The Legal News.

VOL. XIII. AUGUST 2, 1890. No. 31.

The weight to be given to the evidence of professional informers was considered by the Supreme Court of Iowa in *Dickenson* v. *Bently*, June 4, 1890. The Court held that the fact that a person is employed to visit places and purchase whisky in order to ascertain if saloons are illegally kept, is no ground for discrediting his testimony in a suit against the vendors for maintaining a liquor nuisance. "Is there," asked the Court, "anything dishonorable or unmanly in a faithful, conscientious discharge of such duty? If thieves were preying upon the possessions of the people, would it be dishonorable for a person to accept employment to procure the testimony that would result in the conviction of an actual thief? If murderers abound, and their detection is difficult, is an employment that will bring to light the evidence upon which the truth may be known, and the guilty punished, dishonorable? A statement of strong cases wherein good men have no sympathy sometimes aids us to better understand milder ones, as to which the sympathies of men may be directed. We must believe that all good people would commend an employment or service that would result in the prompt and sure punishment of persons guilty of these graver crimes, and such persons would as promptly condemn any employment or service which would result in the punishment of the innocent."

The *Law Quarterly Review*, referring to the subject of champerty and maintenance, says the law as it stands does undoubtedly tend to deprive the poor of a means of meeting the rich on equal terms in litigation by obtaining the assistance of others who believe in the probable success of their suit. "The consequence is, that in many cases a poor suitor (not, perhaps, quite poor enough to sue *in forma pauperis*, and even if he were, not able to afford expenses unavoidable even in that case) is either forced to give up all idea of enforcing his right, or is driven into the hands of the hedge-lawyers. . . . Without expressing a definite opinion, it is not going too far to say that it is at least a matter worthy of consideration whether the law of England should not be assimilated to that of India by enacting that the mere fact of maintenance or champerty shall not of itself be illegal. . . . It is not to be expected that a solicitor will readily undertake to promote a claim involving considerable outlay, and, however honest, some risk of failure, when his client is unable to provide money, merely on the chance of getting his ordinary costs in case of success."

In Mr. Longpré the district of Montreal had a prothonotary who introduced several useful reforms in the administration of his office. It is to be regretted on public grounds as well as for his estimable qualities as a citizen, that his career should so soon have been brought to a close.

COUR DE MAGISTRAT.

MONTRÉAL, 26 mai 1889.

Coram CHAMPAGNE, J. C. M.

BOW v. LEGAULT.

Pari—Courses de chevaux—Prêt—Droit d'action.

JUGÉ:—*Qu'une personne qui prête de l'argent à une autre pour lui permettre de faire un pari sur une course de chevaux, a droit d'action pour recouvrer ce montant, ces sortes de paris n'enlevant pas le droit d'action. C. C., Arts.* 1927, 1928.

Le demandeur a prêté $10 au défendeur pour sa mise dans un pari pour une course de chevaux, et poursuit maintenant le défendeur pour se faire rembourser l'argent ainsi prêté.

Le défendeur plaide que le demandeur lui a prêté cet argent sachant que c'était pour un pari dans une course de chevaux, et qu'il n'a pas d'action pour se faire rembourser.

La Cour a maintenu l'action, plaçant ce