

The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. III. DECEMBER, 1867. No. 6.

SQUATTERS.

A case of great importance to proprietors of Eastern Townships lands will be found in the present issue. In *Ellice v. Courtemanche*, the Court of Appeal has decided that a person squatting upon unoccupied land, without a shadow of title, and clearing the land or building on it, is entitled to demand the value of his improvements before he can be ejected. This decision would afford much cause for regret, did not one or two of the circumstances connected with the case render it one of peculiarity. The question is one which does not require much knowledge of law for its decision. "Am I to put my hand in my neighbor's pocket," said the CHIEF JUSTICE, "because he is a dishonest man?" But put this in another way. Is (not my neighbor but) some parasitical interloper to take advantage of my back being turned, to fasten upon my property, and then am I to be dragged into a troublesome litigation, and to be subjected to the annoyance and anxiety of an *expertise*, to determine in what sum I am to be mulcted for his voluntary and unasked for services, and then if I cannot pay this sum with heavy costs added, am I lose my property altogether? Surely this would be a monstrous proposition. In the case of *Courtemanche*, however, as Mr. Justice DRUMMOND pointed out, there were peculiar circumstances. The plaintiff had an agent who should have notified him that his land had been trespassed upon, but who, on the contrary, allowed the defendant to pay the taxes year after year for three years, and no steps were taken till the value of the land had been more than quadrupled.

THE LANDLORD'S PRIVILEGE.

The case of *Easty v. Fabrique*, reported in this number, is of much interest to commission merchants and others who have to

store goods in bonded warehouses, and who can now do so without fear of a seizure for rent due by the lessee of the premises, so long as the storage has been paid. The owners of goods are in fact placed in somewhat the same position as subtenants who have paid their rent to the party from whom they leased. No doubt of the propriety of the decision could arise, even if it were not fully borne out (as it is) by the authorities.

THE COURT OF APPEALS.

The December term of the Court of Appeals was characterized by unusual vigor on the part of the CHIEF and puisne Judges, and an unusual amount of business was dispatched. Thirty-five cases were taken *en délibéré*, and the old *délibérés* were disposed of. It is probable that some important changes will be made in the members of the Bench constituting this Court before the business of the March term is proceeded with. The Court has been adjourned for judgments to the 28th February next.

FIVE AND TWENTY YEARS AGO.

We have been favored with the perusal of a pamphlet, printed in this city a quarter of a century ago, containing the report of a committee of the Montreal Bar on the state of the administration of justice. It is curious to observe that some of the evils complained of at the present day were in existence in 1842, and specially pointed out in the Report. One of these was the obstruction to business, occasioned by the deficiency of judges in the Montreal District, and the infirmities of one of the judges sitting on the Bench. The Committee also made a sore grievance of the interruptions of counsel by judges during argument. "They must enter their protest against the tone of petulance and cholera, heretofore assumed by a part of the judiciary; and as a matter of right they claim for the bar, both in chambers and in court, entire immunity from offensive language and demeanor."

The charge of offensive behaviour on the bench is one which a judge possessed of tact