

The Legal News.

Vol. XIII. SEPTEMBER 13, 1890. No. 37.

The *Scottish Law Review*, on the subject of judicial remuneration, gives some figures which are interesting. The thirteen judges of Scotland receive £ 49,400 amongst them, or an average of £ 3,800 each. In England there are thirty-four judges, counting Lords Watson and Morris as English judges. The Lord Chancellor receives £ 10,000 per annum; the Lord Chief Justice £ 8,000; the three Lords Ordinary of Appeal and the Master of the Rolls £ 6,000 each; and the remaining twenty-eight judges of first instance and of appeal, £ 5,000 each: in all, £ 182,000, or, on the average, £ 5,353 each. In Ireland there are twenty-two judges who receive altogether £ 81,300, or £ 3,695 on the average each. The diversities of salary are considerable. The Lord Chancellor receives £ 8,000 per annum; the Chief Justice, £ 5,000; the Chief Baron £ 4,600; the Master of the Rolls, the three Lords Justices of Appeal, and the Vice-Chancellor, £ 4,000 each; the two judges of the Bankruptcy Court, £ 2,000 each; the Admiralty judge, £ 1,200; and the remaining eleven judges, £ 3,500 each. The remuneration of County Court judges, (of whom there are fifty-seven) is now fixed by Statute at £ 1,500 per annum and travelling expenses. There are also twenty-six metropolitan police magistrates; the senior receives £ 1,800 per annum, and the rest £ 1,500 per annum. In India the salary of a judge of the Supreme Court ranges from £ 4,500 to £ 7,200; in the more important parts of Australia, from £ 1,700 to £ 3,500. In continental Europe judicial salaries are small. In the Imperial or highest Court of Appeal in Germany the ordinary judges have only £ 600 a year, and the president £ 1,250 and an official residence. In France, with 18,650 judges, the salaries of local judges range from £ 75 in the lowest class to £ 320 in the highest. In Austria and Holland the salaries of local judges are from £ 150 to £ 250; in Russia from £ 244 to £ 350; in Belgium £ 120; in Switzerland £ 180; and in Italy £ 100.

In *Gordon v. Silber*, Lord Justice Lopes decided, Aug. 9, that where husband and wife are guests at a hotel, the landlord has a lien on the goods of the wife for the expenses of the husband and wife. The question does not appear to have been previously decided in England. The husband had been staying at the hotel for some time alone, and had incurred expenses which he had paid; he was then joined by his wife, who came to the hotel with a large quantity of luggage, which it was admitted was her separate property. The husband and wife occupied the same rooms, and they remained at the hotel together for some time, the husband leaving some days before the wife. The husband having become insolvent, it was sought to render the goods of the wife liable for the balance of the hotel bill incurred by husband and wife. Lord Justice Lopes said, it is only fair to give the innkeeper rights co-extensive or commensurate with his obligation to receive his guest and keep his goods safely and securely, and in accordance with this principle, as the guests received were the husband and the wife, and as all the goods received by the hotel-keeper were received by him as the goods of the husband and the wife, and as he was responsible for all the goods so received by him, whether they belonged to the husband or the wife, his right of lien was co-extensive with these liabilities, and extended to all the goods which had been brought by his guests to the hotel, whether they were the separate property of the wife or not, inasmuch as such goods satisfied the condition laid down by Chief Justice Wilde in *Smith v. Dearlove*, 6 C. B. 132, where he said, "The right of lien of an innkeeper depends upon the fact that the goods came into his possession in his character of innkeeper as belonging to a guest."

PUBLIC SPEAKING.—Lysias, says Plutarch, wrote a defence for a man who was about to be tried before one of the Athenian tribunals. Long before the defendant had learned the speech by heart, he became so much dissatisfied with it that he went in great distress to the author. 'I was delighted with your speech the first time I read it; but I liked it less the second time, and still less the third time; and now it seems to be no defence at all.' 'My good friend,' said Lysias, you quite forget that the judges are to hear it only once.'