The Legal News.

Vol. XII. JANUARY 5, 1889. No. 1.

The small number of superior judges in England has long made it difficult to satisfy the wants both of the provinces and of the metropolis. Recently, for a considerable period, there were but four judges left in London, one of whom was required daily in chambers, leaving three to cope with the long lists of causes awaiting trial. It appears to be yet undetermined whether a remedy will be applied to this state of things by increasing the number of superior judges or increasing the jurisdiction of the local judges. The *Spectator* remarks:—"Between the two remedies suggested there is not much to choose in the way of expense; but it is submitted that the balance of convenience is in favor of an increase in the number of judges such as would enable circuit business to be done properly, and London work to be efficiently performed. Decentralization involves crystallization. County court judges, after some years in a given locality, begin to know too much of the inhabitants, become familiar with the appearance of suitors, and the manners of the advocates who appear before them. Sometimes they become—but this is rare—violently dogmatic, or take an objection on principle to an Act of Parliament. The writer has experience of one who can hardly be induced to recognize the Married Women's Property Act, and of more than one whose patience yields to the strain caused by the feeling that, if he listens to argument, he may lose a convenient train. Moreover, if you increase the jurisdiction, you make it inevitable that the county court judge should, from time to time, be compelled to try cases in which the interests of his friends are involved, which is a thing by no means to be desired, for, let him be ever so impartial, he will in such cases be accused of favoritism. Under the circuit system, on the contrary, legal intelligence circulates. Judges fresh from London, from contact with the highest ability at the bar, go through the country administering justice to men who are complete strangers to them, and knowing nothing of the antecedents of the parties. They have the evidence before them, and decide accordingly; and so deciding, or in criminal cases apportioning punishment, they are, in addition, an example of judicial demeanor."

The remarks of Professor Huxley on public speaking, which will be found on another page, are in accord with a very wide experience on the part of men of distinction. Careful preparation is the keynote of the best advice on the subject. The late Thos. D'Arcy McGee was a brilliant and a ready speaker, but we know that he never delivered a public address without having previously written out what he proposed to say, though the manuscript was not used or produced at the time. The late Mr. Kerr, Q.C., informed the writer that he always wrote out his arguments beforehand, even in the inferior courts. In appeal, he often contented himself with reading from the printed case. It may be a consolation to nervous speakers to read the frank admission of Mr. Huxley on this subject. That one as "chock full of science" as Captain Cuttle believed Solomon Gills to be, should confess to a nervousness never to be overcome, will give them the comfort which springs from the feeling of companionship in misery.

COUR SUPÉRIEURE.

AYLMER, (dist. d'Ottawa), 17 octobre 1888.

Coram WURTELE, J.

(En Chambres)

SAWYER et al. v. BOHAN et al.

Huissier—Frais.

JUGÉ:—*Sur motion pour faire réviser la taxation des frais d'huissier, que dans une action émanée de la Cour Supérieure, au chef-lieu d'un district, dans une cause de* $100 *à* $200, *l'huissier chargé d'un bref de Fi. Fa. de bonis n'a pas droit contre le défendeur à plus de frais que si tel bref eut été exécuté par l'huissier le plus proche du domicile du défendeur, mais a droit à ses frais de route contre la partie qui l'emploie.*

Les défendeurs résident dans le comté de Pontiac et ont été poursuivis pour une somme