

RECENT ENGLISH PRACTICE CASES.

punged as scandalous, and had given the defendants their costs of the application as between solicitor and client. The taxing master disallowed the costs of copies of the pleadings for the use of council and the judges on the ground that it was not the practice to allow the expense of copies of pleadings except at the hearing. Bacon, V. C., disallowed objections to this finding.

The COURT (Jessel, M.R., and Brett and Lindley, L.JJ.) reversed the decision and allowed the cost of the copies, holding that the general rule laid down by the taxing master could not be sustained, and that as the copies were necessary to enable the case to be properly argued they must be allowed.

[NOTE.—*The Imperial and Ontario Rules are identical.*

CLARKE V. BRADLAUGH.

Time from which writ takes effect—Day, fractions of—Fiction of law.

[Nov. 14, C. of A.—W. N. 1881, p. 137.

Appeal of defendant from judgment of Queen's Bench Division on his demurrer to the statement of claim, reported L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 151, and noted in our issue for Sept. 15, p. 343.

The defendant in person argued, as in the Court below, and also that the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, had been repealed in respect to penalties, as well as with respect to the form of the Parliamentary oath, by the Statute Law Revision Act, 1875.

The COURT (Lord Coleridge, C.J., and Baggallay and Brett, L.JJ.) now affirmed the judgment which had been given for the plaintiff by the Queen's Bench Division.

DALRYMPLE V. LESLIE.

Ont. O. 27.

Disclosure—Whether party interrogated is bound to state contents of documents in his possession.

[Nov. 10.—W. N. 1881, p. 138.

Motion by way of appeal from an order of Lindley, J., discharging a master's order directing that the defendant in an action for libel should make a further answer to inter-

rogatories. The plaintiff's second interrogatory required the defendant to state whether she sent any letter or letters to a third person making any libellous statements of the plaintiff set out in the interrogatory, or statements to the same purport and effect, and further to state as fully as she could what her statement or statements were, and to exhibit a copy or copies of them if she had them. The defendant answered that to the best of her recollection and belief she did not send any letter or letters making the statements mentioned in the interrogatory "or any of those exact statements;" that she did write a letter to the third person, but she had no copy of it, and was unable to state "with exactness" what the statements contained therein were.

The COURT (Grove and Bowen, JJ.) held that the answer was sufficient, and affirmed the decision of Lindley, J.

Motion refused.

LAW STUDENTS' DEPARTMENT.

THE LAW SCHOOL.

The revived Law School is hard at work. The Chairman of the School, Mr. Thomas Hodgins, Q.C., opened on 13th inst., with an interesting lecture on Constitutional Law, a subject with which he is very familiar. In his first lecture he took up the question of the relation of the Colonies with local legislatures to the Empire. He will on Tuesday next discuss the various constitutions granted to Canada since the Treaty of Paris in 1763, and subsequently take up the British North America Act and the Criminal Law.

The other lecturers are Mr. J. D. Delamere, who lectures on Pleading and Practice, and Messrs. J. E. McDougall and E. D. Armour, on subjects not yet definitely arranged.

The lectures are given on Tuesday and Thursday until Christmas vacation. They begin again after January 9th, and will be delivered on the Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday of each week until May 1st.