

made his statement was so far in charge of the premises that it must be imputed to the company that the statement was made to him as a person who, in the absence of others, had authority to receive it, and T.'s withdrawal of his application must be taken to have been communicated to the company. Further, that directors who are making allotments of shares based upon payments to their bankers, ought to make inquiry as to the payments. The stoppage of T.'s cheque was on record, and if the directors in the present case had ascertained that they would have been put upon their guard. The allotment to T. had been made without authority, and he was entitled to the relief he asked for.

---

*LORD RUSSELL ON THE LATE CHIEF JUSTICE COLERIDGE.*

As the late Chief Justice Coleridge has fared somewhat hardly at the hands of his biographers, it is but fair that so competent a critic as his successor, Lord Russell of Killowen, should say what he knows. This he has done in an article contributed to the *North American Review*.

Speaking of the celebrated "silver" tongue, Lord Russell says: "If I except the voices of, perhaps, Sir Alexander Cockburn, Mr. Gladstone, the present Sir Robert Peel, and the late Father Burke, of the Dominican Order, I shall have exhausted the list of those who may be said to have been his superiors in this respect."

His power of advocacy are thus referred to: "Mr. Coleridge possessed the gift of lucid exposition, and had higher qualities as an advocate than Mr. Karlake. He commanded a more beautiful diction, a finer voice, and he was endowed with a power of imagination and of pathos in which his rival was deficient. It used to be said of Mr. Coleridge that he was worst in a losing and best in a winning case, when a blaze of fireworks was wanted. I think this does not do him justice. I have known him fight difficult cases strenuously, and winning cases modestly. He was taken all in all, a remarkable advocate. No doubt the case with which his name will be principally linked is the *Tichborne Case*. His cross-examination of the Claimant was at the time the subject of widely divergent opinions at the Bar. For my own part, I thought it, and still think it, the best thing he ever did. It was not a cross-examination calculated, nor should I think even