

ribbons and earrings! You had better pay your debts.' 'I can't,' pleaded Mrs. Solly. 'Then I shall send your husband to gaol,' said

the Court, 'and that will cut off the supplies. It's rubbish. £1 a month, first payment in a fortnight.'

## THE VOICE OF LEGAL JOURNALISM.

*Extracts from Exchanges.*

### Law Reform.

If the Judges are desirous of effecting a real economy in the administration of the law, they might do worse than turn their attention to the costs that are incurred in almost every case by the attendance of witnesses who are never called. For this wasted expenditure our system of pleading is largely responsible. A number of issues are raised in a statement of defence, and it is necessary that the plaintiff should be prepared with evidence as to all of them; but when the case comes into Court the defendant chooses to rely on one or two of the numerous issues he has raised, and the money paid to the witnesses who were prepared to speak to the other issues is wasted. What is required is that those who unnecessarily raise issues should pay for them, even though they may succeed in the action generally. This is frequently done in patent actions, and there is no reason why a similar rule should not be applied to other cases in which issues are without due cause raised on the pleadings. If this proposal were adopted little would be heard of the abolition of pleadings, for the penalizing of parties who raise unnecessary issues would render it almost certain that the real issues in every case would be defined. Such a system of plead-

ing would inevitably tend to lessen the cost of litigation.—*Law Journal* (Eng).

\* \* \*

### The Joys of Matrimony.

In an American paper, *Notes and Comments*, we read that the Court, in holding that \$5,000 was an excessive award for alienating a wife's affections, said, that whatever affection she may have previously cherished for her husband "must already have been effectually eradicated when he is shown to have been committed to the county goal for setting his wife on a hot stove." Perhaps this was only his somewhat curious device to increase the warmth of his wife's affection for him.—*Law Notes*.

\* \* \*

### Intellectual Tests for Jurymen.

The newspapers are making a great outcry about so-called "knock-out" questions, which have recently been asked jurors, and in some cases witnesses, in criminal trials in New York City. In the trial of Police Inspector McLaughlin, the appellate division of the Supreme Court have recognized certain forms of questions, by affirming the judgment of conviction.

In this case there were eight of these so-called "knock-out" questions asked by the State. One of the questions was as fol-