

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XX.

AUGUST 1, 1884.

No. 14.

DIARY FOR AUGUST.

2. Sat.....Battle of the Nile, 1798.
3. Sun.....8th Sunday after Trinity.
6. Wed.....Duke of Edinburgh born, 1844.
10. Sun.....9th Sunday after Trinity.
12. Tues.....Primary Examinations.
13. Wed.....Sir Peregrine Maitland, Lt. Gov. U. C., 1818.
17. Sun.....10th Sunday after Trinity.
18. Mon.....Gen. Hunter, Lt. Gov. U. C., 1799.
19. Tues.....First Intermediate Examinations.
21. Thur.....Second Intermediate Examinations.
24. Sun.....11th Sunday after Trinity.
25. Mon.....Francis Gore, Lt. Gov. U. C., 1806.
26. Tues.....Solicitors' Examination.
27. Wed.....Barristers' Examination.
31. Sun.....12th Sunday after Trinity.

TORONTO, AUGUST 1, 1884.

THE Ontario Bench has a large proportion of common law judges—some say it is “overweighted with common law.” In 1874 when the Court of Appeal was reorganized there were five equity men on the Bench—one in Appeal, three in Chancery, and one, Mr. Justice Gwynne, in the Common Pleas. In 1883, when a fifth Appeal Judge was added, there were only three equity men among the judiciary. The fifth Appeal Judge was to assist in the business of the High Court and “especially of the Chancery Division thereof.” Now there are only two judges who have had an equity training, while eleven have been taken from the common law bar, viz.: five in Appeal, three in the Common Pleas Division, two in the Queen’s Bench Division (one judgeship vacant), and one in the Chancery Division.

THE question of the disputed boundary between Ontario and Manitoba has been settled by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and the western limit given to Ontario in the Arbitration between the Dominion and Ontario, in 1878, has been held to be the legal boundary of

Ontario on the west. The dispute between the Dominion and Ontario as to the northern boundary of the latter was not submitted to the Judicial Committee.

OUR ENGLISH LETTER.

(From our own Correspondent.)

DURING the whole of the past week the interest both on the public and the legal profession has been centred upon Charles Bradlaugh’s trial at Bar. It is a noticeable fact that this peculiar and not altogether pleasant personage upon the modern political stage has a knack of presenting to the courts novel combinations of circumstances. When, for instance, he sued Mr. Newdegate for maintenance all the researches of some half-a-dozen men were unsuccessful in discovering a case exactly on all fours with Mr. Bradlaugh’s. There are hundreds of cases in which contracts have been held void for maintenance and for champerty, but there is not a single case which runs parallel to Mr. Newdegate’s except the case of *Wallis v. the Duke of Portland* reported in Brown’s Cases in Parliament. There too a difference was to be found, for *Bradlaugh v. Newdegate* was a direct proceeding grounded upon the offence of maintenance, while the facts of *Wallis v. the Duke of Portland* were that the Duke of Portland had promised to pay the plaintiff a certain sum of money in the contingency of his successfully bringing an election petition against the sitting member for Colchester. The plaintiff founded an action on the promise, but the contract was held void on the ground that it involved maintenance. So, too, the present case is one of a novel