

The Legal News.

VOL. VIII. JULY 18, 1885. No. 29.

For some time past there has been a good deal of grumbling and dissatisfaction in some legal circles in England, in consequence of the failure of law students, and even of barristers, to obtain admission to rooms in the Royal Courts where important trials were in progress, the excuse being that the Court room was full. The matter has become so prominent that it has elicited the following observations from Sir James Han-
 nen, president of the Probate Division:—"I wish to say a word or two on a matter that has been pressed upon my attention. There is, of course, very great difficulty in making arrangements during the hearing of an important case like this for those who desire access to the court. I never found any real difficulty during all the years I have sat on the bench in satisfactorily dealing with such matters until I came into these buildings. It is now the constant subject of complaint, and I will therefore state, for the information of the public, the directions I have given as to the admission of the public to this court. They are very simple. This is a public court, admission to which the public are entitled to, provided there is accommodation. I have stated over and over again that while there is sitting accommodation, barristers and others are entitled to admission as a right. A person of whom I know nothing applied to me as a student for permission to be in the court. I informed him of the regulations I had laid down, and I am now told that he has been refused admission. To refuse him admission was an illegal act. I am informed that this person has misconducted himself. That must be the subject of enquiry elsewhere; but whoever refused him admission to this court while there was room, when he had my order, was guilty of an illegal act."

In our last issue, in a reference to the case of *Reg. v. Macdonald*, an error occurred which it is well to correct at once to avoid misapprehension. The paragraph should have read, "A case bearing a slight resemblance to the knotty cabman's case," &c. In the cabman's case, the title of which is *Reg. v. Ashwell*, a cabman received a half sovereign which the giver as well as the taker supposed to be a shilling, and afterwards, when the real value of the coin was known, the cabman retained it. In *Reg. v. Macdonald* the question was whether a minor who had purported to enter into a contract for the hiring and purchase of furniture, and who had sold it before he had paid all the instalments, could be convicted of larceny. Another question of larceny has just been decided by the Supreme Court of Illinois in *Stoker v. People*. The question was whether a constable who collects money on an execution, and fails to pay the same to the party entitled thereto, is guilty of larceny. The Court held in the negative. This decision, however, turned mainly upon Sect. 76 of the Criminal Code of the State.

The Insolvency bill submitted to the Dominion Parliament is one of the measures the consideration of which, owing to the length of the Session and the pressure of other business, has necessarily been deferred.

Mr. Christopher Robinson, Q. C., who has been connected with the work of law reporting in Ontario since the year 1852, and who has filled the position of editor-in-chief of the Law Reports since 1872, has just retired from that position, and has been succeeded by Mr. James F. Smith.

SUPERIOR COURT—MONTREAL.*

Judicatum solvi—Opposition—Contestation de l'opposition.—*Jugé*:—Que c'est seulement celui qui porte, intente ou poursuit une instance ou procès qui est tenu de fournir le cautionnement *judicatum solvi*, et tel est un opposant afin de distraire; que la partie qui conteste une opposition ne faisant qu'exercer les droits de son débiteur pour résister à l'opposition,

* To appear in full in Montreal Law Reports, 1 S.C.