The Legal News.

VOL. XI. FEBRUARY 11, 1888. No. 6.

Mr. Justice Stephen, in the case of *Taylor* v. *Timson*, January 16, delivered an interesting judgment, maintaining the right of every Englishman, although so humble as a boy in a reformatory school, to attend the parish church. The plaintiff, Taylor, a boy in a reformatory, sued a churchwarden to recover damages for assault in being prevented from entering the parish church of Netley. It appeared that as the boy was passing in by the gate of the churchyard, in order to attend service in the church, Timson laid his hand upon him and pushed him back, thereby preventing him from attending service. The defendant justified his act on the ground that in the church, which contained 305 sittings for a population of 1,100, places could not be found for the boys from the reformatory. The learned judge said he would not decide the question whether the incumbent, as the freeholder, had a right to exclude people from the church; but the churchwarden clearly had no such right. The learned judge directed attention to 5 & 6 Edw. VI., c. 1, repealed in the reign of Queen Mary, but revived by 1 Eliz. c. 2, which enacts that all persons shall diligently and faithfully, having no lawful or reasonable excuse to be absent, endeavour themselves to resort to their lawful parish church or chapel accustomed upon every Sunday or other days ordained and used to be kept as holidays. The boy Taylor had, therefore, not only the right, but it was his duty, under pain of fine, to attend his parish church. Judgment was given for the plaintiff with 1s. damages. "For many years," added the learned judge, "the difficulty has been all the other way—to get people to come to church." We have a faint suspicion that there is a long arrear of fines due by Mr. Justice Stephen.

The Solicitor General, Sir E. Clarke, Q.C., in the address to the Birmingham students, referred to last week, made some observations worthy of note. He said:—"What is the interest of the public at large? That should be our first consideration; and if we were disposed to forget or disregard it, a very little reflection would show us that this is a practical age, and that, whether we like it or not, a Parliament which addresses itself to industrial and social reform will make short work of professional rules or the privileges of private institutions, however venerable, if they are found to hinder the attainment of an important public object. That object is the prompt and inexpensive administration of justice, civil as well as criminal, and the enforceable obligation upon everyone to whom the State grants the special privilege of practising in its Courts to do to the best of his ability any work which he accepts payment for doing. In my belief this object can be effected only by the fusion of both branches of our profession, and I wish to set before you this evening some of the reasons why I believe that change will not only produce great public benefit, but will raise the condition and improve the position of the whole profession." The Solicitor General then referred to the ordinary costly routine, by which the suitor explains his case to a solicitor; the facts and proofs are collected, and then the knowledge which the solicitor has acquired has to be conveyed to counsel,—all at great expense. "In most cases the counsel is not the choice of the litigant, but is simply the counsel usually employed by the solicitor. Whether he performs his duty or neglects it, whether he does it well or ill, he is under no legal liability to the man by whom he is paid. The brief may not have told him all the facts, he may not have read it; he may be in another Court when the case is being tried; but a client is absolutely in his hands, and cannot sustain any legal claim, even for the return of the fees which have not been earned." For this and other grievances the cure suggested is the fusion of the advocate and solicitor branches of the profession. "There are now solicitors," he said, "who would make great advocates. There are barristers who would do thoroughly well the solicitor's work; and by letting each do the work for which he was best fitted we should give the litigant a larger area of choice, and save him from the useless burden of being bound to employ two persons instead of one."