The Legal News.

Vol. IX. DECEMBER 18, 1886. No. 51.

Sir Foster Stawell, it is stated, has been appointed Lieutenant-Governor of Victoria, in recognition of his distinguished services as Chief Justice of the colony. It might be desired that such positions should be more frequently filled by the appointment of distinguished members of the bench.

Mr. Justice Day, a judge of the English Queen's Bench Division, has been doing a little in the viewing and interviewing business. Having had before him, at the Liverpool Assizes, four cases in which members of a gang of desperadoes, called the "High Rip" gang had been charged with assaulting, stabbing, and molesting various people, he expressed incredulity at the system of terror alleged to exist, and, apparently with the object of satisfying himself, on Saturday night, the 13th November, made a tour of the lowest parts of the city. Accompanied by his son, he visited some of the vilest haunts known to the police. He was the witness of many uproarious scenes, but fortunately passed through them unmolested. Among other places visited was a lodging-house in Ben Jonson Street, known as the "Loose Box," where a lively *fracas* was, at the time of the judge's visit, being indulged in.

The successor to Sir James Bacon, Mr. Arthur Kekewich, Q. C., according to the *Law Journal*, "is a member of an old and much-respected Devonshire family, and he has contested constituencies in the Conservative interest. He was at Eton and Balliol, and was a fellow of Exeter College on the Devon foundation. As a junior counsel he had a lucrative practice, especially in company cases and the administrative business of the Court. On becoming Queen's Counsel, he took his seat in the Court of Mr. Justice Kay, with rare appearances in the Court of Appeal. He will make a courteous and upright judge, but he will happily disappoint the expectations of the profession if he adequately fill the post occupied by Sir James Bacon and his distinguished predecessors."

The assessment of damages in actions for personal injuries frequently gives rise to considerable difficulty. In a recent case of *Corner & Byrd*, M.L.R., 2 Q. B. 262, the amount awarded by the first Court to a wife for the loss of her husband was cut down to less than one half by the Court of Appeal. The Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *Vicksburg & M. R. Co.* v. *Putnam* (Oct. 26, 1886) had occasion to consider this subject. The Court held that while standard life and annuity tables, showing, at any age, the probable duration of life and present value of a life annuity, are competent evidence, the rules derived therefrom are not the absolute guides of the judgment and conscience of the jury; and an instruction directing the jury to ascertain the loss of income by the use of such rules, the charge nowhere suggesting that the jury are at liberty to ascertain such loss according to their own judgment, is erroneous. In *Phillips* v. *London & S. W. Ry.*, the judges strongly approved the usual practice of instructing the jury in general terms to award a fair and reasonable compensation, taking into consideration what the plaintiff's income would probably have been, how long it would have lasted, and all the contingencies to which it was liable; and as strongly deprecated undertaking to bind them by precise mathematical rules in deciding a question involving so many contingencies incapable of exact estimate or proof. See especially the opinions of Lord Justice Brett and Lord Justice Cotton as reported in 49 Law J. (Q. B.) 237, 238, and less fully in 5 C. P. Div. 291, 293. The natural, if not the necessary, effect of the peremptory instructions at the beginning and end of dealing with this matter would be to lead the jury to understand that they must accept the tables as affording the rule for the principal elements of their computation, and to create an impression on their minds, which would not be removed by the incidental observation of the judge, when speaking of the possibility of the plaintiff's getting well, "This is only