

FIXTURES—MOVABLE CHATTELS—MANSION—STUFFED BIRD COLLECTION.

Hill v. Bullock (1897), 2 Ch. 55, was an action brought to determine the question whether stuffed birds, attached to movable trays, placed in cases affixed to the walls of a mansion house, were fixtures, and as such passed with the house as annexed to the freehold, or whether they were chattels which would pass to a trustee in bankruptcy. Kekewich, J., decided that the stuffed birds were not fixtures, but passed as chattels. The cases in which the birds were contained were conceded to be fixtures. An attempt was made to bring the case within the principle of a decision of Lord Romilly to the effect that statues, though not actually affixed to a building, but which were placed in or upon it in furtherance of the general architectural design of the building and not merely ornaments to be afterwards added, were fixtures, but Kekewich, J. thought the principle of that decision might properly be extended to structures such as those in which the birds were contained, but not to the contents thereof.

Correspondence.

NEW RULES AND FORMS—ONTARIO.

To the Editor of the Canada Law Journal.

DEAR SIR,—How long will the long suffering legal profession submit to injustice without murmur? The popular delusion to the contrary notwithstanding, no class of men are more patient under tribulation than members of this profession, even when wounded in the house of their friends. This soliloquy is occasioned by the innovations created by the new Consolidated Rules of Practice. If the learned Commission, whose labors have resulted in the promulgation of the new Rules deemed it necessary to amend the old ones, surely they might have kept their hands off the forms. What further information the non-professional defendant may be supposed to gather from the intimation in the new form of writ, that if he does not defend himself the plaintiff may pro-