

The Law Reports for August comprise 23 Q.B.D., pp. 133-263; 14 P.D., pp. 85-130; 41 Chy.D., pp. 437-577, and 14 Appeal Case, pp. 105-336.

ELECTION—NOMINATION PAPERS—SIGNATURE—ADDITION OF WORD "JUNIOR."

In *Gledhill v. Crowther*, 23 Q.B.D. 136, it was held by Mathew and Grant-ham, JJ., that the addition of the word "junior" to the signature of a nominator to a nomination paper did not have the effect of invalidating the nomination, notwithstanding that the name of the nominator appeared on the register without the addition, that being the usual signature of the nominator.

MUNICIPALITY—CHARGE ON PREMISES FOR LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS—STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.

Hornsey Local Board v. Monarch Investment Society, 23 Q.B.D. 149, was an appeal from a County Court. Under a statute certain expenses incurred by a municipal body were made a charge on the premises in respect of which the same were incurred. Mathew and Grantham, JJ., held that this charge must be enforced within the twelve years allowed by the Real Property Limitation Act, 1874; and that the period began to run from the date when the expenses were incurred.

BIGAMY—SECOND MARRIAGE WITHIN LESS THAN SEVEN YEARS AFTER HUSBAND OR WIFE LAST HEARD OF
—HONEST BELIEF ON REASONABLE GROUNDS, OF DEATH OF HUSBAND OR WIFE—24 & 25 VICT.
C. 100, s. 57—R.S.C., c. 161, s. 4.

In the *Queen v. Tolson*, 23 Q.B.D. 168, a very strong court, numerically, was summoned to dispose of an important question of criminal law upon a case stated and reserved by Stephen, J. The question being, whether a woman who had gone through the form of marriage a second time, within less than seven years after her husband had been last heard of, under a *bona fide* belief on reasonable grounds that he was then dead, could be properly convicted of bigamy. The majority of the Court, Lord Coleridge, C.J., Hawkins, Stephen, Cave, Day, A. L. Smith, Wills, Grantham, and Charles, JJ., held that she could not; but a strong minority, consisting of Denman, Field, and Manisty, JJ., and Pollock and Huddleston, B.B., dissented. This case may be taken as authoritatively settling the law on this important point, on which there were conflicting decisions. *Reg. v. Turner*, 9 Cox C.C. 145, *Reg. v. Horton*, 11 Cox C.C. 670, and *Reg. v. Moore*, 13 Cox, C.C. 544, being in favour of the view adopted by the majority of the Court; while *Reg. v. Gibbons*, 12 Cox, C.C. 237, *Reg. v. Bennett*, 14 Cox, C.C. 45, and *Reg. v. Prince*, L.R. 2, C.C.R. 154 were opposed thereto. The judgments of Wills and Stephen, JJ., are interesting for the discussion they contain on the maxim *actis non facit reum, nisi mens sit rea*, and the limitations to which it is subject.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS—DISHORNING CATTLE—INFLECTION OF UNNECESSARY PAIN.

Ford v. Wiley, 23 Q.B.D. 203, was a prosecution to recover a penalty under 12 & 13 Vict., c. 92, s. 2, for cruel treatment of oxen by dishorning them. The evidence proved that the act of dishorning was accompanied by great pain and