

The Legal News.

VOL. VIII. APRIL 11, 1885. No. 15.

The Term of the Court of Queen's Bench, Crown Side, which has just terminated, presented a series of cases of peculiar interest, and not least the embracery case of *Reg. v. Leblanc*, reported in the present issue. As the law reporter does not usually follow the judge holding the criminal terms into this division of the Court, and as there has recently been special and well-founded complaint against popular reports of the proceedings, it may be useful to state that the text of the reports in the *Legal News* has had the approval and *imprimatur* of the learned judge presiding. As far as we recollect, all the reports of criminal cases which have appeared in the *Legal News* since the beginning of the work have been similarly approved. By text we mean the body of the report, exclusive of the head notes.

The *Montreal Law Reports* for April, in addition to the instalment of the Queen's Bench series issued some time ago, comprise pages 145 to 192 of the Superior Court series. Sixteen cases are reported, in which a number of new questions of interest are decided. The issues for the four months to date of the current year make a total of 416 pages of the work, including decisions on almost every branch of the law.

We were not aware that the colony of Canadian lawyers in New York was especially large. As far as this section of Canada is concerned, the *émigrés* whom we can call to mind were gentlemen whose continued presence here would have proved rather embarrassing to themselves, and have subjected them to possibly prolonged deprivation of liberty. These are hardly to be considered fair specimens of the profession in Canada; their success or failure abroad does not prove much one way or the other, nor are they comfortable associates for those who may legitimately seek to try their fortune in a larger field. We presume that there must

be some of the latter, for a writer in a contemporary says:—"Many Canadians are prone to think that to locate in New York means assured success. Let not the young men of Canada deceive themselves; they will find at the bar of that State many hard-working, energetic, capable lawyers, men who devote their time both early and late to the continuous and well-directed prosecution of their profession, so many in fact, and so well directed their efforts, that the competition there is most intense."

A law in force in Illinois apparently compels judges to grant a change of venue, upon application supported by affidavit charging the judges themselves with "prejudice." A judge writing to the *Chicago Legal News* exclaims indignantly against the toleration of such a practice. He says in thirty years' experience he has never known a single meritorious petition against the judge. "The law permits the judge to be outraged and humiliated by any suitor, whether conscienceless, or ignorant, or possessed of the vulgar notion that because the judge holds a point of law adversely to him, he is therefore prejudiced, and peremptorily closes his mouth to his own vindication. The very man whom the law places in the judgment seat with the injunction to give judgment against no man, nor even to entertain a charge against him, without giving him an opportunity to be heard in his own vindication, and whose conspicuous station, lifelong habits of study and thought, and the desire to win the approval of his fellow men, all tend to inspire with a high sense of honor, is the *only* individual entering the courts of law who can be stained and defamed and bedaubed with impunity, and who can be driven away from that tribunal, so far as the particular case is concerned, by an *ex parte* affidavit mechanically copied from a book of practice, and which has been tested in the Supreme Court and found sufficient." He is surprised that such an iniquitous rule should be tamely submitted to, and encloses the following copy of an order on change of venue recently made by himself:—"This untrue petition seems to be correct in form and