

who is desirous of enforcing the forfeiture of a tenancy must be careful not to distrain on his tenant's goods after he has acquired the right of re-entry, as such a distress is a distinct waiver of the forfeiture and replaces the parties in their original position of landlord and tenant under the agreement.—*Irish Paper*.

CONTRADICTORY STATUTES.—The question, What is the rule of construction to be adopted if two contradictory statutes should receive the royal assent on the same day? is one of very great interest. We think the right view is that the two contradictory enactments cancel one another, and we are confirmed in this opinion by a reference to 33 Geo. III., c. 13, by which "the clerk of the parliaments shall indorse on every Act," immediately after the title, "the day, month, and year when the same shall have passed, and shall have received the royal assent, and such indorsement shall be taken to be a part of such Act, and to be the date of its commencement, where no other commencement shall be therein provided." The other view, that a Court could take judicial notice of the order in which the royal assent was given, has in support of it the cases in which exceptions have been allowed (see *Clarke v. Bradlaugh*, 51 Law J. Rep. Q. B. 1; L. R. 8 Q. B. Div. 63) to the rule, that the law takes no account of the fraction of a day; but it has been expressly held that an Act becomes law as soon as the day of its date commences, so that a child born before the royal assent was given to an Act would have the benefit of it: *Tomlinson v. Bullock*, 48 Law J. Rep. M. C. 95; L. R. 4 Q. B. Div. 230; and this points to the royal assent fixing one and the same minute for the commencement of all the Acts receiving the royal assent on the same day. On the lists, of course, of bills awaiting the royal assent they must be separately distinguished, but they could not be numbered in chapters until after the royal assent had been given, for of any given number of contemporaneous bills *non constat* (in law) that all will be assented to by Her Majesty. Therefore a conflict, if it exists, must result in cancellation; but the rule (see "Maxwell on Statutes," 2nd ed. p. 186) that "the language of every enactment must be so construed, as far as possible, as to be consistent with every other which it does not in express terms modify or repeal," will, of course, apply with extra force to two contemporaneous enactments.—*Law Journal*.

MOOT COURTS AND LEGAL EDUCATION—In view of the Moot Courts recently established in connection with the Law School, a few words containing some practical ideas, suggested by a "Moot" at the University of Melbourne, may be of interest. Our friends at the antipodes, while a little behind us perhaps in this matter, are evidently nevertheless fully aware of the practical importance of a knowledge of pleading and evidence being acquired by students of the law. The following is from the *Australian Law Times*:—"So much has been said about the education of the legal profession at the University lately on various branches of law, and so many changes have been made in the curriculum with the view and hope of making perfect lawyers out of raw students, that it is refreshing to observe that