

diction of the Judges of the several County Courts as Local Judges of the Supreme Court is co-extensive with any jurisdiction they may lawfully exercise as Judges or acting Judges of any County Court.

This was a motion to set aside an order for judgment made at Vancouver by the Local Judge for the County Court District of New Westminster, granting leave to the plaintiffs to sign final judgment against the defendant, and also to set aside the judgment signed in pursuance thereof on the ground that the Local Judge sitting at Vancouver had no jurisdiction to make the order, the writ of summons in the action having been issued from the Registry at Kamloops, in the County Court District of Yale.

Held, that the Local Judge sitting within his own jurisdiction under Rule of 16th December, 1892, may deal with an application irrespective of the fact that the action belongs to another Registry—the practice under this Rule differing in this respect from that under Rule 1075.

Motion dismissed with costs.

P. E. Irving, for plaintiffs.

Robert Cassidy, for defendant.

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM

Lord Justice Lindley would like to add a new petition to the Litany: "From lady litigants good Lord deliver us!" But there may be worse things than lady litigants. Lord Norbury, of Irish fame, for instance, had in his Court a monomaniac whose delusion was that he was the Chief Justice, and Lord Norbury an imposter. Long and good-naturedly did the Chief Justice tolerate the would-be usurper, till he threatened, and was proceeding, to depose the Chief Justice from the Bench. Then at last he had to appeal to the usher: "Jackson, turn *Lord Norbury* out of Court!" This reminds us of a story by Dean Ramsay of a Scotch minister, who, on going to preach, found the pulpit in the possession of the village idiot—so called, but with a glimmering of mother wit. "Come down, sir, at once!" said the irate minister. "Na, na, minister," responded the droll; "just come up beside me. A faithless and perverse generation needs the baith of us."—*Law Journal*.

A London jury performed a thoroughly good feat in the variation of verdicts recently. A former pauper was indicted for stealing the suit of clothes in which he left the workhouse. The first verdict the jury returned was this: "We find that the prisoner is not guilty of stealing the clothes, and that he admitted his guilt (before the magistrate) through ignorance. We strongly recommend him to mercy because he has done honest work for eighteen months." But the Judge refused to accept a plea of mercy for a crime which was never committed, and sent the jury back to redraft their verdict. After an hour the foreman came back and said: "We have very reluctantly brought the prisoner in guilty, but we unanimously and strongly recommend him to mercy."—*Law Journal*.