

and admitting substantially what was stated by the witnesses in their depositions before the commissioner.

Held, per DRAKE, J., that as the commission evidence was not put in by defendant as part of his case, defendant should be deprived of the costs of it.

Held, also, that defendant was not entitled to the costs of the abortive trials.

Langley, for defendant. *Cassidy*, K.C., for prosecution.

Book Reviews.

A treatise on injunctions and other extraordinary remedies. By Thomas Carl Spelling. 2nd edition. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1901.

This is a second edition of Mr. Spelling's well-known work, and consists of two volumes, comprising in all nearly 1900 pages. The largest portion of the work is devoted to the subject of injunctions, but the law relating to habeas corpus, mandamus, prohibition, quo warranto and certiorari is also fully considered. As this is a second edition, it is hardly necessary to give a detailed review of its contents. The number of cases cited is enormous, principally of course United States decisions, but they are by no means confined to those of that country. In this edition Mr. Spelling has wisely followed the excellent arrangement adopted in the first edition, but has added a number of new sections required for further clearness and exactitude owing to the development of the law. The author seems to have the happy faculty of gathering together appropriate cases into the numerous sub-divisions of each subject so that the work is a valuable digest as well as an excellent treatise. As some one has said, he dominates his subject, and does not allow his subject to confuse or dominate him.

UNITED STATES DECISIONS.

SOLICITOR—PRIVILEGE—Privileged communications to an attorney are held, in *Koeber v. Somers* (Wis.) 52 L.R.A. 512, not to include a conversation giving authority to compromise on action, since the giving of such authority necessarily implies a right to communicate the fact.

SLANDER OF CORPORATION.—Slander of a person who is a majority stockholder and officer of a corporation, when not spoken with respect to the business of the company, is held in *Brayton v. Cleveland Special Police Co.* (Ohio) 52 L.R.A. 525, to give the corporation no right of action either for the slander or for the injury to its business which resulted from the loss of public confidence in such person. A note to this case reviews the authorities as to actions for libel or slander of a corporation.