in the habit of attacking magistrates and chairmen of quarter sessions. Nevertheless, notwithstanding his Lordship's remarks, it is obvious that there must necessarily be more divergence in the views with which magistrates inflict punishment than amongst the judges of the High Court, because whilst the judges of the High Court have all been trained in the same school, the magistrates are drawn from different professions, which naturally induce different habits of thought and afford differing standpoints for the view of administering criminal justice. The judges, too, have much greater opportunities of interchanging their ideas on the subject than the magistrates have. The magistrates, therefore, have all the greater need of using the best means at their disposal for studying the practice of the bench in adjoining jurisdictions. Special provisions have quite recently been passed providing for the expenses of associations of county councils who are performing administrative functions recently exercised by the justices without any advantage of that sort. There seems to be no reason why the justices should not have similar facilities with regard to the discussion of the duties that yet remain to them. It has been always one of the great defects of the administration of criminal justice in this country that the jurisdictions of the several judicial authorities have been too much hedged about from each other, so as to be almost foreign countries to each other. There should be some better provisions for maintaining an interchange of ideas, and the best will then be found generally to prevail with less sharp contrasts than now obtain."

COMMENTS ON CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

The Law Reports for June comprise 24 Q.B.D., pp. 625-754; 15 P.D., pp. 81-121; 44 Chy.D., pp. 1-217; 15 App. Cas., pp. 49-202.

PRACTICE—DISCOVERY—INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS.

In *Wideman* v. *Walpole*, 24 Q.B.D., 621, the Court of Appeal (Lord Esher, M.R., and Lopes, L.J.) permitted an affidavit to be filed by plaintiff denying the possession or control of a document ordered to be produced for inspection, and thereupon the appeal from the order made by the Divisional Court (24 Q.B.D., 537) noted *ante* p. 295, was reversed with costs.

PRACTICE—PLEADING—MATTER IN AGGRAVATION OF DAMAGES—LIBEL—ORD. XIX., R. 27 (ONT. RULE, 423).

In *Whitney* v. *Moignard*, 24 Q.B.D., 630, a point of practice was disposed of by a Divisional Court (Huddlestone, B., and Williams, J.). The question was one of pleading in an action for libel, published in a newspaper. The statement of claim alleged that the defendant knew that the words published would be, and the same in fact were, repeated and published in other editions of the same newspaper. It was held that the evidence of the facts stated in the paragraph would be admissible at the trial, and therefore the paragraph was properly