The Legal News.

VOL. XIII. JANUARY 11, 1890. No. 2.

A gentleman down in Virginia, in an article entitled 'Sacking the Temple,' laments the ruin which codification must work to the stately edifice of the common law. In phrase somewhat stilted he exclaims : "The splendid columns, the massive pilasters, that supported the grand temple, have been moved, and the structure is slowly and inevitably crumbling away. Modern hands must build a modern structure, but the startling announcement has been made that these iconoclasts must build the structure anew from the rubbish of the old ; soiled, marred, defaced, impaired, scarred and demolished, though it has been from the fall. And where is their architect, and where are their skilled artificers and mechanics? The acanthus leaves from the Corinthian capital will find a place on the head of the sculptured Centaurs from the Doric Parthenon. The fluted columns of the Roman Parthenon will sustain the gothic gable, instead of the portico. Some mossy boulder from a Teutonic stronghold will be laid upon the volutes of the Græco-Gothic structures of France ; and from the ruins of this great fallen structure we will trace the indiscriminate composite of the legal architecture of every civilized nation, placed without form, forbidding, gloomy, mossy, cold ; frequented only by the owls of the profession who constructed it ; the mausoleum of reason, truth and justice." This is a sample of anti-codification extravagancy. On the other hand, the friends of codification are too sanguine in their predictions of what codification will accomplish. For example, the *Albany Law Journal* tells the fervid writer from whom we have quoted, to go to sleep, "and wake up again in twenty years, and we will show him a temple worthy his admiration." The usefulness of codification in respect of many branches of the law cannot be denied. Some of the statutes which exist in countries not under code rule, are in fact sections of a code. Nevertheless, great expectations are not thus far justified by experience of codes. One test which may be applied—an imperfect one, of course—is whether they diminish the work of the courts. Here in Canada we have two large provinces side by side, one without a code and one which has been governed by a code for nearly a quarter of a century. Is there less litigation in one province than in the other? We do not find such to be the case. In the city of Montreal alone we have ten or twelve judges of first instance constantly occupied with the work which the bar of this district contrive to put before them. Therefore one great argument which the friends of codification in the United States are constantly urging—that it will make the law certain—does not appear to be unassailable. We do not dispute that codification has its advantages ; but it must not be forgotten that it has also some drawbacks, as Mr. Bishop very forcibly pointed out in the article quoted in our eleventh volume, p. 76.

Mr. Justice Grantham, in his charge to the grand jury at the Liverpool assizes, referred to the subject of a court of criminal appeal, which has been brought prominently forward since the Maybrick case. After observing that there seemed to be a good deal of misapprehension on the subject in the public mind, his lordship pointed out that the procedure in civil and criminal jurisprudence was totally different. In the former the object of each party was to conceal his hand from the other ; in the latter, no evidence could be produced at the trial with which the prisoner was not acquainted. In the vast majority of cases in which prisoners had been found to be innocent after their conviction, that discovery had only been made months or years after the conviction, and a Court of Criminal Appeal could only have re-tried the case with the same set of witnesses and the same circumstances which the first Court had before it. They had, however, a Court of Appeal in the Home Secretary, and he thought the present arrangement was more favorable to the prisoner than if a Court were established. The Maybrick case was cited as an example of the danger of a Court of Criminal Appeal and its prejudicial effect on the prisoner. Any