excluded. We think it should have been received. It would have shown the market for these machines there, and the facility with which they could be sold, and would have had some tendency to show the extent of the business the plaintiffs could have done there, and the value of their agreement.

We think the opinions of witnesses as to the value of the agreement, as to the profits which it, or any agency established in pursuance of it, could produce,as to the damages plaintiffs realized, and as to the number of machines they could have sold, were properly excluded. This was not a case for expert or opinion evidence. There is no certain basis of facts proved, or facts assumed, upon which an opinion could be based. The conflicting opinions of interested witnesses, selected because of their favorable opinions, instead of aiding the jury, would probably add to their embarrassment. The safer rule in all such cases is, to exclude opinions and receive the facts, and then leave the matter for the determination of the jury. They may not have any certain basis upon which to rest their judgment, but that cannot be helped. They are supposed to be disinterested, and must apply their experience and common sense to the facts proved, and reach the best results they can. Our views as to opinion evidence were so fully expressed in *Ferguson* v. *Hubbell*, 97 N. Y. 507, that they need no re-statement here. We have no means of knowing that the views expressed by Judge Woodruff, in *Taylor* v. *Bradley*, supra, as to the proof of the damages by the estimates of witnesses, were coincided in by his associates. They were not necessary to the decision of that case, and we are not prepared to assent to them. In *Mitchell* v. *Reed*, supra, the opinions of witnesses as to the value of certain leases, based upon certain facts assumed, were received. No question was made at any stage of that case that the opinions were not competent. The rule as to opinion evidence was liberally applied in that case, and, we are inclined to think, properly. There was some certain basis for the foundation of opinions by experts in reference to the worth of property which had salable value.

We have not considered the bearing of the statute of frauds upon this case, as no point or reference to it was made upon the trial. Our conclusion therefore is, that this judgment should be reversed and a new trial granted, costs to abide event.

All concur, except Miller, J., absent.

Judgment reversed.

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Sept. 25.

Judicial Abandonments.

George Elie Amyot, Quebec, dry goods merchant, Sept. 22.

Arthur Gingras, Quebec, shirtmaker, Sept. 15.

Curators Appointed.

Re Joseph Brault, Barrington Station, district of Beauharnois.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, Sept. 21.

Re Isaïe Hortie, district of Ottawa.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, Sept. 17.

Dividends.

Re O. Boisvert, district of Richelieu.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 14, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Re J. A. Claveau, district of Chicoutimi.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 8, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.

Re P. J. Lalonde.—First and final dividend, payable Oct. 14, Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator.

Re Hennyle Parent, district of Rimouski.—First dividend, payable Oct. 8, H. A. Bedard, Quebec, curator.

GENERAL NOTES.

FUGITIVE INK.—A friend of ours is about to make a fortune out of an ink which fades out in a short time, varying with the strength of the preparation, from six weeks down to twenty-four hours. We hazard the prediction that it will fill a long felt want. Politicians have suffered untold annoyance, and at times a bitterness of soul which amounted almost to repentance, for lack of this invention. Letters written in moments of rash confidence, which were not burned as directed, have turned up at inopportune junctures to blast their authors. Harmless little transactions of a speculative character, recorded in permanent fluids, have proved "damned spots" which will not "out." It is, however, for its usefulness to the legal profession that we call attention to this ink. Lawyers will earn the gratitude and favor of overworked judges, and materially promote their clients' interest, by writing their briefs in it. On the other hand, a large number of judicial opinions might with advantage be written in it, and the law preserved from precedents which ignore the best settled principles. It is especially recommended for those appellate Courts which are in the habit of overruling their own decisions at intervals of a few years in a way which gives a new meaning to the bandage on the eyes of Justice in allegorical pictures.—*American Law Review.*