

were added other courts for the trial of criminal cases—one at least being allotted to each province. In the past year the number of these courts has been diminished to thirty-four—being one for the capital of each province in which there was not a Court of Appeal. The present Minister of Justice, however, was set upon effecting economies, and proposed to the Legislature to abolish these thirty-four criminal courts, and to substitute for them the judges of first instance to whom I have referred. The advocates of twenty-three out of the thirty-four capitals which will thus be deprived of their Court of Criminal Jurisdiction laid before the Minister of Justice a projected reform which was as economical as his own—namely, to establish in each province a single court for civil and criminal affairs in lieu of the fifteen existing Courts of Appeal. The Minister of Justice not having received this proposal cordially, the advocates of twelve provincial capitals have struck work, as they declare, in the interests of justice; but, according to the Minister, merely for the protection of their personal practice and privileges. Public opinion is far from regarding this strike with sympathy.”

---

In Dr. J. Dixon Mann's recently published work on Forensic Medicine and Toxicology, the author makes the following observations with reference to the position of medical men in the witness-box:—"It is an honourable law of the medical profession that confidential statements made by a patient to a medical adviser are held to be inviolable secrets. In a Court of law this inviolability is overruled; a medical witness, if asked, is bound to reveal any secrets that have come to his knowledge whilst in attendance on a patient. However repugnant it may be to the feelings of a medical man to violate the confidences of the consulting-room, he has no option. If, when in the witness-box, he refuses to answer a question involving the betrayal of a secret which is really the pro-