

OUR ENGLISH LETTER—RECENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

give a man work, they are retaining him as a leader and a junior. I do not, however, imagine that a recent suggestion that men should not be compelled to request the honour, but that the Lord Chancellor, should, *sponte sua*, confer it upon them, is likely to be popular. If this rule were adopted several undesirable consequences would ensue, and the most undesirable of all would be that politics would influence the choice. Yet a man is neither a worse nor a better lawyer because he is the hottest of Tories or the fiercest of Radicals.

Among the men whose fate is hanging in the balance just now are Moulton, of scientific renown; Crump, of Bradlaugh fame, whose powers of close argument have recently been made known to the Privy Council in one or two Canadian cases, and Woolf, of the Bankruptcy Bar. There are others of equal celebrity, but these three are the most likely to make their mark. The first is a specialist, the second is an exceedingly subtle lawyer and master of considerable eloquence, and the third is versed in the intricacies of Bankruptcy. Now, in Bankruptcy, there is much need of leaders.

Amongst the few satisfactory topics of the day is the recent decision with regard to the status of colonial Queen's Counsel when circumstances bring them before the English Courts. Englishmen have long desired the settlement of this question. Only last term a young friend of your correspondent was engaged to appear before the Privy Council, together with an eminent member of the New Zealand Bar. It was the very first occasion in which he appeared in Court. No one was more anxious that the real leader should be to the fore. Yet the practice was so unsettled that up to the last moment neither leader nor junior knew what was to be done. This, of course, was an extreme case, but the final settlement of the question is grateful to all. A Canadian lawyer knows

at least as much, and probably a great deal more, of Canadian law than an English barrister of equal standing, and it is right and proper that they should rank simply by seniority, and that there should be no other distinction between them.

It is not too much to say that a deadlock in the Queen's Bench Division is inevitable. During the forthcoming assizes there will be only six common law judges left in town to do all the work in Court and Chambers. The Bar regards the prospect with despair, especially when it sees that the merchants of the city are sick and tired of delays and are showing an increasing desire to settle their difficulties by arbitration. A leading shipowner and Member of Parliament told me the other day that he would rather incur any loss or suffer any injustice than submit to the delays of the admiralty courts. But the admiralty courts are not a whit worse off than the Queen's Bench Division.

A recent book, David Dudley Field's *Miscellaneous Writings and Speeches* makes one's blood boil for Canada. If any one wants his old sores re-opened, he cannot do better, after looking at the map of North America, than read Mr. Field's review of the Oregon question. He will not adopt Mr. Field's conclusions, but will rise with a strong conviction that the apathy of the English Government and its proverbial indecision allowed the sacrifice of a piece of territory which would be of infinite value to us now.

RECENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

THE November numbers of the *Law Reports* consist of 9 App. Cas. p. 595 to 756; 13 Q.B.D. p. 649 to 696; 9 P.D. p. 181 to 217; 27 Ch. D. p. 1 to 361.

ARBITRATION CLAUSES—JURISDICTION OF ARBITRATOR WHEN LIABILITY UNDER THE ACT IS BONA FIDE DISPUTED.

The first case in the first of these, *Brierley Hill Local Board v. Pearsall*, p.