored by him, in submission to the opinion of the Court of Queen's Bench (note *u*, 542), he is not aware that the law, as laid down by Lord Tenterden, or offered in any edition of this work to the acceptance of the profession, has been authoritatively questioned."

ADDISON ON CONTRACTS.—"An able book."—Parke B. in *Ellen v. Topp*, 15 Jur. 452.

AMOS AND FERARD ON FIXTURES.—"An excellent book."—Lord Campbell, C. J., in *Martin v. Roe*, 7 El. & Bl. 247.

ANGELL ON WATERCOURSES.—"A very able treatise."—Lord Wensleydale in *Chasemore v. Richards*, 7 House of Lords Cases, 383.

ARCHBOLD'S CRIMINAL PLEADING AND EVIDENCE.—The third edition swarms with errors, the work of an anonymous editor. They were carefully expunged in the fourth edition, which was edited by John Jervis, Esq., late Lord Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas.

"Precedents by persons who are deceased are had recourse to as a sort of authority, and no doubt they are justly entitled to it; but in this particular case, with all the respect I feel for Mr. Archbold and Mr. Jervis, I find that the two precedents differ, and I think the best course to adopt is not to pronounce an opinion upon them, but to look at the words of the Act."—Coleridge, J., in *The King v. Kendrick*, 3 Neville & Manning, 407 (1835).

In *Regina v. Webb*, Temple & Mew, C. C. 28, it was said at the bar that Archbold's forms have not received any public approbation, nor are they to be considered as law. Pollock, C. B., in answer, observed: "Generally speaking, Mr. Archbold's publications are remarkable for their accuracy, and I know no person who has contributed more