forbid a barrister suing for his fee, they must exist whether the two branches of the profession be united or not. That is to say, the general practitioner cannot sue for his fee when acting as an advocate, but he may when acting as an attorney. But it is apparent at every line that their lordships were dealing with a subject about which they had forgotten anything they ever knew. The question is as old as the hills, and the difficulty is not one of "public policy" properly speaking, but of the nature of the service. There is no way of measuring the value of intellectual and moral services. This is equally true of the advice of a physician, the consolations of a priest and the advocacy of a lawyer. It has nothing to do with "usage or the peculiar constitution of the English Bar." It existed in Rome, and the law of France is not really very different from that of England. In England the action is peremptorily denied—in France the right of action is admitted and the remedy is practically refused. The whole question was well explained in the case of *Devlin & Tumblety* decided in 1858, 2 L. C. J. p. 182; and this case is not over-ruled by *Amyot & Gugy*. R.

THE TIME FOR VACATION.

The *Law Journal* (London) seems to approve of the proposal that the Long Vacation in England shall begin on August 1, (and end on old Michaelmas Day, Oct. 11). This seems to be a reasonable suggestion, and if the time of the year were the only consideration we suppose there are few lawyers who would not welcome the change. Our own Vacation has just been made nine days earlier as well as nine days longer, beginning July 1. Our contemporary says the "abnormal heat" of the weather (80 deg. in the shade) supplies an argument in favour of the proposal. In this "margin of the frozen zone" (*vide American Law Review*), the thermometer as we write (Aug. 21) marks just 91 deg. in the shade and has stood nearly at that point during the best part of seven days; so that our friends of the British Association and tourists from across the border have an opportunity of solving their doubts as to whether the streams and lakes of the country are ever clear of ice, or whether our broad lands are ever anything but "acres of snow."

NOTES OF CASES.

SUPERIOR COURT.

MONTREAL, Feb. 8, 1884.

Before TORRANCE, J.

MAJOR v. PARIS.

Procedure—Absentee—Power of attorney.

The production of a general authorization to sue for the recovery of debts due to an absentee is a sufficient compliance with C.C. P. 120, § 7. It is not necessary that the attorneys ad litem be named therein.

The plaintiff, residing at Chicago, had authorized, by a writing produced, two persons named therein, to buy the book debts of F. X. Major, of Montreal, and to sue for the recovery thereof. The action was on notes in favor of said Major.

The defendant moved that the power of attorney be declared insufficient, contending that a special authorization to plaintiff's attorneys was necessary.

The COURT held that the power of attorney to collect the debts of Major, which had been filed, was a sufficient compliance with the Code.

Motion rejected.

Trudel & Co. for plaintiff.

J. G. D'Amour for defendant.

SUPERIOR COURT.

MONTREAL, January 28, 1884.

Before RAINVILLE, J.

DORION v. DIETTE, & DIETTE, opposant.

Execution—Sale of moveables—Error in advertisement of sale.

An error in the advertisement of sale of moveables seized, giving a wrong number to the place of sale, does not annul the seizure, but merely makes it necessary to give other and correct notices of sale.

In an advertisement published in a newspaper of a sale of moveables, the number of the house where the sale was to take place was given incorrectly.