

## The Legal News.

VOL. IX. SEPTEMBER 18, 1886. No. 38.

"B," who is generally understood to be a correspondent filling a high judicial office, writes to the *London Times*:—"It may be a difficult thing for the Americans to make a law to punish or prevent the plots against this country now being formed in Chicago; and if they could, they may be unwilling to do so. But we are not without a remedy in our own hands. The subjects of this country may be made directly liable for acts done abroad. Of course, nothing could be done against them till they came within the jurisdiction. The subjects or citizens of other States, who owe no allegiance here, could not be directly affected by our legislation; but they could be indirectly. Thus there might be a statute that no one not a British subject committing certain acts should enter British territory, and that if he did, he should be liable to the same penalty as a British subject committing the same offence. Such a law would be acted on by our Courts. It could only be objected to by foreign States as a breach of the comity of nations. But it would not be open to such an objection if only a reasonable protection for ourselves. Such a law would reach naturalised persons if they visited us."

In the case of *Maberly v. Maberly*, July 19, the Court of Chancery took notice of the present disturbed condition of affairs in Ireland. A testator had directed that the whole of his estate, real and personal, should be converted, and invested in Irish land. Vice-Chancellor Bacon held that in present circumstances it would be improper and imprudent on the part of the trustees to follow their testator's instructions in this respect.

The following document was delivered to the Rev. Mr. Drought on his expulsion from France for presenting an address of condolence to the Duc d'Aumale: "Considering

Article 7 of the law of November 13 and 21 and December 3, 1849," worded as follows: "The Minister of the Interior may, by a measure of police, order any foreigner travelling or residing in the territory to leave immediately and to have him conducted to the frontier;" considering the reports of the Prefect of the Oise, dated July 24 and 29, 1886, concerning M. Drought, an English subject residing at Chantilly; considering that the presence of the above-named foreigner on French territory is of a nature to compromise the public safety—on the recommendation of the Prefect of the Oise, the Minister decrees—Article 1. M. Drought is ordered to quit French territory. Article 2. The Prefect of the Oise is charged with the execution of the present decree.—The Minister of the Interior, SARRIEN."

### COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.

QUEBEC, May, 1886.

HALL, Appellant, and THE UNION BANK OF LOWER CANADA, Respondent.

*Procedure—Demand for Particulars.*

*In an action upon a promissory note, the defendant moved that the plaintiff be required to furnish him with a statement of assets, realized by the plaintiff, and which should be set off against the note, and that the delay to plead should not run until such statement was furnished.*

**HELD:**—*That such a demand, if properly supported by evidence, might be made by motion, but the better course for the defendant was to plead the counter indebtedness, or to file an incidental demand; and accordingly the court affirmed the judgment of the lower court, which rejected such motion.*

**RAMSAY, J.** This is an appeal from an interlocutory judgment dismissing a motion. The action was on a promissory note; the motion was made by the defendant, praying the court to order that he be furnished with a statement of assets realized by the plaintiff, and which should be set off against the note, and that the delay to plead shall not run until such statement be furnished.

It was moved to reject this appeal, because