

in question had passed the law examinations in the University of Brussels, and having obtained her diploma, wished to be sworn as a barrister. She presented herself before the Court of Appeal and asked leave to go through the customary ceremony and inscribe her name as a member of the profession. Two barristers appeared on her behalf, but in vain. The Procureur-Général, whose consent, by the Napoleonic law, is necessary, refused to permit the admission of the oath, and the matter was referred to the Court for consideration, which upheld his decision. The reasons given by the Court state that "law and custom alike forbid that a woman should exercise the profession of a barrister; her place in society allots to her duties which are incompatible with the exercise of the profession—a profession for which she has neither strength nor leisure. Since legislation denies a woman the right of instituting any action without the consent of her husband, it cannot be expected that she should be permitted to do for another what she is forbidden to do for herself."

The variation of age in judges of the United Kingdom is considerable. The oldest judge in England is Mr. Justice Manisty, of the Queen's Bench Division, aged 81; the youngest, Mr. Justice Charles, of the Court of Appeal, aged 50. In Scotland, the oldest of the Lords of Session is Lord Glencorse, Lord Justice General, aged 79; the youngest, Lord Wellwood, aged 50. In Ireland, the Hon. J. Fitz Henry Townsend, of the Court of Admiralty, aged 78, is the oldest judge, and Mr. Justice Gibson, of the Queen's Bench Division, aged 44, is the youngest.

#### CIRCUIT COURT.

RICHMOND, January 19, 1889.

Coram Brooks, J.

THE NEW ROCKLAND SLATE CO. v. THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWNSHIPS OF MELBOURNE AND BROMPTON GORE.

*Arts. 100, 698, 1061, M. C.—Corporation complaining of over valuation—Remedy.*

**Held:**—1. That, under the provisions of articles 100 and 698 of the Municipal Code, it was not competent for a corporation to petition

to set aside a valuation roll for alleged illegality: that a corporation who claimed over-valuation of their property, and had obtained a partial reduction, cannot petition for the annulment of the roll, but should have proceeded by appeal under Art. 1061 of M. C.

2. That even supposing the petitioner had a right to ask for the annulment of the roll, the irregularities complained of were not sufficient to justify the annulment of the roll.

PER CURIAM:—This is a petition to set aside a valuation roll under the provisions of articles 100 and 698, Municipal Code.

The petitioners allege that in June or July, 1887, respondent's council named three valuers, Chas. McLean, Wm. N. Skinner and Geo. D. Sloan, who proceeded to make the roll, employing the secretary-treasurer of the municipality to assist them; that they completed the roll on the 14th July, and it was then deposited in the office of the municipality. That they placed the property of the petitioners, about 350 acres, being lot 23 and part of lot 22, range 4, Melbourne, consisting of a slate quarry, then actually worked, with the buildings at \$89,200,—\$75,000 for the quarry, and \$14,200 for the buildings. That on the 8th August the roll was examined and revised by the municipal council, and the valuation of plaintiffs' property reduced by \$25,000, making it \$65,200. That the roll as amended came into force August 14th. That the valuers in a spirit of hostility to petitioners, placed an excessive valuation on their property, and the municipal council, misled thereby, only reduced it by \$25,000. That as amended and reduced, the value of the petitioners' property (a slate quarry) is wholly disproportionate to other property in the municipality. That the actual value of lands in that vicinity does not exceed \$5 per acre. That the valuers can only value the land, and not minerals. That other properties in the vicinity, such as the lands of the Hon. H. Aylmer, B. Walton Estate, Williamson, Cromber etc., are only valued at so much per acre; and the valuation complained of is excessive, disproportionate, and illegal.

They then go on to say that the roll is null and void:

1. Because the valuers were not qualified.