MR. PATTON'S JURY BILL.

Mr. Patton has again brought up his bill to allow verdicts to be rendered on trial by jury in civil cases, although the jury may not be unanimous. We see the bill has passed the Upper House.

Importunity may do much, as in the case of the widow of old, but we continue to retain our opinion that the change is uncalled for, and unnecessary; and we believe that if every judge and every barrister in Upper Canada could be heard on the subject, not one in fifty would speak in favour of it.

The reason assigned in the preamble, is not correct. It is put with the double negative, that "it not unfrequently happens" that juries are unable to arrive at a unanimous decision. That is, it frequently so happens. We join issue at once with Mr. Patton, and deny the fact; and we should like to know from what source the information is derived. If we are rightly informed, not more than four such cases have occurred in the courts of the county where Mr. Patton has practised, for the last seventeen years.

We trust that the House of Assembly will require proof of the matter of fact stated in the preamble, before adopting the measure. It may find supporters among the Chancery men from Upper Canada, but we cannot think it will be favourably viewed by any member of the Common Law bar.

MR. E. S. WHIPPLE.

We published some time since, a letter from Mr. Whipple, with some remarks which appeared to be called for by the occasion. We have recently received a letter from a correspondent, but not for publication, written "to disabuse our minds with regard to what might be supposed to be a want of candor on the part of Mr. Whipple." Our correspondent gives a full and satisfactory explanation of the circumstances, and adds, "Mr. Whipple is an upright generous-hearted, honourable man, and would not stoop to a low thing. I hope, therefore, you will accept this explanation from me, even at this late period."

In view of the information now given, our readers will see that the remarks made contain no reflection on Mr. Whipple. "The cap does not fit." We willingly recur to the subject to say, we are quite satisfied. Our readers cannot, after this explanation, retain any unfavourable impression in respect to Mr. Whipple.

OFFICIAL SALARIES.

We observe that Mr. McMicken has, during the present session of the Legislature, introduced a bill intituled "An Act to provide for the attachment of official Salaries on execution for debt."

JUDGMENTS.

QUEEN'S BENCH.

Present: ROBINSON, C.J.; MCLEAN, J.; BURNS, J.

March 4, 1861.

Heck v. *Knapp.*—Rule discharged.

McDonell v. *Murphy.*—Rule to enter verdict for defendant discharged.

Rice v. *Wells*—Rule discharged.

Irvine v. *Nicholson.*—Rule *nisi* discharged.

Robinson v. *Spry.*—Rule discharged.

VanBrocklin v. *Corporation of Town of Brantford.*—Rule discharged. McLean, J., *dissentiente.*

Reed v. *Wedge.*—Rule *nisi* refused.

Executors of Baldwin v. *Foster.*—Rule *nisi* granted.

Corporation of Sullivan v. *Kelly.*—Rule *nisi* granted.

Burwell v. *Port Burwell Harbor Company.*—Rule absolute to enter nonsuit.

Smith v. *Paisley.*—Rule absolute for new trial. Costs to abide the event.

Blenkensee v. *O'Neill.*—Rule absolute for new trial. Costs to abide the event.

Lazeau v. *Leonard.*—Rule absolute for new trial, without costs.

Canada Western Assurance Company v. *Jarvis.*—Rule discharged, if plaintiffs consent to accept £6, 5s.; otherwise new trial without costs.

Armstrong v. *Little.*—Rule absolute.

Gleason v. *Ayer et al.*—Rule absolute for new trial, costs to abide the event.

Ashton v. *McMillan.*—Full costs not taxable in actions of replevin, more than in other actions, where verdict within jurisdiction of an inferior court, and no certificate.

Lavoie v. *Treadwell.*—Rule discharged.

Prosser v. *Henderson.*—Rule discharged.

In the matter of the Heirs of Mulholland.—Let the partition be recorded.

McCarty v. *Comisky.*—Rule absolute to set aside judge's order, upon payment of costs.

Pogue v. *Pogue.*—Rule absolute upon payment of costs.

Edison v. *Stevenson.*—Rule discharged.

Harrison v. *Brega.*—Rule discharged.

Kesteven v. *Gooderham et al.*—Rule discharged with costs.

Hayes v. *O'Connor.*—New trial without costs.

The Queen v. *McEvoy.*—Conviction affirmed as a conviction for assault and battery at common law.

Vidal v. *Donald.*—Rule absolute for new trial, costs to abide the event.

In re Robertson and Township of Wellesley.—Rule discharged, with costs.

March 9, 1861.

Mutual Insurance Company v. *Palmer.*—Rule *nisi* refused.

Martin v. *Clark.*—Judgment for plaintiff on demurrer.

Darling v. *McLean.*—Judgment for defendant on demurrer. Postea to defendant.

Fellowes v. *Hunter.*—Judgment for defendant on demurrer.

Drew v. *Finlayson.*—New trial upon payment of costs.

Sherman v. *The Corporation of the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengary.*—Rule *nisi* to set aside by-law discharged.

Ketchum v. *Smith et al.*—Appeal allowed.

Buck v. *Hunt.*—Appeal dismissed with costs.

Russell v. *Russell.*—Judgment for tenant.

Harvey v. *Jacques.*—Judgment for defendant on demurrer.

Abbott v. *Skinner et al.*—Appeal dismissed.

Eckhardt v. *Raby.*—Rule discharged.

Sutherland v. *McKune.*—Rule discharged.