whileld v. Law-

-Bank discountpromissory note wrty, in favor of of her husband, ined thereon by bod faith before Banque Nationale

ming contractof the amount what is commonn settlement of plations on the t delivery of the

161.

(1.) Where it of a promissory the Bills of Exleve them from payable to order ed the note to to compel him sinst the maker; and a judgment besuperfluous.

74.

respress company or railway comthe Railway Act, a express comhas not granted (2.) An adedoes not lie in Co. v. Grand

REGISTRAR.

Production of documents.] A registrar is a public officer, depositary and custodian of public documents. He is not bound to produce in Court the documents, or books in use, in his office, unless the suit relate to the form or authenticity of such documents. Schiller v. Compagnie du Pacifique Canadien, 174.

REGISTRATION.

Donation by marriage contract.] See DONATION, 456.

---- Renewal of registration-Servitude.] See SERVITUDE, 425.

---- See DONATION, 107 ; SALB OF IMMOVABLES, 465.

RESPONSIBILITY.

Of carrier.] See CARRIER, 131.

- Of street railway company.] See Nualiannen, 10.

--- See MASTER AND SERVANT, 197.

REVENDICATION. See SALE OF MOVABILM, 354.

Deposit.] See PROCEDURE, 450.

RIGHT OF WAY. See Survitude, 179, 425.

ROAD, PUBLIC.

Chemin de tolérance—Prescription.] However long a road has been used by the public, if it appears that the proprietor intended to retain the ownership, e.g., by putting up bars, exacting toll, etc., the road remains a mere chemin de tolérance, and the proprietor is always at liberty to close it. McGinnis v. Létourneau, 278.

SALE OF IMMOVABLES.

Payment of hypothecary claim by purchaser.] M. acquired certain real estate against which a judgment had previously been registered. M. paid off this hypothecary claim. When he did so, the time for renewing the registration of the judgment claim against the property had not expired. *Held*, that the payment by M. of the hypothecary claim against the property was made en temps wile, and had the effect of extinguishing the hypothec, and that M. was entitled to retain the amount so paid out of the price payable to his vendor. Kay v. Gibeault, 465.

- Sale for laxes.] See MUNICIPAL LAW, 423.

SALE OF MOVABLES.

Contract—Sale of goods—Date of shipment specified—Performance.] K., in St. Louis, Mo., on the 22nd March, sold 1,000 barrels of flour to M. in Montreal, "shipment 15th," meaning 15th April. The flour was shipped March 30th and M. objected to this shipment as premature. The flour was held in Montreal, and tendered again to M. on April 18. Held, that this was a good ignder