

decision upon such question, or difference, shall be final and binding between the employer and contractor without any appeal whatever." The plaintiff who was the contractor had been paid the whole of the amounts which had been certified by the architect to be due to him, but he alleged that he was entitled to a further sum which he claimed to recover in this action. He made no application for arbitration. Lord Reading, C.J., who tried the action, held that in the absence of the architect's certificate that the claim made by plaintiff was unaffected by the arbitration clause, or of any evidence of any improper dealing between the architect and the employer, the action could not be maintained.

CRIMINAL LAW—EVIDENCE—PREVIOUS CONVICTION—ADMISSIBILITY—CRIMINAL EVIDENCE ACT, 1898, 61-62 VICT. c. 36, s. 1 (f) (ii)—(R.S.C. c. 145, s. 12).

*The King v. Wood* (1920) 2 K.B. 179. In this case the question was raised whether it was open to the prosecutor to give in evidence a previous conviction of the accused where the same related to an offence committed subsequent to that for which he was being tried; the Court of Criminal Appeal (Lord Reading, C.J., and Darling and Sankey, JJ.) held that he could.

CRIMINAL LAW—EVIDENCE—PRISONERS JOINTLY INDICTED—EVIDENCE OF ONE PRISONER—CROSS-EXAMINATION TO INCRIMINATE ANOTHER PRISONER.

*The King v. Paul* (1920) 2 K.B. 183. The point decided in this case is that where two persons are together indicted for an offence and one of them offers himself as a witness it is competent for the prosecuting counsel to cross-examine him with the view of incriminating his co-prisoner, even though his evidence-in-chief was simply a confession of his own guilt.

RAILWAY COMPANY—GOODS DELIVERED FOR CARRIAGE IMPROPERLY PACKED—KNOWLEDGE OF COMPANY OF INSUFFICIENCY OF PACKING—DEFENCE THAT DAMAGE DUE TO IMPROPER PACKING.

*Gould v. South Eastern and Chatham Ry.* (1920) 2 K.B. 186. This was an action against a railway company for damage to goods entrusted to it to be carried. The goods in question were insufficiently packed and this was known to the defendants' servants when they received them for carriage; but they contested the plaintiff's claim on the ground that the damage was due to the insufficient packing. The County Court Judge who tried the action was of the opinion that the defendants having knowledge