

see where the learned judge who granted the new trial got his authority for such a proceeding. The *Albany Law Journal* remarks that up to the present time "neither ignorance, blunders nor misapprehension of counsel, not occasioned by his opponent, is reason sufficient for setting aside a judgment or granting a new trial. Any other course would be apt to lead to collusion and confusion in the administration of justice, and for this reason courts are strongly disposed to hold parties as bound by the acts of their attorneys in their behalf in all cases where they are authorized to appear, and in which no fraud is shown, the client being left to his remedy against the attorney for negligence."

---

There has recently been a discussion in the British House of Commons in reference to appellate jurisdiction in criminal cases. The object of the bill, however, is not the establishment of a Court for reviewing verdicts, but a Court in which sentences can be revised. The question is often asked why a man should have the right of appeal in a dispute as to a small sum of money, and be denied the privilege when his life is at stake. Our namesake in England gives the answer when it says that appeals do not lie from lower courts to higher ones on question of fact, and that "in appeals from the High Court the judges of the Court of Appeal have made it a rule not to disturb the verdict of a jury, unless it can be shown that twelve reasonable men could not arrive at such a decision. If such a test were applied in criminal cases a successful appeal would be nearly impossible. In questions of law an appellate tribunal already exists in the Crown Cases Reserved." The debate on this bill, introduced by Mr. Pickersgill, was a very interesting one, and can be found in full in the *English Law Journal* for March 27th.

---

A valued contributor takes exception to Mr. Morse's criticism of Lord Watson's remarks (ante p. 223.) He thinks the latter was right to draw public attention to the inappro-