

him so. I merely respected him, but thought we could get along. But his kisses and caresses were so numerous I couldn't do my work. He approached me every minute and hour of the day. He would kiss me fifty times a day and fifty kisses at a time. Then he kept me awake half the night kissing me. He would only quit when I would remonstrate bitterly."

---

The following story of the new Lord Chief Justice is told by a correspondent. I was once (he writes) in the old Court of Appeal, when Mr. Rufus Isaacs, as a junior, was arguing a case before the court over which Lord Esher presided. Lord Esher had the disconcerting habit of breaking in upon counsel, especially juniors, in the middle of their argument with questions—a practice which may have shortened tedious cases, but was not altogether fair to its victims. In this instance he fired off posers time after time at the counsel, and every time Mr Isaacs with perfect courtesy and good humour would drop his argument, take up the new question, deal with it, and then return. "As I was submitting to your Lordships——" and so on. Lord Esher in a few minutes would thrust in another question, and once more counsel's imperturbable coolness and confidence would deal with it. At the close of the argument Lord Esher—a grim old man with a face like a Chinese idol—spoke to the other Lord Justice, and then said, "The Court desires me to thank you, Mr. Isaacs, for the manner in which you have argued this case." Counsel's pallid face flushed at this unprecedented compliment, and quite a little thrill ran round the solicitors and barristers' clerks in court.—*Ex.*

---

A judgment recently delivered in Saskatchewan of *Mcighen v. Knappen* brings up an interesting question of law, and we may be indebted to the Solicitor-General for the settlement of a doubtful point. It appears that he obtained a judgment some years ago for payments due him on a sale of land to the defendant. Since the date of the judgment the plaintiff also obtained an order for foreclosure; and now it would appear that the defendants claim that the money judgment cannot be enforced, as the plaintiff has the land back. If the case goes further it will decide an interesting point of law as to which there has been a divergence of opinion.