

—who are lawyers. And of these there are about 120 working locally up and down the country.

FINALITY ON QUESTIONS OF FACT.

Vexed questions sometimes arise in this country concerning appeals from County Courts. It is one of the characteristics of these tribunals that the decision of the Judge on a mere question of fact is final. No Kadi under a palm tree was ever more absolute than he who presides in an English poor man's Court! Time was when his jurisdiction was very small—limited to deciding points involving £20 and no more. In those days the fact that there was no appeal from a decision on fact was not important.

Recent statutes, however, have made such changes that now a judgment of an inferior Court which involves up to as much as £100 may be absolutely binding if it is founded on fact, whereas a judgment of "one of His Majesty's Superior Courts of Record" can be reviewed on fact as well as on law. The rule that there is no appeal on fact applies to cases under the Workmen's Compensation Act; and if the County Court Judge is to have the last word in dispensing very large amounts annually in compensation it is of the utmost importance that he shall decide according to law.

CONTROL OF INFERIOR COURTS.

This finality has often been criticised. One frequently hears a member of the Court of Appeal: "I do not say that I should have come to the same conclusion as the County Court Judge, but I am bound by his ruling on the facts." It is thus that we often hear of "County Court Justice" as administered in England. Where, however, the Court of Appeal finds that a County Court Judge is trying to arrogate to himself the right to be final on law as well as on fact, he will admonish him. In a recent case a County Court Judge considered an application by the widow of a workman who had met with an accident. The defence was that the necessary statutory claim had not been made in time—that is within six months of the accident. The learned Judge found as a fact that the notice had been given,