Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XX. OCTOBER 1, 1884. No. 17.

DIARY FOR OCTOBER.

3. Fri.....First edition English Bible printed 1535.
5. Sun.....*17th Sunday after Trinity.*
6. Mon.....County Court and Surrogate Term (except York). Non-jury sitting of County Court (except York).
8. Wed.....Harrison, C. J., sworn in, 1875.
11. Sat.....Guy Carleton, Gov. of Canada, 1774. County Court and Surrogate Term (except York).
12. Sun.....*18th Sunday after Trinity.* Lord Lyndhurst died, 1863.

TORONTO, OCTOBER 1, 1884.

THE case of *Herman Loog* v. *Bean* in the July number of the *Law Reports* which we have noted in our article on recent English decisions, is one of considerable public importance. It establishes that the Court has jurisdiction to grant an injunction to restrain the repetition of slanderous statements affecting trade and property. Injunctions have before been obtained to restrain libels of a like nature, but this is the first precedent for restraining slanders. It is almost to be hoped that the jurisdiction will be extended to other slanders and libels, besides those affecting trade and property. The law of slander and libel has heretofore, as it seems to us, afforded a very inadequate remedy for such injuries. By the time the case is tried and judgment given, the public will have very likely become thoroughly biassed against the unfortunate victim, and have received an impression which it is quite impossible to remove. It will, however, be much more satisfactory, if, as soon as the writ is issued, it is possible to obtain an interim injunction to be subsequently made perpetual, which will effectually clap a 'muzzle on the slanderer's mouth, and once for all upset the libeller's ink-bottle. We can imagine a certain railway company commencing an action for an injunction against a newspaper published not a hundred miles off, and the latter finally stopping its injurious comments in consequence. We commend *Herman Loog* v. *Bean*, and the cases referred to in it, to the notice of the solicitors of the Canada Pacific Railway.

IN a note appended to the case of *Re Bingham and Wrigglesworth*, 5 O. R. 612, which was an application under the Vendors' and Purchasers' Act, R. S. O. c. 109 s. 3, it is stated that the learned judge, in consenting to hear the petition, said that he did not desire to make a precedent in practice under the Act of entertaining petitions on all questions of a like kind, as he thought he foresaw undesirable consequences, if all questions of title were to be settled in this way, where the existence or validity of the contract was not disputed. The question at issue between the parties in that case was the construction of a deed in the chain of title, and we can conceive of no case in which it would be more eminently fit that the summary proceedings pointed out by the Act should be resorted to. Wherever the construction of the instrument affects the rights of third persons who are not before the Court, it is, we presume, open to the Court either to direct an action to be brought or such parties to be notified, but we should imagine without such express direction it would be always safer for the solicitor to resort in the first place to the summary method of the Act before plunging into an action.

Certainly in entertaining an application