

with indictable or other offences to be competent witnesses on their own behalf show that more than half of the accused persons elect to give evidence on their own behalf, and that often the husband or wife is also called. The result is that the sittings of the courts are protracted, and the pressure of work is largely increased in all criminal courts. Mr. Justice Hawkins has recently been discussing the Act at considerable length whilst addressing a grand jury. He thought it badly drawn, and difficult to construe, and was not in his opinion well considered, and he was not in love with it, and it would not tend on the whole to the beneficial administration of criminal justice. Another writer says that it will prove useful in securing for a guilty person his own just punishment by clearing up in the course of cross-examination any doubt which the evidence for the prosecution might have left in the minds of the jury. The manner in which it has been received in England does not induce us to alter the opinions which we have from time to time expressed in reference to the change which has been made in criminal evidence.

---

We are rather apt, and with some reason, to grumble at the amount of cases reported in the Dominion, and possibly it might be better to have fewer of them. However, this may be, we are very happily situated as compared with our legal brethren across the border. We issue in this country about fifteen volumes per annum. In the United States lawyers are supposed to be more or less familiar with the contents of about 110 large volumes. To keep track of all these cases would, of course, be simply impossible. Efforts are therefore made by various law book publishers to select the most important cases, and note authorities bearing thereon. As an example of this, we might refer to the *Lawyer's Reports Annotated* for October last. We see there a note by Mr. Labatt, articles from whose industrious and able pen have from time to time appeared in this journal. The principal case in that number is one reported of the Michigan Supreme Court, on the subject of knowledge as an element of an employer's liability to an