

at Hamilton, in the Province of Ontario, and that before the date of the alleged service, the defendants had ceased doing business in Montreal, and had not at the time of said alleged service, any office in Montreal where, or any agent there upon whom, service could be made; that the return was false, and they prayed to be allowed to contest the truth thereof, and that it might be declared false, &c.

The plaintiff filed an answer in law, in which he alleged that the exception was unfounded and illegal, because the truth of the return could only be contested by improbation, or by motion if the court so ordered, and not by *exception à la forme*.

The Superior Court (Loranger, J.) dismissed the exception with costs, the *Considérant* of the judgment being:

“Que la vérité du rapport de signification en cette cause ne peut être contestée par voie d'exception à la forme, mais doit l'être soit par inscription de faux ou par requête sur permutation du tribunal.”

Tait, Q. C., moved for leave to appeal from this interlocutory judgment, and cited C. C. P. articles 116, 119, 79, and 159; *Hudon v. Solman*, 12 L. C. J. 120; *McMillan v. Buchanan*, 17 L. C. J. 13; *Brosseau v. Alves*, 17 L. C. J. 228; 2 Doutre P. C. 36, Nos. 74 & 75.

Morris, contra, relied on Arts. 79 and 159 C. C. P., and also contended that the two cases last above cited supported the judgment.

The Court intimated that it was against the judgment, and suggested that the plaintiff would save costs by desisting therefrom; as the appeal would have to be allowed.

The judgment was accordingly desisted from.

Motion granted as to costs.

Abbott, Tait & Abbotts for defendant moving.
J. L. Morris for plaintiff.

GENERAL NOTES.

The refusal of Lord Coleridge to visit Canada after he had led the Canadians to suppose that he would do so, has naturally caused a considerable amount of disappointment in that colony. All the arrangements for the reception of his Lordship had been made by the Bar of Ontario, the time for his visit to Toronto had been fixed by Lord-Coleridge himself, and everything was in readiness for what we doubt not would have been a brilliant reception. To throw aside a definite engagement with the Bench and the Bar of—

what a writer in a Canadian journal not inaccurately describes as “the noblest province of the British Empire,” is unfortunate to say the least.—*London Law Times*.

The Chicago Legal News says: “We have watched the course of the Lord Chief Justice since he has been in this country, very closely, and we have not been able to say that he has made any mistake except this one. This was certainly a mistake as the result has shown. He was invited to a complimentary dinner, which for reasons best known to himself he declined, and suggested to the committee that Sir James Hannen and Lord Justice Bowen would be glad to accept the complimentary dinner which was to be prepared for the Lord Chief Justice of England.”

In accordance with a suggestion made to us by correspondents in Nebraska, we give below the pronunciation of such American names of reporters and legal authors as seem to be liable to mispronunciation:—Angell, Ain'jell; Bigelow, Big'el-o (g hard); Bispham, Bisp'h'am; Bouvier, Boo-veer'; Brevard, Bre-ward'; Cheves, Chev'ess; Coldwell, Cald-well'; Deady, Dee'dy; Denio, De-ny'o; Dessausure, Des-saus-sure; Devereux, Deve'r-o; Dillon, Dil'on; Du-vall, Du-vall'; Ewell, Yew'el; Gill, Gillman, G hard; Gilmer, Gilpin, G hard; Hening, Hen'ing, Houk, Howk; Houston, How's-ton; Keyes, Kize; Lea, Lee; Leigh, Lee; Littell, Lit-tell'; McLean, Mac-lane; Minot, My'nott; Rapajje, Rap' al-jay; Schouler, Skool'er; Taney, Taw'ney; Wythe, With (th as in thong); Yeates, Yates.—*Soule and Bugbee's Legal Bibliography*.

Some curious ceremonies, says an English journal, are still kept up in the Tower of London. That of locking up the tower of nights is the most ancient, and the most stately. A few minutes before the clock strikes eleven, the porter, with an attendant, appears before the main guard-house, carrying a lantern, and calls out, “Escort Keys.” The guard, supplied always from the Queen's Household Troops, then turns out and escorts “Keys” to the outer gate, called the “Spur,” each sentry challenging as they pass his post, “Who goes there?” “Keys.” After the gates are securely locked and barred, the procession returns, the sentries exacting the same explanation as before. When they come in front of the main guard-house the sentry stationed there gives a loud stamp on the ground with his foot and demands, “Who goes there?” “Keys.” “Whose keys?” “Queen Victoria's keys.” “Pass, Queen Victoria's keys and all's well.” The porter then calls out, “God bless Queen Victoria!” to which the main guard responds, “Amen.” The guard then presents arms, the officer kisses the hilt of his sword, and the keys are deposited in the lieutenant's lodging. After this all ingress and egress is impossible.

Not many years ago there lived in the city of Montgomery, Alabama, a young man whom we will call Smith. He had not long resided in the city before he betook himself to the study of law, and to that end borrowed a straight back chair and space to put it, in the office of one of the prominent law firms in that city. One day the senior member of the firm requested Smith to look up for him some authorities on the question of ejectment. Smith undertook his task with great alacrity, and felt highly flattered that his instructor should have intrusted to him so important a matter. The first volumes in which he began to make his search were the old English Reports. He had searched through almost the entire series of Reports without finding any authorities. And in almost every case he encountered, *Ree* figured as one of the parties. The search was long and arduous, however, before he lost his patience with *Ree*. Finally he could stand it no longer, and impatiently exclaimed “Governor, who is this man *Ree*? He is the most interminable litigant I ever heard of, and he must have lived to be two or three hundred years old.”—*Alabama Law Journal*.