The Legal News.

Vol. XIV. AUGUST 1, 1891. No. 31.

In *Farrell* v. *Brand* the Superior Court, Montreal, Pagnuelo, J., (Oct., 1890) held as follows:—1. Le fait d'offrir en règlement d'un billet une somme moindre que le montant de ce billet constitue une interruption de prescription à l'égard de ce billet. 2. La reconnaissance par un débiteur que le capital d'une créance est dû ne constitue pas une interruption de prescription quant aux intérêts de cette dette. The person to whom Mr. Justice Pagnuelo handed his notes in this case is requested to return them to the learned judge, or to the editor of this journal, for publication.

"A Magistrate" sends the following communication to the *Times*:—

"A learned recorder, Q.C., in charging the grand jury of a county town (there were no prisoners for trial), made the following remarks:

"'He thought it possible that one of these days it might be considered that the attendance of a grand jury at quarter sessions was unnecessary, and there was a sufficient protection that persons would not be improperly put upon their trial, as the cases were heard in the first instance by the magistrates.'

"How devoutly it is to be wished that this blessed day may come soon, and that the common sense of this recorder may prevail!

"In former days, when the squire heard the case of the poacher upon his own preserves and committed him with no other assistance than his own legal lore, the institution of a grand jury was indeed a safeguard; but in these enlightened times of magistrates' clerks and well-regulated petty sessions it is nothing less than absurd, as regards quarter sessions at least, that the deliberate opinions of justices advised by a lawyer should be submitted *quasi* for approval and should be liable to be overruled by less cultured minds. It is very doubtful, too, even as regards assizes, if the institution of a grand jury can be of any real utility, except to share with a judge the responsibility of saying that such and such a prisoner shall not be put upon his trial in a particular class of case of an unmentionable character for want of evidence. But the judge in such cases is surely able to bring about the same result by a timely hint to counsel.

"Is there, however, any such further necessity, or even propriety, in the institution of a grand jury that it is worth while to continue the trouble and expense and loss of time involved? This is no age for pedantic and cumbersome methods of obtaining justice. No one travels nowadays by a stage-coach, except as a curiosity. The blast of the trumpet down St. James's Street is interesting, no doubt; but for the dozen persons sitting upon the coach there are a dozen thousand travelling on the railway.

"The relationship of a grand jury to a modern Court of justice is somewhat in the same ratio. Magistrates and commercial men who are bound to attend there know that they are doing no good whatever, except, perhaps, to swell the triumph of a judicial car on a Roman holiday.

"Pedantry will not fail, I am aware, to dish up some sort of argument for the continual usefulness of a grand jury; but common sense says loudly 'No!' even though judges here and there may join in the chorus of admiration for this old-fashioned palladium of the liberty of the subject, which represents now only the waste of time, the waste of labour, and the waste of money."

TARIFF OF FEES.

The following changes in the tariff of fees have been announced in the *Quebec Official Gazette*:—

Whereas by article 29 of the Code of Civil Procedure, and articles 2710, 2711 and 2712 of the Revised Statutes of the Province of Quebec, it is among other things enacted that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make, modify, revoke or amend the tariff of fees payable to prothonotaries, clerks, sheriffs, coroners and criers, and whereas the Act of last session 54 Vict., ch. 48, respecting appeals, has rendered certain