The Legal News.

VOL. IV. JUNE 11, 1881. No. 24.

THE LAW OF LIBEL.

Mr. Irvine's Bill, already adverted to, has been thrown out on a close division. In consequence of some change of system at Quebec, the press are no longer supplied with copies of bills, and of votes and proceedings, and the ordinary darkness which reigns over legislative business in this Province, has become more profound. We have not, therefore, had an opportunity of seeing the clauses of the bill, but the objection to it appears to have been the supposed encouragement it would afford to the publication of reckless statements, and wilful and malicious slanders. The majority of the House conceived that it would do more harm than good, and the bill was shelved accordingly. We do not clearly see why there should be any difficulty on the subject. We presume that the press would be satisfied if our law were placed on the same footing as in the United States. What the law is there we find concisely stated in a recent article in the *Albany Law Journal*:—"The truth may be given in evidence; and if it shall appear that the publication was with good motives and for justifiable ends, the jury may acquit in a criminal case, and the damages may be mitigated in a civil case." Probably, our law as to civil cases (which alone were in question in Mr. Irvine's bill) is not far different, but it would be well to leave no ambiguity about it.

NOTICE OF JUDGMENTS.

A correspondent directs attention to what he considers a *desideratum* in the Superior Court. He is desirous that judgment should not be rendered in the absence of counsel, and he bases this petition upon the fact that errors arising from oversights or misapprehensions, which might be rectified on the spot, become irrevocable if counsel are not present. The Court of Appeal, of late, has adopted a system of notifying counsel by post-card of the date of final judgment. The expense is very small for the great boon thus conferred on the profession. In old times, we have frequently known lawyers to wait in Court a whole day, for a judgment which came not. As proceedings in the Superior Court yield a revenue to the Government, the Prothonotary might, perhaps, be authorized to incur this small expense, not exceeding 2 cents for each cause disposed of.

JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS IN ENGLAND.

It has been remarked that the last three appointments to the English bench have been non-political. Mr. Justice Cave and Mr. Justice Kay (the latter appointed to fill the vacancy in the Chancery Division, caused by the resignation of Vice-Chancellor Malins) were not in politics at all. Mr. Justice Mathew was a candidate for an Irish borough, but was not a party man. That these gentlemen, says the *Law Times*, should, under the circumstances, have been raised to the bench must be a mortification to members of the bar, who have spent many thousands in contests and petitions, and whose prospects of promotion are at present very slight.

NOTES OF CASES.

SUPERIOR COURT.

MONTREAL, May 28, 1881.

Before MACKAY, J.

SHARPLEY v. DOUTRE et vir, and O'DOWD, T. S.

Exemptions from seizure—Ball Dress.

A ball dress is not exempt from seizure as "ordinary and necessary wearing apparel," under C.C.P. 556.

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff, having a judgment against the defendant, has attached or seized in the possession of the garnishee a ball dress, the property of the debtor.

The seizure is opposed for various reasons, some of form, but principally because (says defendant) a ball dress is exempt from seizure. The plaintiff denies this.

The objections of form have nothing in them, the defendant's first plea being to the merits, and so a waiver of form matter.

For the determination of the chief question, we must of course keep to our own law. It does not declare free from seizure under execution the clothes belonging to the debtor (as does the Louisiana code,) nor does it make liable to