

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XVII.

MAY 15, 1881.

No. 10.

DIARY FOR MAY.

1. Sun....2nd Sunday after Easter.
3. Tues...Supreme Court sittings, Primary Exam.
4. Wed...Primary Exam.
5. Thurs...Primary Exam.
8. Sun....3rd Sunday after Easter.
9. Mon...Hon. George Brown died, 1880.
10. Tues...Court of Appeal sittings begin. Co. Court sittings for York begin.
11. Wed...Final Examination.
12. Thurs...Final Examination.
13. Fri....Final Examination.
14. Sat....Final Examination.
15. Sun....4th Sunday after Easter.
16. Mon...Easter Term begins.
18. Wed...D. A. Macdonald, Lieut.-Gov. Ontario, 1875.
21. Sat....Confederation of B.N.A. Provinces proclaimed, 1867.
22. Sun....Rogation Sunday, Earl Dufferin Gov.-General, 1872.
24. Tues...Queen's Birthday, 1879.
26. Thurs...Ascension Day.
29. Sun....1st Sunday after Ascension.
30. Mon...Proudfoot, V. C., appointed, 1874.

TORONTO, MAY 15, 1881.

It is said by the *Legal News* that a suggestion recently made to appoint a Chief Justice of the Superior Court for the Montreal Division, in the Province of Quebec, is to be carried out; and that Mr. Justice Johnson, the senior Judge of the District, will be the first Chief Justice.

WE PUBLISH in another place a decision of the County Judge of Leeds and Grenville, holding that a claim is recoverable in a Division Court on a promissory note over \$100, and under \$200, even though part of the claim is for notarial charges, which of course are not "ascertained by the signature of the defendant." A case recently came before Judge Ardagh of Barrie (*McCutcheon v. Creswick*), where a somewhat similar point came up for decision. He held, under the same section of the act, that overdue interest was recoverable although the amount of the

claim thereby exceeded \$100. This case will come up again on a motion for prohibition, but the view of the learned judge will probably be sustained.

A CONSIDERATION of these matters suggests to us the thought that some provision should be made for the representation of the views of the judge of the court below, when constitutional points arise, and his decision comes up for review in cases of prohibition, &c. The law must, we presume, be settled at the expense of individual litigants, but it often occurs, and naturally enough, that a Division Court suitor is not sufficiently interested to employ counsel, and the consequence is that the grounds on which the case has been decided are not brought to the attention of the appellate tribunal. It would not be worth while to provide for every case of the kind, but it might be desirable so to arrange that the Attorney-General should intervene in support of the judge's ruling in cases involving important points such as questions of jurisdiction of inferior courts, construction of statutes, &c. The details could easily be worked out if the principle should commend itself to the Attorney-General. Some such provision is all the more necessary where, as in Ontario, the Legislature is composed of only one chamber and the legislation is very hurried, and the statutes not unfrequently far from being worded with exactness or clearness.

A CORRESPONDENT sends us the report of a Division Court case for publication; but as we think the judge was wrong in his ruling, we prefer simply to note the decision