

The Legal News.

VOL. X. SEPTEMBER 17, 1887. No. 38.

The case of *The Bradstreet Co. & Carsley*, M. L. R., 3 Q. B. 83, has been settled, and the questions involved will, therefore, not be submitted to a higher tribunal. A case much resembling this, has lately been decided by the New Jersey Court of Appeals, *King v. Patterson*, 9 Atl. Rep'r, 705. The Court held that a communication made by the proprietor of a mercantile agency, in respect to the character and financial standing of a trader, is privileged when made to those of its patrons who have a special interest in the information communicated. But this privilege does not extend to publications made to patrons who have no such interest in the subject-matter. The publication by mercantile agency of a notification sheet, which is sent to its subscribers irrespective of their interest in the plaintiff's standing and credit, is not a privileged communication, and the proprietors are liable for a false report of the plaintiff's financial condition in such publication.

The *Law Journal* (London), referring to the retirement of Mr. Justice Grove, who has been succeeded by Mr. Charles, Q.C., in the Queen's Bench Division, says: "The characteristic by which Mr. Justice Grove will be remembered by the profession was his simple and laborious love of justice. He might be relied on to try every case that came before him with an anxious desire to arrive at the truth, which was not diverted a hair's breadth by any of the smaller judicial vices, such as vanity, ambition, or the love of applause. He has a constitutional abhorrence of shams and a native common sense which stood him in good stead on the bench. A peculiarity about his career was that he was the only man of science, in the special application of the word, on the bench of his time, but that no judge's judgments were less scientific in form, and that cases requiring scientific knowledge, such as patent cases, by some perversity of chance seldom came in

his way. On one occasion, we believe, there was a serious collision between his judicial and experimental characters. Trying a gang of coiners on circuit, Mr. Justice Grove listened patiently, but with an amused smile, to a policeman describing the use to which an implement of the coiners' art, which he had captured, was put by them. He expatiated on the value of it to coiners from the smallness of its size, characterising it, from the point of view of the Queen's revenue, as the most 'mischievous' thing that ever was made. 'I believe, my lord,' he added, 'they call it a Grove battery.'

A question of some interest to tenants of portions of a building has been decided by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts (*Lowell v. Strahan*, June 30, 1887, 12 Northw. Rep. 401). The Court held that a lease of the "first floor" of a building includes not only the interior, but also the front wall of that part of the building, as parcel of the leased premises, and gives the lessee not merely a privilege or easement appurtenant to the building to use the wall for certain purposes, such as putting out signs, but the right to the exclusive use thereof.

COUR SUPERIEURE.

FRASERVILLE, 22 juin 1887.

Coram CIMON, J.

ANTIL V. MARTIN, Esqté.

C. C. Arts. 165, 166, 169, 170.—*Obligation du père de nourrir, entretenir et élever ses enfants.*

JUGÉ:—*Que le père a droit d'exiger que les revenus personnels de ses enfants mineurs satisfassent à leurs dépenses d'entretien, de nourriture et d'éducation; ou, en d'autres termes, que le père n'est pas obligé d'encourir ces dépenses sur ses biens personnels, si ses enfants ont des revenus.*

Le défendeur est le tuteur des six enfants mineurs du demandeur. Celui-ci allègue que chacun de ces enfants ont un revenu personnel de douze piastres par année; que ces enfants demeurent avec lui, qu'il leur donne tous les soins et les entretient, les