

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XX.

DECEMBER 1, 1884.

No. 21.

DIARY FOR DECEMBER.

2. Tues.....County Court sittings, York, begin.
4. Thur.....Divisional Court sittings, Chancery Div. H. C. J., begin.
6. Sat.....Michaelmas sittings, Com. Law Div. H. C. J., end. Armour, J. sworn in Q.B., 1877.
7. Sun.....2nd Sunday in Advent.
9. Tues.....Gen. Sess. and Co. Ct. (except York) begin.
11. Thur.....Blake, V.-C., sworn in, 1872.
14. Sun.....3rd Sunday in Advent.
15. Mon.....Christmas vacation in Supreme Ct. and Exchequer Ct. begin. Morrison, J., sworn in Ct. of Appeal, 1877.

TORONTO, DECEMBER 1, 1884.

OUR English correspondent in his letter published in this issue, alludes, in passing, to the question of precedence of Colonial Queen's Counsel in England, which was recently authoritatively decided, through the very proper stand taken by Mr. Attorney-General Mowat in connection with the argument of the Boundary Case. Those who desire fuller information on the subject may be referred to our article of September 16th: (*supra* p. 299.)

THE decision of Vice-Chancellor Bacon, in England, at the suit of the present Lord Lytton, enjoining Miss Devey, executrix of the late Lady Lytton, from publishing letters written by the late Lord Lytton to his wife, on the ground that though the property in the letters, as pieces of paper, may be in Miss Devey (a point, however, as to which another suit is pending) yet, even so, that does not give her the right to publish them—has called forth a leading article from the *Times*, and is indeed of much interest not only to lawyers, but to all interested in the preservation of *bonos mores*.

LORD BRAMWELL'S bill on the law of evidence proposes to enable any one who is charged with an offence to be a "competent witness" on the hearing at every stage. The wife or husband of the accused is in like manner to be a competent witness. And these provisions are to apply whether the accused is charged solely or jointly with others. But the accused is not to be compellable to be a witness, nor is the wife or husband to be admissible as a witness without the consent of the accused, "unless so compellable heretofore." When an accused person is a witness, he is not to have the right to refuse to answer a question on the ground that it would tend to criminate him as to the offence charged, unless the Court thinks fit to allow it.

IN an article published in this Journal, in the month of May last, we drew attention to the doubt which existed as to whether the Master in Chambers has jurisdiction to grant final judgment under Rule 80 (p. 159). There is an old story of a man who, being cast into gaol, sent for his lawyer, who after hearing the facts of the case, and what the man had done, exclaimed: "But they can't put you into prison for that! They can't put you into prison for that!" "But, by heaven, they have," replied the hapless client. In somewhat the same way the Master has again and again met objections to his jurisdiction to order final judgment under Rule 80, by ordering it. Now, however, we are glad to hear the question is likely to receive authoritative decision in a case of *Elliott v. Rogers*, recently argued before the Common Pleas Divisional Court and now standing for judgment.