

EDITORIAL NOTES.

nent positions at the Bar, whilst his painstaking accuracy and industrious research are well known to his brethren. To understand any amending Act, a knowledge of the pre-existing law is always essential; and in order to present to both the Common Law and Chancery practitioner a really clear explanation of many of the clauses of the new Act, a thorough knowledge of the present practice in all the different courts is absolutely necessary. For this reason Mr. Maclennan is eminently well qualified for the task he has undertaken. Although, for some years past, he has been most in the Court of Chancery, the Courts of Common Law were, nevertheless, the arena in which his first honors were won; and few of those who have become eminent as counsel have taken as much care as he has, that their knowledge of mere matters of practice should not become rusty. This knowledge of both systems will be of great help to Mr. Maclennan, and of much benefit to his readers.

THE profession are fortunate in having the benefit of the labors of these gentlemen in assisting them to a knowledge of a procedure entirely new to us. Few of those who have any business to do in the Courts will be without a copy of each work. The long vacation will give us a desirable opportunity of indulging in a little of that pleasant light reading which these gentlemen will provide. If the Attorney-General, who has brought in this Act, and is doubtless familiar with its details, would kindly shut up the legislative shop that has passed it, for a few years, he might save them the task of annotating supplements, and the rest of us of spending a weary existence in trying to keep pace with complicated and never-ending alterations in the practice.

A LATE decision in the English Common Pleas Division has added to the Humors of the Law. The Court there set aside the find-

ing of the jury in a compensation case against a Railway Company, on the ground that the claimant had treated the jury to a champagne lunch. The judge took occasion to distinguish between, and differentiate the dangers to be apprehended from divers classes of luncheons, e. g., the luncheon unprepared and the luncheon prepared beforehand; the champagne luncheon and the non-champagne luncheon. The law, in such cases, abhors hospitality, especially where the cup is passed "with beaded bubbles winking at the brim."

THE law relating to sign-boards has been discussed before Chief Judge Bacon in a case involving the ownership of a well-known picture by David Cox which was painted on the sign-board of the old inn at Bettws-y-Coed, called "The Royal Oak." Upon the insolvency of the tenant, it was claimed by the landowner as a fixture which passed with the inheritance, and the County Judge so decided—but was reversed on appeal, the Chief Judge holding that it had been painted by the great artist for the innkeeper in 1847, who was on terms of friendship with him, and that it had been hung up as his picture and had never lost its character as a tenant's fixture. *Ex. p. Shaun; 29 W. R. 248.*

A CORRESPONDENT in British Columbia has kindly sent us a copy of "The Rules, prepared by Mr. Attorney-General Walkem, to Carry into Effect the Supreme Court Act of that Province." We have not had an opportunity of examining them, but, doubtless, they have been carefully considered by the profession in British Columbia, and the opinion there is set forth in the following resolution, unanimously passed at a large meeting of the Incorporated Law Society, recently held at the Secretary's office:—

"*Resolved*, That the Incorporated Law Society of British Columbia desire to express