

thus leaving the mortgagee in precisely the same position as any other unsecured creditor. This irregularity, on the part of both lawyer and law clerk, is explained by the fact of the mechanical work of filling up the blank spaces, seeming to cease when there are, at first glance, no others to fill up. It is, however, most important to note, as before urged, that the printed word "against" is not the last, but must be followed, in writing, by either "him," or "her" or "them," as required.—*Monetary Times*.

An important judgment has been rendered by the Superior Court at Montreal, in the case of *Lambe vs. the Montreal & Sorel Railway Company*. It will be remembered that after the issue of a writ of *venditioni exponas* in this case, at the instance of the local Government, represented by Mr. Lambe, collector of revenue, the Great Eastern Railway Company, lessee of the Montreal & Sorel, filed an opposition. This opposition was dismissed, however, but an appeal, still pending, was taken from the judgment. Meanwhile, the Government petitioned to have a sequestrator appointed, who should collect the revenue of the road for the benefit of the creditors. This was again opposed by the Great Eastern on different grounds, and, among others, that a sequestrator could not be appointed to a railway company; that the Great Eastern had a lien on the road by their lease, and that it was in the interest of the creditors that they should continue to run the road. The court dismissed this opposition on every point, and ordered the appointment of a sequestrator, holding that there was no ground for the alleged right of the Great Eastern to indefinitely run the line, and that there was connivance between the defendant and opponent. This is the first instance of a sequestrator being appointed to a railway in this province.

---