and the defendant's discharge moved for on the ground that the local legislature had no power to create an offence punishable by hard labour, which was in effect a crime.

The Court held that under the B. N. A. Act, sec. 92, Nos. 9, 15 and 16, the local legislature had the exclusive right to legislate in relation to shop, tavern, auctioneer, and other licenses, in order to raise a revenue; and that it had the right to impose punishment by fine, penalty, or imprisonment, for enforcing any law properly passed on matters within its exclusive jurisdiction.

The Court further placed a construction upon sec. 91, No. 27, and held that when the Imperial Parliament used the words "The Criminal Law," and "including the procedure in criminal matters," they did not mean that the local legislature had not power to legislate so as to punish by fine and imprisonment for the purpose of enforcing laws in respect of local matters, but only applied to cases "on which there was no power given to the local House to legislate."

It was held that the Act was within the scope of the powers conferred on the Provincial legislature, the punishment prescribed being with a view of effectually enforcing a law which the Ontario Parliament had the power to enact.

Richards C.J. (who delivered the judgment of the Court), goes on to observe that if the local legislature were to pass a *general* law forbidding the compounding or settling of the offence by any person who had been guilty of a violation of local statutes, and declaring the same to be a misdemeanour, for which the party could be indicted and punished by fine and imprisonment, that might be considered as passing a criminal law and regulating the procedure in it.—*Regina vs. Boardman*, 30 U. C. R. 550.

The other case was one relating rather to practice, decided by Mr. Dalton, the clerk of the Queen's Bench, sitting in Chambers. It was held that the fiat of the Attorney General was necessary to the due issuing of a writ of *scieri facias*, to set aside a patent at the instance of a private relator. This was the law under the Consolidated Stat. Canada, c. 34, and the Statutes of Canada, 1869, sect. 29, does not alter it. In view of the B. N. A. Act, 1867, sec. 92, Nos. 13 and 14, when such writ issues in Ontario it should be upon the fiat of the Attorney General of that Province, the Attorney General of the Dominion having no jurisdiction in the premises.—*Regina vs. Pattee*, 5 Prac. Rep. 292.

Upon the Insolvency Act, 32, 33 Vict. c. 16 (Dom.), several decisions have been pronounced by the Courts of Queen's Bench, Chancery and Common Pleas, which may be noted as follows:

Sec. 31.—The County Judge of a County in which no board of trade exists, appointed an official assignee for the county within 3 months after this Act came into force (1st Sept. 1869). It was held by the Court of Common Pleas that this appointment was valid under sec. 31, although a board of trade existed in an adjoining county, but had