

# Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XX.

APRIL 1, 1884.

No. 7.

## DIARY FOR APRIL.

1. Tues.....County Court Sittings (except York).
3. Thur.....Prince Leopold born, 1853.
5. Sat.....Canada discovered, 1499.
6. Sun.....6th Sunday in Lent.
7. Mon.....Non-jury sittings of County Court (except York)—  
County Court Term and Surrogate Court Term.
11. Fri.....Good Friday.
12. Sat.....County Court Term ends.
13. Sun.....Easter Sunday.
14. Mon.....Easter Monday. Princess Beatrice born, 1857.

TORONTO, APRIL 1, 1884.

PLAYFULNESS in lawyers is much to be commended; it shows a buoyancy of disposition which speaks of innocency of heart, and is always calculated to create an agreeable impression. Hence we cannot doubt that the following passage in the appellant's factum in the *Dominion Telegraph Company v. Gilchrist* will be of much service to the cause of the appellant, and will be fully appreciated by the Judges of the Supreme Court:—

"The plaintiff in this case is known as a very clever man, not liable to be imposed upon or unfairly dealt with, but, if the portions of his evidence which he would have the Court believe are to be believed, he is the most credulous man in the universe; but this cannot be believed by anyone who is acquainted with him or his reputation. Anyone who believes that he is the credulous babe he pretends to be in evidence, believes an impossibility."

But if playfulness is commendable in lawyers, so also is it in legislatures, and a good joke once made should always be preserved. An excellent one is being kept on record in our statute books by the "Eternal General" as we once heard an intelligent small boy call Mr. Mowat. The following communication explains to what we are referring, but we fail to see why our correspondent should feel annoyed; on the contrary, we are grateful that such

a sense of humour exists among the members of the Government. We most of us learn to distrust the man of sour countenance, but those who appreciate innocent fun are generally men of integrity:—

"I see that in the Attorney-General's Married Woman's Property Bill, now before the Provincial Parliament, sec. 8, R. S. O. 125, is re-enacted verbatim. When I was a student 'grinding' for my Intermediates, I used to feel a perpetual annoyance with the closing simile in the section—that under certain circumstances a married woman shall have and enjoy all the earnings of her minor children in as full and ample a manner as 'if she continued sole and unmarried.' I still feel inclined to ask every time I read the section: How many minor children is a woman, who continues sole and unmarried, supposed to have? Cannot Mr. Mowat substitute some other phrase which will not be open to the imputation of hinting at a very lax state of morals among the readers and compilers of the Revised Statutes?"

IN the recent case of *Reg. v. Price*, Mr. Justice STEPHENS held that the cremation of a corpse, provided it be performed decently and inoffensively, is not a criminal offence. In a case of *Williams v. Williams*, 20 Ch. D. 659; 46 L. T., N. S. 275, Mr. Justice KAY expressed a very strong opinion that a testator could not lawfully direct his executors to give his corpse to a third person for the purpose of being burned. In that case the plaintiff by fraudulent representations had got possession of the testator's corpse for the purpose of cremating it, pursuant to the express written directions given to her by testator before his death; and the learned judge held that, having wrongfully obtained possession of the corpse, the expense of the cremation could not be recovered from the testator's estate, notwithstanding that the testator expressly directed that the costs of the cremation should be borne by his estate.