with the Insolvent Act. The Sheriffs, that unfortunate body who have recently been brought unto unenviable notoriety by one of their number, will, doubtless, be consoled by the thought that the whirligig of time is likely to bring them to the top, and smother the Official Assignees in the sea of obloquy, which they have prepared for themselves at the bottom.

For the benefit of the Students' Debating Society, and those wishing to hold Moot-courts, we will insert, from time to time, subjects which are propounded for discussion in the law-students societies in England. At Manchester the debate was on the subject: "A railway passenger gives his portmanteau to a servant of the company, who asks if he will have it with him in the carriage, and on the passenger consenting, places it in the carriage some time before the train starts. The portmanteau is stolen before the passenger enters the carriage. Is the railway company liable for its value?" At the united law students' debate, the subject was the rather advanced one: "That children born out of wedlock should be legitimatized by the subsequent marriage of the parents." Another topic discussed was one which fortunately possesses no interest for us in Canada: "Should the right of presentation to Church livings by private persons be abolished?"

As there seems to be a fair prospect of the English Judicature Act becoming engrafted in the legal system of this Province, it may not be amiss to notice the principle of decision which obtains in England where the former practice in law and equity has been diverse. The Lords Justices hold that preference should be given to that practice which appears to be the most reasonable, and and most in accord with natural justice. Thus in *The Newbiggin Gas Company* v. *Armstrong*, 28 W. R. 217, the question came up as to who should pay the costs when the action had been brought by the solicitor without any authority from the nominal plaintiff. Jessel, M.R., compared the roundabout practice in Chancery, which left the defendant to get his costs from the plaintiff, and the plaintiff to get them from the solicitor, with the more sensible practice at law, where the course was to serve the defendant with notice of the application and to order the solicitor to pay the costs of both plaintiff and defendant in the first instance. It was then held by all the judges that the latter practice was to be prerfered and should henceforth be the practice in such cases, under the Judicature Act. It appears that the Master of the Rolls had come to the same conclusion in *Nurse* v. *Durnford*, 28 W. R. 145, when sitting as a judge of first instance.

A correspondent gives us another advertisement illustrative of the subject of unlicensed conveyancers and—collection *bureaus*—let us call them (see p. 92). We presume he is aware, though perhaps all our readers are not, that one of the advertisers there referred to, is not only a Division Court Clerk but also a member of the Local Legislature. When this is realized, it will be easier to understand one of the reasons why the extension of the Division Courts is possible. We have so often expressed our opinion on the subject of unlicensed conveyancers, that we may seem to be monotonous; but we give the Benchers fair warning that we shall not cease agitation on this subject until something is done to remedy the present crying evil. We do not expect much from the legal members of