

hand when they tried to support it if given within fourteen days, or even within three days when 'all were within twenty minutes' walk of each other' (*Tindal v. Brown*, 1 T.R. 168, 9); and so the modern rule was fixed that ordinarily notice is sufficient if given on the following day" (g). "The process is now going on as regards the question of timely notice to the indorser of a demand note" (h).

What a pity, after all, that there was not a "Law Merchant," or a Common Law, wherewith to settle long ago all these age-long controversies; or if indeed there was one, that it has been so irretrievably lost. But may we not yet hope? In London the other day a pachyderm which had lain lost for some 150,000 years was accidentally dug up.

JOHN S. EWART.

Winnipeg, Manitoba.

(g) P. 214, 215, 226.

(h) P. 215. Citing *Paine v. R. R. Co.*, 118 U.S. 152, 160.

Correspondence.

JUDICIAL FRILLS.

To the Editor of the CANADA LAW JOURNAL.

SIR,—No one may hereafter be heard to say that *noblesse* doesn't *oblige* the editors of legal publications in the United States. In the last number of the *American Law Review* I find the following editorial reference (p. 733) to one of the Federal judges: "Mr. United States Circuit Judge LeBaron B. Colt, of Rhode Island." Surely the "Genius of Democracy" will clamour for "the wig and the ermine, the buckles and sword," of the effete English Bench after this!

QUIDNUNC.