

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE—REVIEW.

ity, or by the negligence, defaults or irregularities of the manager.—*The Bank of Toronto v. The European Assurance Society*, 13 L. C. Jurist, 63.

CORPORATION.

Held, That a city corporation may be sued in damages for assaults committed by its servants, such as policemen, when the assaults are approved and attempted to be justified by the Corporation.—*Doolan v. The Corporation of Montreal*, 13 L. C. Jurist, 71.

INSOLVENCY.

Held, that an insolvent may validly make a voluntary assignment to any official assignee, whether resident or not within the county wherein such insolvent has his place of business.—*Brown v. Douglas*, 13 L. C. Jurist, 29.

INSOLVENCY—SECRETION.

Held (TORRANCE, J., dissenting). 1st. Where a trading partnership obtained advances from a bank under an agreement, that the moneys derived from the sale of hemlock bark extract, manufactured by them, should go in liquidation of the debt to the bank, and the said partnership, while in a state of insolvency and largely indebted to the bank, sold a quantity of bark extract, and applied the proceeds to the payment of other debts; that such act did not amount to secretion.

2nd. That there cannot be constructive secretion.—*The Quebec Bank v. Steers et al.*, 13 L. C. Jurist 75.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE LAW JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—Are clerks of the Superior Courts—or deputies—or clerks of the County Courts, authorised in issuing subpoenas in cases depending in their courts, without the production and filing of a præcipe by the party making the application.

Yours, &c.,

Chatham, April 6, 1869.

ONE, &c.

[The practice in the Crown offices in Toronto is not to require præcipes for the issue of subpoenas. We presume the same rule should be observed in the outer counties.—Eds. L. J.]

REVIEWS.

THE LAW OF RAILWAY COMPANIES, COMPRISING THE COMPANIES CLAUSES, THE LANDS CLAUSES, THE RAILWAY CLAUSES CONSOLIDATION ACTS, THE RAILWAY COMPANIES ACTS, 1867, AND THE REGULATION OF RAILWAYS ACT, 1868. With notes of all the decided cases on these Acts, &c. By Hy. Godefroi, of Lincoln's Inn, and John Shortt, of the Middle Temple, Barristers-at-Law. London: Stevens & Hauges, Law Booksellers and Publishers, 11 Bell Yard, Temple Bar, 1869.

We have to thank the publishers for an early copy of this work. The editors appear to have acquitted themselves well. The notes are terse and yet sufficiently full to give the desired information as to judicial interpretation of the sections annotated. Annotated editions of important acts of Parliament are of great service to the profession, and for purposes of ready reference are preferable to treatises. The aim of an editor of an annotated edition of a statute should be to avoid loading his notes with details as to facts. What the reader of such a work wants is the marrow of the decision, and that expressed in the fewest possible words. The editors of the work before us have not been unmindful of this requisite. By observing it they have succeeded in presenting to the profession a great body of law on subjects of very general importance in a portable form, considering that our Railway Clauses Consolidation Act is in great part taken from the English Act, the value of this work to all interested in Canadian railways is obvious; with many railways constructed, others in course of construction, and yet others projected, there is already much "railway litigation" among us. The duties and obligations of railway companies to "adjoining proprietors," and the public are not at all times easily ascertained or easily defined. The consequence is daily increasing litigation, and daily increasing necessity for a work like that now before us. Its cost is so moderate as to place it within the reach of all. The facility it affords for reference to decided cases is so great that the possessor of it must save time, and "time saved" to a man of good practice in our profession is "money made." The index is truly exhaustive. By means of succinct notes and an elaborate index no real