The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXIV. NOVEMBER 1, 1888. NO. 17.

WE regret to chronicle the death of Hon. James Patton, Q.C., who was one of the founders of this journal more than thirty years ago. His death was as sudden as it was deplored. We shall refer to his career hereafter.

WE make space to note the following changes in the judiciary, which have just been announced: Hon. Mr. Justice Patterson takes the place of the late Mr. Justice Henry in the Supreme Court, at Ottawa; and James Maclennan, Q.C., is to fill the seat vacated in the Court of Appeal.

A SOMEWHAT important change has been made by the revisers of the statutes in regard to jury notices. Under the Revised Statutes of 1877, c. 50, s. 253, the jury notice was required to be delivered with the last pleading; but now, by the Revised Statutes of 1888, c. 44, s. 78, the notice may be delivered at least eight days before the sittings at which the action is to be tried, or within such other time as may be ordered by the court or a judge. The jury notice, therefore, need not now be served until after notice of trial has been given. This change, we fear, has been made, like some others, without sufficient consideration of the consequences, and of the fact that it places in the hands of a litigant desirous of delay a means of effecting his wishes through the forms of legal procedure, which he is very likely to abuse. It certainly seems in the highest degree inconvenient that after notice of trial before a judge alone has been given, and preparation made for the trial, it should be open to the opposite party merely by filing a jury notice to render the notice of trial nugatory, and postpone the trial perhaps for three or four months. When a jury notice is given under such circumstances, it is obvious that the costs of the notice of trial, and of issuing, and serving, and countermanding subpœnas may, in many cases, be rendered useless, and questions will arise as to which of the litigants is ultimately to bear these useless costs. If the opposite party is within his rights in giving the jury notice, it is difficult to see how he can be made liable for the costs of the abortive proceedings, even though he should ultimately fail in the action; and at the same time it is hard that the opposite party, if successful, should be put to these useless costs. We doubt very much whether the amendment made by the revisers is likely to turn out any improvement on the former procedure.