

*Senécal & Croisière; Senécal & Champagne; Senécal & Sylvestre.*—Hearing concluded. C.A.V.

*Taylor & Webster.*—Heard. C.A.V.

Saturday, Sept. 24.

*Canadian Pacific Railway Co. & Chalifoux.*—Judgment confirmed, Cross, J., diss.

*Canadian Pacific Railway Co. & Cadieux.*—Judgment confirmed, Cross, J., diss.

*Cie. du Grand Tronc & Lebeuf.*—Judgment confirmed, Cross, J., diss.

*Cité de Montréal & Labelle.*—Judgment confirmed, Cross, J., diss.

*Redfield & La Banque d'Hochelaga.*—Judgment confirmed.

*Macfarlane & Stimson.*—Judgm't confirmed.

*McGillivray & Watt.*—Judgment confirmed.

*Brosseau & Forgues.*—New hearing ordered.

*Lowrey & Routh.*—New hearing ordered.

*Gilmour & Lapointe*, and the eight other cases enumerated above.—Heard on motion for appeal to Privy Council. C.A.V.

*McTavish & Fraser.*—Application to be heard by preference. Referred to Clerk of the Court.

Monday, Sept. 26.

*Smith & Wheeler.*—Heard. C.A.V.

*Cie. de Pret & Crédit Foncier & Sansterre.*—Part heard.

Tuesday, Sept. 27.

*Senécal & Beet Root Sugar Co.*—Motion for dismissal of appeal, granted for costs only.

*Gilmour & Lapointe*, and the eight other cases enumerated above.—Motion for appeal to Privy Council granted.

*Giles & Jacques.*—Judgment reversed, Tessier, J., diss.

*Primeau & Giles.*—Judgment reversed, Cross, J., diss.

*Exchange Bank & City & District Savings Bank.*—Judgment confirmed.

*Latham & Kennedy.*—Judgment confirmed.

*Senécal & Croisière; Senécal & Champagne; Senécal & Sylvestre.*—Judgment confirmed in each case.

*Gilman & Gilbert.*—Re-hearing ordered.

*Canadian Pacific Railway Co. & Chalifoux.*—Motion for appeal to Privy Council granted.

*Cie. de Pret & Crédit Foncier & Sansterre.*—Hearing concluded. C.A.V.

*Mullarky & Kronig.*—Heard. C.A.V.

The Court adjourned to Nov. 15.

## REWARDS FOR APPREHENDING CRIMINALS.

Rewards offered for the discovery of crime have long been part of the procedure resorted to in this country, for however public-spirited may be the majority of citizens, there are so many ramifications in the occasions and consequences of criminal acts, that no organization is equal to the speedy administration of this class of remedies. The older acts of parliament abound in inducements to public informers, and though these are seldom introduced in modern acts, the disposition to trace out and punish delinquencies is fortunately a very common attendant upon every species of wrong. Yet, as everybody knows, it is no uncommon occurrence for the government or for individuals to offer rewards for the discovery of offenders, and this quickens the diligence not only of constables, but of that large class of persons who are always looking out for employment. In working out this practice, some interesting and useful decisions have been from time to time come to in the courts, for, as may be supposed, the offer of a reward brings forward many competitors who jealously watch each other's claims, and as there is more of chance than merit in the prizes, the successful winner is subject to double scrutiny. The public policy of offering rewards has indeed often been doubted, especially where constables are concerned. A constable is bound by his very duty to search for criminals and bring them to justice. And it has been well remarked by several judges that the expectation of rewards must offer great temptation to delay an active search, by which delay the criminal might escape, or to delay taking into custody a criminal who gives himself up, so that the constable might appear to use exertions to procure complete information and for that to claim the reward. There would also be a temptation, particularly to those constables in the detective service, to look to bribes or to seek promises of reward from persons anxious to recover their property, and unless such were offered, to be inert in their efforts.

On the other hand even private individuals are too apt at times to be careless of the public advantage, if only they can by any