The Legal News.

VOL. XIII. FEBRUARY 22, 1890. No. 8.

The B. A. Bill this year secured more powerful support, and has passed both branches of the Legislature. The leaders of both political parties concurred in recommending the bill. The fear which some would appear to entertain that this measure would introduce unqualified persons into the profession, has been shown to be chimerical, and experience will probably demonstrate that the proposed change of the law is not only in the interest of the Universities but of the Bar as well.

The clear and succinct statement of the law applicable to tariffs of fees, by Mr. Justice Cimon in the case of *Duberger* v. *Angers*, *ante* p. 50, directs attention to the duty now imposed on the General Council of the Bar to regulate the tariff (R. S. Q. 3599), and to an omission to provide for attorneys' fees in cases in the Superior Court of $200 and under, in districts other than Quebec and Montreal. The result is that the fees are taxable on a higher scale in the country districts than in the two districts named.

The notice in the Advocates' Library, not to speak loud, should probably be altered to an injunction not to speak at all. Study and reflection are not aided by the buzz of two or three conversations proceeding simultaneously in different parts of the chamber. While we were in the library of Osgoode Hall a few days ago, we noticed that silence prevailed, though a good many persons were present. We cannot say whether it is always so; but nothing but lack of accommodation elsewhere can excuse the introduction of business conversation into a library.

The celebration of the centenary of the U. S. Supreme Court appears to have had as much success as celebrations of this kind usually attain. Never before, perhaps, was there such a congregation of eminent judicial dignitaries, and it is fortunate that no crank disappointed in litigation conceived the idea of extinguishing so much light and learning by some fell design against the judiciary. The President was kept away by the great affliction in the family of Secretary Tracy. Reference was made to the fact that on the same day, a century ago, the Supreme Court had adjourned for want of business. Now the Court has business waiting, sufficient to occupy four years.

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA.

OTTAWA, January, 1890.

Quebec.]

ONTARIO & QUEBEC RAILWAY CO. v. MARCHETERRE.

Application to give security for costs—Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, Sec. 46—Appeal—Jurisdiction—Interlocutory judgment—Final judgment—Art. 1116, C. C. P.—Amount in controversy not determined—Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, Secs. 28, 29.

STRONG, J. (in Chambers) *dubitante* as to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to hear an appeal from a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench for Lower Canada (appeal side), and desiring to give the parties an opportunity of having the question of jurisdiction decided by the full Court, granted an application to allow the payment of $500 into Court as security for the costs of the appeal, as the time for appealing from the said judgment would elapse before the next sittings of the Court.

On a motion to quash for want of jurisdiction, before the full Court, it was

HELD—1. That a judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench for Lower Canada (appeal side), quashing a writ of appeal on the ground that the writ of appeal had been issued contrary to the provisions of Art. 1116 C. C. P., is not "a final judgment" within the meaning of section 28 of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act. (*Shaw* v. *St. Louis*, 8 Can. S. C. R. 387, distinguished).

2. Per Ritchie, C.J., and Strong, Taschereau and Patterson, JJ., that the Court has no jurisdiction where the amount in contro-