

Vezina v. Lefebvre et vir.....	179	Wilkins v. Tobacco Ins. Co.....	136
Vien v. Sicotte et al.....	270	Wilkinson v. The State.....	146
Viger v. Corp. of Town of Longueuil.....	267	Williams v. Williams.....	80
		Williamson v. Barbour.....	87
Waldron v. Brennan.....	333	Wilson v. Grand Trunk Railway Co.....	45
Walker v. Wait.....	112	" & Rafter.....	211
Ward v. Atlantic & Pacific Tel. Co.....	144	" v. Rhodes.....	72
" v. Hobbs.....	160, 274	Wingate v. Foster.....	64
Washington v. State.....	18	Woosier v. The State.....	112
Watson v. Thompson.....	142, 387	Workman et vir & Renny.....	82
Weeks v. New York, N. H. & Hartford RR.....	143	Wornack v. Circle.....	79
Weldon v. Dicks.....	152	Wright et al. & Foster.....	394
White v. Miller.....	144		
Whitehouse, In re.....	88	Yarrow v. Knightly.....	80
Whiteman v. Hawkins.....	135	Yglesias v. Mercantile Bank.....	56
Wilkes v. Beaudry.....	157	Young v. Dental Association of P. Q. .	292, 294

ERRATA.—P. 201, for "rerespented," read "represented."

P. 202, for "*Mills & Weare*," read "*Mills & Meier*."

P. 312, for Lazeau, read Lareau.

P. 414, the heading "Superior Court," should appear over the case of "*Maillé v. Richler*."

P. 349, *Comp. de Prêt. et Crédit Foncier & Baker*, the grounds of the judgment of the Court below are imperfectly stated. The principal *considérant* was as follows:—"Considering that the petitioners *en nullité de décret* have proved the allegations of their petition, and that under the first notice of sale given in this case, the said sheriff cannot give them more than the thing sold, that is to say, lot 620, and that there was essential misdescription in saying that the house mentioned in the notice was on lot 620;" &c. The property was described in the notice as No. 620, and as having a two story wooden house on it, while, in fact, the house stood partly on the lot sold, and partly on the next lot.