character, and his courtesy to the members of the profession." In the discharge of his judicial duties, he was most upright and conscientious, but perhaps over-painstaking in seeking to make his court a court of equity and good conscience. He hated wrongdoing in the abstract, as distinguished from wrongness in method or decision, and sometimes what seemed good reasoning and authority was wasted on him, as his mind was always seeking the ultimate right and an equitable decision as between man and man. This might not tend to make him popular with the profession, and may be admitted to have been an element of weakness in his character as a judge, but one cannot but admire and respect the thought that dominated his mind. A sketch of his life appears in another place.

SPECIALLY INDORSED WRITS.

In the recent case of Munro v. Pike, 15 P.R. 164, Armour, C.J., affirmed the decision of the Master in Chamber, refusing an order for a summary judgment under Rule 739, on the ground that the whole of the plaintiff's claim as indorsed on the writ was not the subject of a special indorsement.

The indorsement was as follows:

"The plaintiff's claim is on a mortgage dated the 11th day of November, A.D. 1890, made by the defendant, as mortgagor, to George A. Shaw, as mortgagee, and assigned by the said George A. Shaw to the plaintiff by indenture dated 11th March, 1890.

The following are the particulars:

By the terms of the said mortgage, on default in payment of the interest, the principal becomes due. Default took place in payment of the interest due on the 2nd day of November, A.D. 1892. The plaintiff claims interest on \$650, from 2nd November, 1892, at the rate of seven per cent., and on \$22.75 at the rate of six per cent., until judgment."

The Master in Chambers held that the writ was sufficiently indorsed so far as the setting forth of the covenant for the payment of the amount of the mortgage was concerned; but he held the indorsement defective as a special indorsement for omitting to state