

great deal of matter into a few words. Although an active conservative and a convincing platform speaker, he has never been induced to become a candidate for any political office or position.

In 1882 Mr. Wilson married Anna Marsden, eldest daughter of C. R. Atkinson, Q.C., Chatham.

Our portrait is copied from a photograph of Mr. Wilson as he appeared before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The costume is unknown in the Dominion, except, strangely enough, in the extreme westerly province of British Columbia.

The following appointments have been made to the County Court Bench: J. R. O'Reilly, Q.C., of Prescott, has been appointed judge of the County Court of the United Counties of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry in the place of Judge Pringle resigned. Neil McCrimmon, barrister, of Toronto, fills the vacancy caused by the death of G. H. F. Dartnell, late judge of the County of Ontario; and Robt. B. Carman, junior judge of Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, becomes judge in the room of E. J. Senkler, deceased, late County Judge of Lincoln.

The *Central Law Journal* calls attention to the case of *Marden v. Dorthy* decided by the Court of Appeals of New York, which, it is said, has caused great discussion and comment in that State, and is worthy of note by practitioners of this country. As stated by our contemporary, the facts of the case were that the owner of property was induced by artifice to sign her name to a paper without any knowledge that it was a deed, and she had no intention of conveying her property. The deed was never delivered nor acknowledged, but a genuine certificate of acknowledgement was in some way obtained and the deed recorded. No consideration passed, and the grantee had no knowledge of the deed, and was induced by artifice to sign papers which proved to be mortgages on the property. The owner lived on the property, with the grantee, her daughter, her name appearing in large letters on the doorplate and house block, and the alleged bona fide mortgagees resided in the same city. It did not appear that the mortgagees ever saw the genuine signature of the owner, or made any investigation beyond the record. It was held that the owner was not estopped from questioning the validity of the fictitious mortgages