

he has sold, provided that he does not represent that he is carrying on the identical business. May he, however, directly solicit the customers of his former business to give their custom to him? Twenty-five years ago this question arose for the first time in *Labouchere v. Dawson*, and Lord Romilly granted an injunction to restrain such solicitation. His judgment was followed by Sir George Jessel, who even held that the man who had parted with the good-will of a business might not trade with any of his old customers. These decisions were overruled by the Court of Appeal in *Leggett v. Barrett* and *Pearson v. Pearson*. Most purchasers of businesses protect themselves against the competition of their predecessors by restrictive provisions in their agreements; but where they have neglected to safeguard their interests in this manner, the judgment of the House of Lords will, to some extent, give them a just and effective protection.—*Ib.*

THE LAW OF LARCENY.—The common law of larceny complicated by mistake which divided the long array of judicial wisdom in *Regina v. Ashwell* is now troubling the Celtic intellect. A., the master of a vessel loading a cargo, gives B., one of his labourers, in payment of his wages a 10*l.* note in mistake for a 1*l.* note. B. takes the note in all innocence, but shortly afterwards discovers the mistake, and makes up his mind, as he frankly declares, to appropriate, and does appropriate, the unearned increment, and duly disburses it at a public house. About the moral character of this transaction there will not be much doubt, only whether it is technically larceny or not. *Regina v. Ashwell* leaves the law, so says *Regina v. Flowers*, in its pristine state, which was that the innocent receipt of a chattel, coupled with its subsequent fraudulent appropriation, does not amount to larceny. The *asportavit*, to talk technically, is not there. It would be a nice speculation whether the technicality of our criminal law has saved or lost more prisoners. The misspelling of a Christian name in an indictment has delivered many a man from hanging; but what of 'constructive treason'? 'O Justice!' we may exclaim, 'what crimes have been committed in thy name!' Hair-splitting is a fine intellectual exercise in civil cases, but it wears a ghastly aspect when a man's life or even his liberty is trembling in the balance.—*Ib.*