

cricket field. Some men in this field endeavoured carefully to drive it back through the gate, but the horse refused to go, and, having run against a wire fence, fell over it and was injured by one of the posts. The judge of the County Court nonsuited the plaintiff, holding that the damage was too remote; but the Divisional Court (Wills and Lawrance, JJ.) sent the case for a new trial, holding that the injury to the horse was the natural consequence of the defendant's negligence. See *Pearce v. Shepard*, 24 Ont. R. 167.

JUSTICES—INTEREST—BIAS—DISQUALIFICATION OF JUSTICE.

In *The Queen v. Huggins*, (1895) 1 Q.B. 563; 15 R. Mar. 393, an application was made to quash a conviction on the ground that one of the six justices by whom the conviction had been made was disqualified by reason of interest. The conviction was had under a statute prohibiting an unqualified pilot from assuming or continuing in charge of any ship after a qualified pilot has offered to take charge of her. The magistrate who was objected to was a pilot, but was specially employed to pilot the ships of a certain company, and by the terms of his employment was restricted from offering his services as pilot to any other company, and was in no way brought into competition with the defendant. But the Divisional Court (Wills and Wright, JJ.) were of opinion that the fact of his belonging to the class whose interests were affected by the decision was sufficient to disqualify him. As Wills, J., puts it, suppose all six justices had been pilots, the tribunal would not have been a fair one, and, that being so, the objection must equally exist though only one of the six was a pilot.

DEFAMATION—SLANDER—ALDERMAN—WORDS IMPUTING MISCONDUCT IN A PUBLIC OFFICE—SPECIAL DAMAGE—EMOTION, POWER OF.

*Booth v. Arnold*, (1895) 1 Q.B. 571, was an action for slander in respect of words spoken by the defendant imputing dishonesty to the plaintiff as an alderman in which two points of considerable interest are discussed, one of which, however, the majority of the Court of Appeal deemed immaterial. The first question, and one on which the case turns, was whether the action was maintainable without proof of special damage. And the Court of Appeal (Lord Esher, M.R., and Lopes and Rigby, J., JJ.) held