

THE
Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXXI.

JUNE 15, 1895.

No. 11

A CORRESPONDENT rightly assumes that there must be a large amount of *personalia* of the Bench and Bar, and anecdotes and incidents of much interest, well worth preserving, connected with the traditions and current history of the Bar in the various Provinces, which is at present lying waste, and being forgotten and lost. He suggests that it would be well to garner them in a department of this journal. We concur, and shall be very glad to hear from any of our subscribers with such material as they can give us in this connection. It would be a congenial occupation for some of our readers during long vacation to put into concrete shape such stories of the past as may be floating nebulously in their minds.

AN old subscriber suggests "the propriety of discussing *Hollender v. Ffoulkes*, 16 P.R. 315, in which the defendant's appeal was dismissed with costs, bearing in mind that the question of waiver had not been broached in the argument before Mr. Justice Street, and that no application was ever made to extend the time." It hardly seems necessary to go into this matter at any great length. The Divisional Court, on the appeal from Judge Street's order, held that the order was *substantially right*, but that it was technically defective in not having expressly extended the time for putting in security, as well as allowing the bond. They varied the order in this respect, but ordered the defendant (appellant) to pay the costs, because he had substantially failed in his appeal.

WE see by the decision of the Chancellor *In re Gray*, 26 Ont. 355, that it has been held that an estate tail to which an infant