

A similar statute in England is rigidly enforced, as may be seen by reference to the English Law Journal for December 1, 1883, at page 652. The sentences in the cases there reported were not too severe. The attorneys were struck off the rolls, and the "unqualified persons" sent to prison for six months. Lord Coleridge said that "a greater misconduct can hardly be committed by any solicitor than to lend his name to an unqualified person to enable him to act as a solicitor in any action or suit. Anyone can see that that is about as grave an offence as a solicitor can possibly commit.

THE STATUTES.

IT is related that, in Mosaic times, a Hebrew infant was hidden for three months because he was "a goodly child." The Queen's Printer cannot urge the same reason for having kept his latest bantling—Vol. I. of the Statutes of 1883—concealed from the public for nearly half a year. Shame, not pride, may have been the actuating motive. The book is full of blunders. The second page of the volume is entitled "Errata." The third is devoted to the same subject and corrects the second. The fourth—well, the error-compiler must have succumbed, for his work proceeds no further. The edition should be re-called, and the proof-reader discharged.

The Interpretation Act provides that "all copies of Acts, public or private, printed by the Queen's Printer, shall be evidence of such Acts, and of their contents." The Errata are not copies of Acts, and are not, therefore, evidence of anything. The Acts, as printed, are evidence of the originals, and in *Regina v. Poyntz* secured the release of a prisoner, although it was apparent to everyone that when the printed copy of 45 Vic. cap. 36, sec. cv. sub-sec. 2 provided that an hotel license shall be construed to mean a license for selling liquor in quantities of not *less* than one quart to be