The Legal News.

VOL. VIII. JANUARY 17, 1885. No. 3.

The Supreme Court of Canada, on the 12th instant, pronounced the Dominion License Act of 1883, known as the McCarthy Act, to be *ultra vires* as regards the regulation of retail licenses. This decision, which was given upon the reference provided for by the Act of last session, is based, apparently, upon the judgment of the Privy Council, in *Hodge* v. *Reg.* (7 L. N. 18.) The history of the matter is briefly this: When the decision of the Privy Council in *Russell* v. *Reg.* (5 L.N. 25, 33) was pronounced, it was supposed to be conclusive authority for assuming that the whole subject of the liquor traffic was given to the Dominion Parliament, and consequently taken away from the Provincial Legislatures. The McCarthy Act of 1883 was thereupon enacted by the Parliament of Canada. When the case of *Hodge* v. *Reg.* was carried to the Privy Council, their lordships disavowed the interpretation which had been placed upon their previous decision. The judgment in the *Hodge* case says (7 L.N. 23): "Their lordships consider that the powers intended to be conferred by the Act in question (the Ontario Act of 1877) when properly understood, are to make regulations in the nature of police or municipal regulations of a merely local character for the good government of taverns, &c., licensed for the sale of liquors by retail, and such as are calculated to preserve in the municipality, peace and public decency, and repress drunkenness and disorderly and riotous conduct. As such they cannot be said to interfere with the general regulation of trade and commerce which belongs to the Dominion Parliament." The effect of this decision was to make it doubtful whether the Parliament of Canada had not legislated *ultra vires* in passing the McCarthy Act, and the Supreme Court, on special reference, now holds that the Act is in effect *ultra vires*, except so far as relates to the licensing of vessels and wholesale licenses, and also, except so far as relates to the carrying into effect of the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

Among other decisions of the Supreme Court rendered on the same day are the following:—*Morse* v. *Martin*, (5 L.N. 99), appeal of plaintiff dismissed with costs; *Sulte* v. *City of Three Rivers*, (5 L.N. 330), appeal dismissed with costs; *Charlebois et al. & Charlebois*, and *Charlebois & Charlebois*, (5 L.N. 421), appeal in each case dismissed; *Gingras & Symes*, (7 L.N. 126) appeal dismissed; *City of Montreal & Hall*, (6 L.N. 155), appeal dismissed; *Stevens & Fisk*, (6 L.N. 329), judgment reversed; *Cholette & Bain*, (7 L.N. 220), judgment reversed, and election annulled.

We are pleased to notice that Canadian decisions are read with care in Missouri. Our learned contemporary the *American Law Review*, not only examines the questions decided but, apparently, has leisure to detect typographical errors. He has discovered a misprint which occurs in a reference in a Quebec report published some ten years ago; but oddly enough, our contemporary in correcting this error, himself misprints the title of the case, and changes "Dansereau" to "Dausereau." The learned critic, therefore, hardly commends himself to the office of proof reader.

There is some pertinence in the following remarks of the *Law Journal* (London):—"Perhaps the worst of the evils of a Court of Appeal in arrear, is that the judges work under pressure. Lord Justice Bowen, a short time since, appealed to the bar to co-operate with the judges in clearing the list by shortening their arguments. We are sorry for the necessity for this request, because so soon as a Court of Appeal begins in any way to hurry its work, so soon does it begin to be inefficient as a Court of Appeal. A Court of Appeal ought to hear everything which can be said. Assistance might be rendered by succinctness of argument, but harm rather than good would be done by omitting anything."

Mr. Justice Papineau, on the 17th instant, in *Exchange Bank* v. *Burland*, decided that shareholders who are depositors cannot offset their deposits against double liability calls by the liquidators. There are so many persons interested in this decision, that we print the text of the judgment in the present issue.