

31. The bodies shall be taken directly to the cemetery and the funeral shall be strictly private.

32. The conveyance of the bodies of all persons who have died from small-pox, shall be made exclusively in vehicles specially set apart for that purpose, and approved of by the local board of health.

*Disinfection.*

33. Every person is bound to allow his residence to be disinfected by the officer of the local board of health, and to vacate the same for the purpose if required thereto.

34. No person shall rent a house or tenement wherein small-pox shall have existed without causing it to be disinfected to the satisfaction of the local board of health.

35. No article which has been in immediate or mediate contact with a patient suffering from small-pox shall be removed before it has been disinfected.

*Sales, &c., of articles infected prohibited.*

36. No person shall give or sell any articles, merchandise, products, milk, bread, provisions, &c., if such are coming from a house or property in which small-pox exists or if they are liable to convey the disease.

*Power of Central Board of Health to inspect.*

37. The Central Board of Health, by any of its members or a person authorised thereto, may, at reasonable times, during the day, visit all public or private property and all houses, tenements and appurtenances within the Province, to ascertain the state of the public health and that its regulations are duly executed.

*Penalties.*

38. Whosoever refuses or neglects to conform to any of the aforesaid regulations or willingly obstructs any person in the execution of any of them, or willingly contravenes any of the same shall incur the penalty imposed by cap. 38, of the consolidated statutes of Canada.

*Previous rules and regulations abrogated.*

39. All regulations passed by the central board of health before this date are repealed, except those which concern the imposition and recovery of penalties incurred until this date.

*RECENT U. S. DECISIONS.*

*Innkeeper—Suit for Accommodation and Board—Guest's clothing stolen.*—In an action by an innkeeper against a guest to recover for board and accommodation, the defendant may recoup his damages for the value of clothing stolen from his room. It appeared that before the theft, the following printed regulation was posted in the rooms of the inn: "Lock the door when going out and leave the key at the office"; defendant knew of the regulation, and on the occasion when his clothing was stolen, failed to leave his key at the office. The court ruled as matter of law, that defendant having failed to leave his key at the office on the occasion in question, was not entitled to recoup the value of the clothing stolen. *Held* erroneous; that in the absence of any express contract, an innholder is relieved from liability for loss, only when, in the words of the statute, such loss is attributable to the non-compliance with the regulation. At common law innholders, like common carriers, are regarded as insurers of the property committed to their care, and are liable for any loss not caused by the act of God, or of a public enemy, or by the neglect or fault of the guest. *Mason v. Thompson*, 9 Pick. 280; *Berkshire Woollen Co. v. Proctor*, 7 Cush. 417. Our statutes have in some respects limited this extreme liability. Pub. Stat., ch. 102, §§ 12-16. The statute exonerates an innholder from his common-law liability for a loss sustained by a guest, who has knowingly failed to comply with a reasonable regulation of the inn, if the loss is attributable to such non-compliance. The rulling of the Superior Court went further and held that an innholder is exonerated by the fact of non-compliance, without any inquiry into the question whether the loss was attributable to the non-compliance. The law will not imply a contract against the guest more extensive than the terms of the statute, and in a case like the one before us, in the absence of any express contract, an innholder is relieved from liability for loss, only when, in the words of the statute, such loss is attributable to the non-compliance with the regulations of the inn. *Burbank v. Chapin*. Maine Supreme Judicial Court. Opinion by Morten, C. J. (Sept. 21, 1885.)