Canada Law Iournal.

Vol. XVIII.

FEBRUARY 15, 1882.

DIARY FOR FEBRUARY.

 Fri William Osgoode, first C. J. of U. C., died 1824. Sat Hilary Sittings end. Sun Quinquagesima Sunday. 	
 Wed Ash Wednesday. First day of Lent. Sun. Our demanding Sunday. 	
 Mon Sir John Colborne, Administrator, 1838. Tue Indian Mutiny began, 1857. 	

TORONTO, FEB. 15, 1882.

THE Attorney-General has introduced an Act for simplifying the practice of conveyancing and amending the law of property. It seems to be a reprint, to a great extent, of Lord Cairns' Act, now in force in England. It reaches us too late for further notice at this time.

CHIEF JUSTICE WILSON has held, in Re Squier (see post p. 74) that the Court of Im-Peachment for the trial of complaints against County Judges is still in existence, the Act of the Local Legislature assuming to abolish that Court being ultra vires. This was the view expressed by an able contributor in an article Published in this journal, at p. 445 of last volume.

THERE appears to be only one opinion as to the complete success of the conversazione on Tuesday last, and we may all be proud of the fine appearance both the old building and the new Convocation Hall presented. We print in another column the address presented by the Chairman of the Building Committee and Mr. Edward Blake's

of the committee, whom it would not be difficult to single out. However, like the Oxford man who, in his Divinity examination, was asked to give the names of the major and minor prophets,-we object to invidious distinctions. It is to be hoped so long a period will not again elapse before the Law Society feel justified in giving another "Jamboree "----to use a word which has now received judicial authority in this connection. Possibly the accession of an Edward VII. or an Albert I. to the throne of the British Empire, may afford the next occasion.

THE GUITEAU TRIAL-JUDGE COX'S CHARGE.

It is interesting to read Judge Cox's charge to the jury in the Guiteau trial, in connection with the chapter on "Law and Insanity," or the legal view of responsibility in regard to insanity, in Dr. Maudsley's "Responsibility in Mental Disease," published among the International Science Series. The writer comments severely on the mistaken views of the subject taken by the Courts, and on the answers given to the House of Lords by the Judges in connection with the McNaughton trial in 1843. He gives the substance of those answers thus : "To establish a defence on the ground of insanity, it must be clearly proved that at the time of committing the act the party accused was labouring under such a defect of reason from disease of the mind, as not to know the nature and quality of the act he was doing, or, if he did know it, that he did not know he was doing what was wrong." To this, so far, Dr. Maudsley does not greatly reply. Of course most of the credit is really object, for he admits it will, if strictly applied, due to two or three specially active members cover and excuse many acts of insane vio-

No. 4.