

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XX.

JANUARY 15, 1884.

No. 2.

DIARY FOR JANUARY.

- 15. Tue... Primary Ex. for Students and Articled Clerks begin.
- 20. Sun... 2nd Sunday after Epiphany.
- 21. Mon... First Intermediate Examination.
- 24. Thur... Second Intermediate Examination.
- 25. Fri... Sir F. B. Head, Lieut-Governor U. C., 1836.
- 27. Sun... 3rd Sunday after Epiphany.
- 29. Tue... Solicitor's Examination.
- 30. Wed... Barrister's Examination.
- 31. Thur... Earl of Elgin Governor-General, 1847.

TORONTO, JAN. 15, 1884.

WE have received two answers to the legal puzzle stated by us in our last issue, relating to Mr. G. O., his landed estate, and obnoxious tenant, so we can conclude that the rest of our nine hundred and ninety-nine subscribers (there is one lawyer not on our list) found themselves baffled by it. We will therefore put an end to the harassing suspense of these, and enable them to return to their legal duties with composure. The conveyancer to whom Mr. G. O. resorted bethought him of the change in the calendar which was made in the reign of George II. The lease dating back to the time of Charles II., it ran for two hundred years from the day of its date, which day of course related to the months and days of the old calendar, and thus a margin of a few days remained within which to give the necessary six months' notice.

SINCE our article on the change of time inaugurated by the railways, a valued correspondent states a point which certainly seems to render the legalization of the new time divisions somewhat more difficult, viz., that the railway time belts are to some extent arbitrary, and not true meridians. He says:—"The railway

people abandon meridians as boundaries of time belts, and propose zig-zags and curved fancy lines. They have thrown the whole Intercolonial Railway out of 75° time, and so made two standard times at Point Levis, differing by an hour from each other . . . and they intimate that they may change their time belts as they please." We cannot say how far this is true, of our own knowledge, but it would seem to throw a difficulty in the way of the Legislature sanctioning for universal adoption the changes suggested.

THE Privy Council in *Macdonald v. Whitfield*, 49 L. T. N. S., 446, has demolished the decision of the Court of Appeal of this Province in *Janson v. Paxton*, 23 C. P., 439, which laid down the doctrine that where several persons mutually agree to give their indorsements on a bill, as securities for the holder, who wishes to discount it, they must be held to have undertaken liability to each other, not as sureties for the same debt, and so jointly liable in contribution, but as proper indorsers liable to indemnify each other successively, according to the priority of their indorsements, unless it had been specially stipulated that they were to be liable as co-sureties. In the later case of *Fisken v. Mishaw*, 40 U. C. Q. B. 153, Wilson, J., thus referred to *Janson v. Paxton*: "I must say that *Janson v. Paxton* is directly opposed to the English authorities, both at law and in equity, and they are the authorities which ultimately govern our highest Court of Appeal, the Privy Council." This opinion is fully borne out by Lord Watson, who delivered the judg-