

mum on the subject. The prevailing feature of these changes—if they have any feature—is the triumph of the younger men. But the most certain conclusion to be drawn is that there is a shrinkage in business. When dissolutions come about we can be sure that it is the result of a conviction by one that he brings more to the firm than he takes out, and that his partner absorbs more of the earnings than he contributes to them. We are all the time in receipt of information that points to

a state of distress in the profession in Toronto, but of course the fact, if true, is better hidden than paraded, and no great good can arise from publication of such a state of affairs. Yet the thing is getting so patent that a reference to it will not be out of place, especially in view of the fact that we are soon to have a further batch of young lawyers turned out by the Law School. We think the situation in Toronto is not improving, and that the fact should be understood.

RECENT ENGLISH CASES AND NOTES OF CASES.

Is the solicitor personally bound to repay costs which he has received under an order of the Court of Appeal on that order being reversed by the House of Lords?

HOOD-BARRS v. CROSSMAN AND PRICHARD.

[T. 291; W. N. 30; L. J. 159; L. T. 461; S. J. 347.

No, said the House of Lords, the party only is liable to repay—not the solicitor employed; thus affirming the decision of the Court of Appeal.

* * *

Are entries in a diary made by a deceased solicitor in the course of his business admissible as evidence?

ECROYD v. COULTHARD.

[L. J. 161; W. N. 25.

Mr. Justice North, after a careful review of all the authori-

ties, held that such entries were not admissible, for although made in the course of the deceased solicitor's business, he was under no duty to make such entries. (*Rawlins v. Rickards* (1860), 28 Beav. 370, and *Bright v. Legerton* (1861), 2 De G. F. & J. 617, doubted; dicta of the Court of Appeal in *Hope v. Hope* (1893), L.J.N.C. 110, followed).

* * *

Does the Married Women's Property Act, 1893, apply where a married woman, a defendant in an action, appeals against the decision given?

HOOD-BARR v. HERIOT.

[T. 291; W. N. 30; L. J. 159; L. T. 461; S. J. 347.

The Court of Appeal held that the Act giving the Court power to order payment of costs out of her separate property, notwithstanding a restraint on