move in arrest of judgment, it being impossible to divide the amount and say how much the jury intended to give for what the plaintiff complained of, and how much for what he did not complain of.

Semble, a railway company which has not yet opened its line for the public conveyance of passengers, is not subject to the obligations which attach to common carriers, though it may have occasionally carried passengers for hire for the special accommmodation of persons applying for passage.—*McRae* v. *Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.*, Johnson, Gill, Davidson, JJ., March 31, 1888.

Street Railway—Negligence of conductor—Responsibility.

Held, where the plaintiff, while standing on the platform or step of a street car, was injured by a passing load of wood, that as the immediate cause of the accident was the conductor's want of vigilance in failing to stop the car, as he might have done, in time to prevent the collision, the defendants were responsible The fact that the plaintiff was standing on the platform at the time of the accident, did not relieve the defendants from responsibility, inasmuch as he was permitted to stand there by the conductor who had collected fare from him while he was in that position.—*Wilscam* v. *Montreal Street Ry. Co.*, in Review, Johnson, Doherty, Jetté, JJ., Sept. 29, 1888.

INSOLVENT NOTICES ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Dec. 7.

Dividends.

Re François Bertrand, *alias* Frank Beltrand.—First and final dividend payable Dec. 27, W. L. Shurtleff, Coaticook, curator.

Re Télesphore Brassard.—Second and final dividend, payable Dec. 20, Bilodeau & Renaud, Montreal, curators.

Re Dame M. F. Kutner.—First dividend, payable Dec. 17, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, joint-curator.

Re W. L. Mackenzie.—First dividend payable Dec. 26, Robt. Fair, Black Cape, curator.

Re L. G. Brown (The Magog Hosiery Co.).—First dividend in full of privileged claims, payable Dec. 26, A. F. Riddell, Montreal, curator.

Separation as to property.

Priscilla Brunet vs. Olivier Fortin, Montreal, Dec. 7.

Separation from bed and board.

Louise Lambert vs. François V. Delvigne, painter, township of Chesham, November 22.

Minutes of notary transferred.

Minutes of late E. McIntosh transferred to A. C. Décary, N. P., Montreal.

GENERAL NOTES.

OMISSION.—The article on "Parish Registers" in our last issue should have been credited to the *Law Journal* (London).

MR. JUSTICE GRANTHAM AND THE PRESS.—Mr. Justice Grantham has fallen foul of a section of the newspaper press, with the result that he has called down upon his head persistent abuse. The extra judicial utterance which has provoked this attack was to the effect that certain newspapers live by libel and small gossip. Unfortunately, litigation is pending in which the question of libel or no libel in the particular matter has to be tried. The path of a judge is a very narrow one; it will become narrower as the press develops. Reticence will in the future be the virtue next to patience to be looked for in the judicial office.—*Law Times* (London).

LORDS BY COURTESY AT THE BAR.—Mr. F. T. Uttley writes: "Two noble Lords are reported to have recently set up as barristers in the Temple, and an interesting etiquette question arises as to how the judges are to address them if they plead. It would be awkward for judge and counsel to be mutually referring to each other as 'My Lord.' When the Archbishop of York had once to appear before the Lord Chief Justice he was always referred to as the 'Archbishop of York,' and not as 'Your Grace.'" The *Law Journal* thereon remarks: "The difficulty suggested by our valued correspondent from Manchester in regard to the style in which judges will address the scions of nobility who appear to be coming to the bar does not seem serious. Their titles are courtesy titles, and although it is true in the case of the majority of judges, the title 'My Lord' is purely a courtesy title, yet it is an official title of courtesy and not a social title of courtesy. It could not be contended that the sons of barons who have practised at the bar, and who have been many, were entitled to be addressed as 'Your Honour,' because Vice-Chancellors were, and County Court judges are, so addressed. Practising baronets, of whom there are several, are addressed as 'Sir' from the bench, because that is a title which is their legal due, and is accorded to knights of whom in modern times there have always been some at the bar. The constant struggle to make courtesy into real titles was illustrated at the recent nomination at the Holborn election. A nomination treating a courtesy title as real tendered was rejected by the returning officer, and eventually took the following form: 'Surname—Compton, Right Hon William George Spencer Scott, commonly called Earl;' and the description of 'rank, profession, or occupation' was made, 'Earl by courtesy.' The term 'Right Hon.' should also have been described as a courtesy title. It is only in the case of Privy Councillors that there is any claim of legal right to it; and the rank, profession, or occupation should have been 'esquire.'"