

C. Gooderich & Co., Burlington, Va., we see are about to publish "Chalmer's Opinions," a valuable work now out of print, and most difficult to be procured at any price. They are requesting orders for the work which will be printed with all "convenient despatch." The proposed Edition will contain about 800 pages, medium Octavo. The price in Law binding will be Five Dollars—the price asked for the English edition is Five Guineas. To show the character of the work, the publisher submits the opinions of Mr. Justice Aylwin, Honorable C. J. Lafontaine and others, but its best recommendation to the Lawyer and the Statesman in Upper Canada who has examined the work, will be found in the letter which we subjoin from the Chief Justice of Upper Canada, and it would be superfluous for us to add a word in commendation. We heartily wish the spirited publishers every success. Orders should be sent in at once to the publishers, or to their Agents, Messrs. Armour & Co., Toronto.

Toronto, March 28, 1857.

Dear Sir,—I am glad to see that it is proposed to republish Chalmer's collection of Opinions of eminent Lawyers on questions chiefly relating to the British Colonies. It is a work difficult to be procured in England, and it will be a valuable service rendered to the profession to afford them more general access to a work which contains many able discussions by Lawyers of great eminence, on both sides of the Atlantic, of questions highly interesting, both in an historical and legal point of view.

I am, dear Sir, yours very truly,

J. B. ROBINSON.

Chauncey Gooderich, Esq.

We occasionally see *The Quarterly Journal of Richmond, Va.* It contains original articles, reports of cases and other interesting matter. So far as we have had opportunities of judging, the work we should say is conducted with much ability, and might well find a place in every law library. There is a very good article in the July number, on *Imprisonment for debt*, in which the "mawkish lamentation and misapplied sympathy" of the day are well handled; and correct and enlightened views are propounded on the subject.

The editor has very freely expressed sentiments which he "knows run counter to a great mass of prejudice and misapprehension." We admire the courage of our Virginian cotemporary, and trust his able advocacy will be followed by favorable results.

In other columns will be found a copy of the recent Imperial Statute intitled, "An Act to make better provision for the punishment of Frauds committed by Trustees, Bankers and other persons intrusted with property." We commend it to the law officers of the crown in this colony. One clause which provides that persons receiving property fraudulently disposed of knowingly, the same to have been so shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, will be read with interest at the present time in Upper Canada.

Amongst other Acts of importance passed during the recent Session of the Imperial Legislature, there is one of especial concern to the legal profession in the colonies. It provides that attorneys and solicitors of Colonial Courts may under certain conditions be admitted to practise *in Courts of Law and Equity in England*.

The provisions of the recent English divorce Act are widely discussed. At an early date we shall lay the Act or a reliable summary of it before our readers.

The Report of the English "Common Law Judicial Commissioners" is at length published. It is a blue book of 181 pages, and is described by a cotemporary as being "much ado about nothing." The changes recommended as to the business of the Courts are few and unimportant.

The Law Society of Upper Canada has passed rules, under the authority of the new Act, for the admission of Attorneys.

MONTHLY REPERTORY.

CHANCERY.

L.C.

FARINA v. SILVERBLOK.

July 8.

Injunction.—Liberty to bring action.—Extension of time.

Where the plaintiff's bill was retained for a twelvemonth, with liberty to bring an action, the time was extended the day before the twelvemonth had expired—it appearing that the plaintiff had a *bona fide* intention of bringing the action, and had not been culpably slow in taking steps towards bringing the matter to adjudication.

In this case the matter had been proceeded with up to the hearing, but the plaintiff withdrew the record in consequence of the absence of his counsel.