

THE
MANITOBA LAW JOURNAL.

VOL. II.

JANUARY, 1885.

No. I.

JUDICIAL KNOWLEDGE.

MR. JUSTICE ROSE (Ontario), held that he had no judicial knowledge that beating, and playing, a drum were the same thing, and discharged a prisoner because the fact had not been proved. *4 C. L. T. p. 31.*

Mr. Justice Moss, on the other hand, did not account himself judicially ignorant of the fact that an accommodation endorser usually, after endorsement, hands the note to the maker in order that it may be put in circulation. "I do not feel bound," said that exceedingly able judge, "wholly to shut my eyes to the notorious fact, with which every member of the community, who is concerned in, or has had occasion to observe the dealings of merchants, brokers, and bill discounters with their customers, is perfectly familiar, that such transactions are of every day occurrence, and are entered into under the belief that the law warrants the assumption that the endorser has lent his name to enable the maker to use the note in the money market." *Cross v. Currie, 5 Ont. App. 31.*

Lord Campbell, C. J., was still bolder, and asserted that common law judges were judicially informed of the doctrines of the Court of Chancery, and resented somewhat savagely the imputation that he knew nothing at all about equitable principles. "I have no doubt," he said, "that the judges of a common law court take judicial notice, not only of the doctrines of equity, but of those of every branch of English law, when they incidentally come before them. When a