houses were built in the town—*Goldsmid* v. *Tunbridge Wells Improvement Commissioners*, Law Rep. 1 Eq. 161; S. C. on appeal, Law Rep. 1 Ch. 349.

3. An injunction was granted restraining a local board of health from permitting sewage to pass through drains under their control into a river, to the injury of a miller residing below the outfall of the drains. The company did not stop the flow of the sewage, but alleged that they had not yet discovered means of deodorizing it; that obedience to the injunction would be practically impossible, without stopping the sewage of the town; that there had been no wilful default; and that a sequestration would be useless, as the property of the Board was public property. *Held*, that there had been a contempt, and sequestration was ordered to issue.—*Spokes* v. *Banbury Board of Health*, Law Rep. 1 Eq. 42.

4. A canal company, empowered by its act of incorporation to take water from a stream, then pure, but since become polluted, had been with its lessees (whose lease was about to expire), indicted for a nuisance, in allowing the foul water to stagnate in their canal; and judgment had been entered against the lessees, who had appealed. To an information against the company and their lessees, the company admitted the polluted state of the water, but insisted on their right to draw it, however foul; and said they should probably continue to draw it on the expiration of the lease. *Held*, that the appeal pending at law was not a bar to an injunction; that it was no answer to say that the company did not pollute the water, as they could draw it or not, as they pleased; nor to say that the informants might be left to their legal remedies; nor to say that a worse nuisance would be created in the stream; nor to say that the lessees were the active offenders, inasmuch as the company had set up their rights in the answer: and injunction was granted to commence after eight months.—*Attorney General* v. *Proprietors of the Bradford Canal*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 71.

5. In an injunction to restrain the pollution of a stream, it is proper to insert the words, "to the injury of the plaintiff."—*Linwood* v. *Stowmarket Co.*, Law Rep. 1 Eq. 77.

6. If a judgment at law has been obtained for a nuisance affecting real estate, and substantial damages given, an injunction will almost of course be granted to prevent the continuance of the nuisance.—*Tipping* v. *St. Helen's Smelting Company*, Law Rep. 1 Ch. 66.

Parol Evidence.—*See* Carrier, 6; Legacy, 7; Will, 6.

Particulars.

In an action on a life policy, the defendant having pleaded, that the proposals declared that the life insured had not had symptoms of certain diseases, or any other complaint, whereas he had had symptoms of disease of the stomach, the court ordered particulars of the symptoms delivered.—*Marshall* v. *Emperor Assurance Society* Law Rep. 1 Q. B. 35.

See Patent, 5, 6.

(To be continued.)

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

Articled Clerks—Admission.

To the Editors of The Law Journal.

Gentlemen,—I was articled in July, 1863, and consequently would go up for admission in Trinity term, 1868. Would the Law Society, having as I understand abolished Trinity Term, allow me to go up for admission in Easter Term in that year? I have myself come to the conclusion that they would, from a few remarks of yours in the *Law Journal* of 1865, page 192.

It would be too bad to throw a great number of us back for four or five months. An early answer will oblige several

Law Students.

[Our information leads us to think that such a conclusion is incorrect. The Benchers have in this case no discretion, and cannot, as they can in some cases, permit a clerk to go up for examination before his time is out, and even when they can exercise their powers in favor of the student, he cannot be sworn in until his time is fully up. You could not therefore, unless we are misinformed, go up either for examination or admission until Michaelmas Term.—Eds. L. J.]

Appointment of Official Assignees.

To the Editors of the Law Journal.

Gentlemen,—Just before the publication of your article in the last issue of the *U. C. Law Journal*, a question of some importance upon the subject referred to, came up, as questions do very frequently arise, upon which I should like to see some discussion in your Journal.

The creditors prosecuting a compulsory proceeding by attachment in insolvency, applied to the judge of the County Court here, under the 13th sub-section of the 3rd section of the Insolvent Act of 1864, for an order appointing