

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXXVII.

MAY 15, 1901.

NO. 10.

When discussing the recent deliverance of the English Bar Council on the subject of the status of the Colonial Bar before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council we dealt with the matter on general principles, but we may observe that the opinion we expressed seems also to be that of no less a personage than Lord James of Hereford, who, in 1884, as Attorney-General, in response to an inquiry of an English Q.C., gave an opinion to the like effect as may be seen by reference to 20 C.L.J. 299. His Lordship then said: "It appears to me that the Privy Council is common ground to the Bars of this country and all our colonies and dependencies. I see no reason why we should not accord equal rank to Her Majesty's counsel in the colonies when pleading in colonial causes," etc. This, it is true, was only the opinion of an Attorney-General, and is of course in no way binding on the Council itself, but it can hardly be doubted as being the correct view, and we think any English barrister would be ill advised to dispute it.

The *Central Law Journal* in a lengthy article discusses the question whether damages are recoverable for physical injuries resulting from fright caused by defendants' wrongful acts, and arrives at the following conclusions: 1. The weight of authority holds that physical injuries may proximately result from a wrong through fright. 2. Damages for physical injuries resulting from fright are measured by exactly the same standards that the common law has used for centuries in measuring damages for physical injuries resulting through impact, therefore they are not vague, or shadowy, or sentimental. 3. Physical injuries resulting through fright are no more easily feigned than those resulting from impact. 4. In jurisdictions where damages for physical injuries resulting through fright have been allowed no injurious consequences such as speculative litigation have followed. 5. The adoption of the rule allowing damages will render no defendant liable who has not committed a wrong and caused the plaintiff physical injury. It will give damages to no one except his rights have been invaded and physical injury has been inflicted upon him. It will not injure but protect the public.