The Legal News.

Vol. IX. MARCH 6, 1886. No. 10.

The judicial returns which appeared in the last issue of the *Quebec Gazette* show that there were 232 judgments by the Court of Queen's Bench sitting in Appeal last year. Of these 140 were confirmations, and 92 were reversals. At Montreal 142 judgments were rendered, and 90 at Quebec. There was only one Reserved Case heard during the year.

The Court of Review sitting at Montreal disposed of 203 cases, of which 141 were confirmed, 41 reversed, and 21 reformed. The same tribunal sitting at Quebec disposed of 108 cases, viz, 50 confirmed, 52 reversed, and 6 reformed.

In the Superior Court there were 2,050 judgments in contested causes. The total number of writs of summons issued was 6,451, of which 4,513 were returned. In the Circuit Court there were 27,944 writs issued, of which 10,853 were issued in Montreal.

The case of *Crawford* v. *Crawford*, the *Law Journal* believes, is the first instance of a divorce being obtained on a confession by the wife of adultery with the co-respondent and of the co-respondent being acquitted without his going into the witness-box and denying the adultery. In *Robinson* v. *Robinson*, 29 Law J. Rep. P. M. & A. 178, the case usually cited for this application of the law of evidence, and decided by no less eminent judges than Chief Justice Cockburn, Mr. Justice Wightman, and Sir Cresswell Cresswell, the co-respondent denied the adultery on oath. So it was in a similar case some three years ago before Sir James Hannen. The application of this rule of evidence, adds the *Law Journal*, is, of course, not confined to divorce cases. It equally applies to cases of conspiracy, and A. might be adjudged on his confession guilty of conspiring with B., while B. was pronounced innocent of conspiring with A.

Some of the daily journals are greatly concerned at the congested state of the roll in appeal. Their knowledge of the facts, however, is about as accurate as an English geographer's information about Canada. For instance, we saw the other day a leading article based upon the supposition that there are over three hundred appeals pending at Montreal. It is curious that the interest which inspires such labored efforts does not first prompt to a simple inquiry at the office of the Court to ascertain the real state of matters.

The letter upon judicial silence, referred to on p. 57, is so interesting that we give it entire as it appeared in the *Law Journal*. Another correspondent of the same journal relates the following, which shows that some judges have inclined to the opposite fault :— "About fifty years ago I met an old Northern solicitor, who had come up to attend a case in court and was much shocked, even then, with the incessant talking of the judge, and stated that he had attended Sir William Grant's Court on a similar occasion, and, although the case was most important, with full argument of seniors and juniors, protracted through a summer's evening, as was then the practice, the judge, although evidently paying the greatest attention and taking copious notes, uttered but one word during the whole time, and that word was 'Lights,' as the light faded."

The remedy available to the sufferers by the London riots is not clear. The *Law Journal* says : "The sufferers are not entitled to compensation under the riot act unless the rioters intended and began to demolish whole houses. *Drake* v. *Footit*, 50 L. J. Rep., M. C., 141. And even in that case the compensation is confined to the injury done to the houses, and does not extend to loss from robbery. This fragment of liability is all that is left of the ancient law, making all the inhabitants of a district responsible in damages for violence within it. The district responsible is ordinarily the hundred, of which there are six in the county of Middlesex. The houses damaged, besides those in the city, which is responsible for itself, are in the