

CURRENT ENGLISH CASES.

The Law Reports for October comprise (1895) 2 Q.B., pp. 441-497, and (1895) 2 Ch., pp. 549-602.

GAMING—LOTTERY—"COUPON COMPETITION."—(CR. CODE, SS. 197, 204, 205).

Stoddart v. Sagar, (1895) 2 Q.B. 474, was a case stated by a magistrate. The defendants published a newspaper containing an advertisement of a coupon competition, which was to be carried on by means of coupons to be filled up by purchasers of the paper with the names of horses selected by the purchasers as likely to come in first, second, third, and fourth in a race. For every coupon filled up after the first the purchaser paid a penny, and the defendants promised a prize of £100 for naming the first four horses correctly. They were indicted, under the Act for the Suppression of Lotteries, for opening and keeping an office to exercise a lottery; for selling tickets and chances in a lottery, and for publishing a scheme for the sale of tickets in a lottery (see Cr. Code, ss. 197, 205); and under the Betting Act, 1853 (see Cr. Code, s. 204), for opening and keeping and using an office for the purpose of money being received as consideration for an undertaking to pay money on events and contingencies relating to horse races, and for receiving money as deposits or bets on condition of paying £100 on the happening of events or contingencies relating to horse races. And the question was whether the facts warranted a conviction under either of these statutes. Pollock, B., and Wright, J., held that no offence was proved, and that the transaction was neither betting nor a lottery.

CRIMINAL LAW—AIDING AND ABETTING—FELONIOUS WOUNDING—CONVICTION OF PRINCIPAL FOR UNLAWFUL WOUNDING—(CR. CODE, S. 61. SS. 241, 242).

The Queen v. Waudby, (1895) 2 Q.B. 482; 15 R. Oct. 284, involves a question which, under the Criminal Code of Canada, s. 535, can hardly arise, as by that section the distinction between felony and misdemeanour was abolished. In this case the question turns to some extent on the distinction which still exists in England between felony and misdemeanour. The facts were that two prisoners were indicted, the one for felonious wounding, and the other for aiding and abetting; the principal was convicted of the misdemeanour of unlawfully wounding, and