Thereafter the plan for increasing the stock was abandoned by the corporation and an adjustment with subscribers authorized by its trustees. In an action by a subscriber to recover from the corporation the amount of the assessment paid by him, *held*, that it was no defence that the payment was made upon an illegal transaction.—*Central Law Journal.*

CONTEMPT.

Still another curious question of contempt came up in England, before the Court of Appeal, in *Platting Company* v. *Farquharson*, on the 23d of March last. This was the same case in which the Vice-Chancellor had held that it was contempt to advertise in a newspaper for funds to carry on an appeal. The present alleged contempt was an advertisement in a newspaper offering a reward of £100 to any one who could produce documentary evidence that the process to which the patent in question related had been performed before the year 1869. The plaintiffs alleged that the publication of this advertisement was a contempt of court, and applied to the Court of Appeal for an order to commit the publishers. It was urged that the advertisement would tend to induce the forging of documents, and reliance was placed on the case of *Pool* v. *Sacheverel*, 1 P. W. 675, in which Lord Chancellor Macclesfield committed for contempt a person who had inserted in a newspaper an advertisement offering a reward to any person who should discover and legally prove that a marriage, the validity of whch was in question in the suit, was invalid. The Lord Chancellor was of opinion that the advertisement was a direct inducement to subornation of perjury. The Court of Appeal refused the application. Jessel, M. R., said that the advertisement had been inserted by the publishers in the ordinary course of business, and it was clear that they had no intention of interfering with the administration of justice. In order to justify an order for committal, it must be shown that the advertisement, on the face of it, would convey to the mind of a person of ordinary intelligence that it would tend to interfere with the administration of justice. In his lordship's opinion the advertisement was a very harmless one; £100 was not a very large sum, and documentary evidence was not easily forged. The notion that the advertisement would induce the forgery of documents was a wild one, and was not founded on any reasonable construction of it. It was a common practice to offer rewards for the discovery of a lost deed or a lost marriage certificate, and his lordship had never heard it suggested that it was illegal. He did not profess to understand the case *Pool* v. *Sacheverel*, as it was reported, and said that if necessary he should disregard it. He thought it inconsistent with the practice of government in offering rewards for the conviction of offenders.—*Albany Law Journal.*

NOTES OF CASES.

PUBLISHED IN ADVANCE BY ORDER OF THE LAW SOCIETY.

QUEEN'S BENCH.

VACATION COURT.

Cameron J.] [March 25.

REGINA ex rel. CLANCY v. ST. JEAN.

Alderman—Declaration of qualification—R. S. O. ch. 174, sec. 265—Quo warranto.

The declaration required by the Municipal Act R. S. O. ch. 174, sec. 265, from every person elected under the Act to any office requiring a property qualification, is a pre-requisite to the discharge of the duties of such office.

Where an alderman elect did not state in his declaration the nature of his estate in or the value of the land, but declared that his property was sufficient to qualify him "according to the true intent and meaning of the Municipal Laws of Upper Canada," *Held*, that the declaration was insufficient.

Held, also, that his right to the office on this ground, and for the want of a qualification at the time of his election, might be questioned by a *quo warranto* at the instance of a ratepayer not a voter of or resident in the ward, and who therefore could not be a relator under the Municipal Act. *Regina ex rel. White* v. *Roach*, 18 U. C. R. 226, and *Kelly* v. *Macarow*, 14 C. C. 457, distinguished.