

## ERRATUM

Volume 8, Number 2, 1977

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1059601ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1059601ar>

[See table of contents](#)

### Publisher(s)

Éditions de l'Université d'Ottawa

### ISSN

0035-3086 (print)

2292-2512 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

### Cite this document

(1977). ERRATUM. *Revue générale de droit*, 8(2), 247–247.

<https://doi.org/10.7202/1059601ar>

Droits d'auteur © Faculté de droit, Section de droit civil, Université d'Ottawa, 1977

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>



This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

## ERRATUM

The article of Michael Stober entitled *Entrapment*, published in (1976) *Revue générale de droit*, pp. 25 ss. should be read in the light of the following corrections:

P. 48 Footnote 99

... (R.C.C.A.) should read

(1924) 3 D.C.R. 794 (B.C.C.A.)

P. 59 1st paragraph line 2

... of an inherent «prosecution» should read

... certain courts of an inherent discretion

P. 62 footnote 173

... «(1975)» S.C.R. 649 should read

... (1974) S.C.R. 649

(1974) 24 CRNS 159

(1973) 12 C.C.C. (2d) 337

P. 63 7th paragraph 5th line

(Little «&» the unknown «purchaser» were the «Sellers») should read

(Little and the unknown seller were the traffickers)...

P. 65 2nd paragraph 10th line

... the «actus reus» was not committed should read

... the offence was not committed

## ADDENDA

The following cases are important and were not available or not mentioned by me at the time of publication of the article:

*Queen v. Kuzner*, (1977) 74 D.L.R. (2d) 351 (Ont. C.A.) (1977) 14 O.R. (2d) 665.

Leave to appeal to Supreme Court of Canada granted November 15, 1976.

*Régina v. Bohman*, (1974) 20 C.C.C. (2d) 117 (Ont. Distr. Ct.)

*Régina v. Haukness*, (1976) 5 W.W.R. 420 (B.C. Prov. Ct.)

*Régina v. Scheller et al.* (No. 1) (1977) 32 C.C.C. (2d) 273 (Ont. Ct. Ont.)

*Régina v. Scheller et al.* (No. 2) (1977) 32 C.C.C. (2d) 286 (Ont. C.A.)

*Régina v. Thorpe* (1973) 11 C.C.C. (2d) 502 (Ont. Co. Ct.)

*Rourke, Daniel David v. Queen* — unreported.

Supreme Court of Canada June 24, 1977. Upholding *Re Regina and Rourke* (1976) 25 C.C.C. (2d)

555 (B.C.C.A.) which reversed *Re Regina and Rourke* (1974) 16 C.C.C. (2d) 133 (B.C.S.C.)