The Legal News.

Vol. X. JUNE 25, 1887. No. 26.

A jury, at a recent trial in New York, returned a sealed verdict in these words:—"We, as a body of jurors, have agreed to disagree." The Court declined to receive the verdict, and the jurors were threatened with punishment for contempt. The foreman defended the verdict on the ground that he had seen it done before. Finally the difficulty was overcome by a consent of counsel that the jury should be discharged. The threat of punishment, we presume, referred to the manner rather than to the matter of the verdict, for jurors, as judges of the facts, have as much right to adhere to their respective views as judges have when they are discharging a similar duty.

The *Law Times*, referring to the attorney general's bill for amending the law respecting the attendance of registrars at marriages in non-conformist places of worship, says:—"It proposes to extend to dissenting ministers the power of solemnizing marriages without the presence of a registrar, which is now possessed by clergymen in orders recognized by the Church of England, and by Quakers and Jews. The proposed privileges are to be confined to those denominations who, in the opinion of the registrar-general, have a central organization sufficient for maintaining discipline among their ministers. A large number of the numerous sects, which are known even by name to few persons outside the registrar-general's office, would be excluded by this last provision. We have had no religious census in England for five and thirty years, but the Irish tables give forty-eight sects which only boast two members apiece, and another fifty whose congregations are all under twenty. The bill is principally designed in the interests of the five great Methodist bodies—the Wesleyans, the New Connexion, the Primitive Methodists, the Bible Christians, and the United Methodist Free Churches—all of whom possess extensive organizations, and, as it requires certain preliminary proceedings to be taken before the registrar, and a return under his hand to be given to the officiating minister, who must be registered, it is difficult to see whom the passing of this long-needed measure can prejudice."

Lord Esher had an opportunity in Court recently to rebut the common idea that appeals were taken almost as a matter of course from Court to Court. The masters in Chancery, his lordship said, make about 35,000 orders in a year. Of these 2,000 reach the judge, 250 the Divisional Court, 75 the Court of Appeal, and last year only one went to the House of Lords. There is nothing unreasonable in this.

---

*SUPERIOR COURT—MONTREAL.**

Femme commune en biens—Dommages—Conclusions en faveur de la femme seule.

Jugé,—Que dans une action en dommages pour torts corporels à une femme mariée sous le régime de la communauté, la femme et son mari peuvent tous deux être demandeurs dans la cause en leur qualité de communs en biens; et le fait que les conclusions demandent que la somme réclamée soit payée à la femme est indifférent.—*Gagnon* v. *La Corporation de St. Gabriel*, Jetté, J., 30 avril 1887.

Stipulation for benefit of a third person—Art. 1029 *C. C.*

By an arbitration bond, A agreed to pay the sub-contractors of P, who was the sub-contractor of A, for the construction of the Pontiac Pacific Junction Railway.

R, one of the P's sub-contractors, brought action against P and A, claiming the benefit of the stipulation made in and by the bond.

A pleaded, *inter alia*, that the arbitration was not carried out, no award made, and that the submission became inoperative—Article 1348, C. C. P.

Held,—That the arbitration having fallen through, the submission became inoperative, and the stipulation in favor of R, the third

* To appear in Montreal Law Reports, 3 S. C.