summons the same day it was issued, and on 28th December, he tendered the Registrar $27.75, in full payment of the claim and costs, but the garnishee had already paid into court $29.75 in full of the claim and cost of the garnishee summons, The Registrar did not receive the money from the defendant, and under the circumstances would not enter judgment until the matter had been mentioned to the Judge, and on Jan. 4th, 1900, the case was called before DRAKE, J.

Jay, for the defendant contended that as his client had tendered the money before judgment and within the eight days' limit mentioned in the default summons, he could not be made to pay the costs of the garnishee summons.

Higgins, contra.

Held, that the defendant should not be made to pay the costs of the garnishee summons.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

THE eloquent tribute of the Irish Lord Chief Justice to the late Mr. Justice O'Brien is worthy of reproduction in the most prominent form: His Lordship said that the Bench would sorely miss the late Judge's great learning, his rapid appreciation of legal propositions, the infinite charm of his literary attainments, the rare and matchless eloquence which graced and elevated all his judgments and all his public life. They should see no more the sparkle of that bright and lambent wit that left no wound. They should ever remember his unfaltering love of justice, his conspicuous fortitude in the discharge of his official duties. His intrepid nature knew not how to fear. One might say of him the best thing that could be said of any man in judicial life—that to attain justice and to be credited by all honorable and candid minds with a desire to attain it was at once his object and his reward.

FRENCH JUSTICE.—Two things stand out with great prominence in the American view of the Dreyfus trial. One is the extraordinary character of French procedure, and the other is an apparent deficiency in the character of the French people. The ludicrous medley of hearsay, gossip, beliefs, suspicions, imaginings, and emotions received by the French court as evidence is a surprising burlesque upon judicial procedure. Even if the judges should disregard what is palpably irrelevant, that would not prevent it from being absurd. To permit a witness to strut before the court in a grandiose way, and declare that upon his honor he believes the prisoner guilty, is in the highest degree ludicrous. The judges may not attribute quite so much importance to the belief of the witness as he himself does,