

The Judge (of an inferior court) thereupon lays down the rule as follows: "Having cross-examined the witness before, at the usual and appropriate stage of the trial, your right to cross-examine him again *now* is limited to the new matter in respect to which he was called in rebuttal, unless you state on your responsibility as counsel (1) That you forgot something on your former cross-examination at large, or (2) That you omitted something on your former cross-examination which has occurred to you since as an appropriate subject for further cross-examination."

Counsel declines to say he forgot or omitted anything; cross-examines in respect to the subject matter of the rebuttal, will not accept the right to go further as thus limited, and appeals from the Judge's ruling to vindicate his right to cover the whole ground again at this stage if he sees fit.

The majority of the Court of Appeal are understood to have held that there is no such rule as the Judge below laid down. The point involved seems to be of sufficient interest to warrant a discussion in your columns.

QUERIST.

[We do not see anything to complain of in the ruling of the Judge in the Court below. It may be that there is no rule of law governing such a case; but certainly the Judge appealed from followed a very common and a very reasonable practice, and if no injustice were done, and there seems to have been none, we can see no reason for interference.—ED. C.L.J.]

BRANCH OFFICES.

To the Editor of the Canada Law Journal.

SIR,—I should be glad to know what is the etiquette of the profession as to branch offices. There is certainly an abuse of the practice in some cases. Perhaps some of your subscribers can throw light on the subject.

COUNTRY SOLICITOR.

[We should be glad if some of our subscribers would give the benefit of their thought and experience in this matter.—ED. C. L. J.]