point in issue between us, but in its spirit is against him. His other case of *Franklin* v. *Beesley*, in 1st El. & El. Reports, is expressly against him, shewing that the debt to be discharged must be included in the schedule. In this last case, *Leonard* v. *Baker*, 15 M. & W., 202, is referred to (and "Quinte" had better see it), which supports my position. His last case in 8 Jurist is also against him. I observe that there has been a case just decided in the Queen's Bench, *McKay et al.* v. *Goodson*, reported in No. 5 of Vol. 27 of the Queen's Bench Reports, in which Mr. Justice Morrison, holds, that to enable an insolvent to ask for a discharge, if arrested for a debt due prior to his assignment in bankruptcy, he must clearly show that the debt was included in his schedule filed with his assignment. His words are, "Upon an application of this nature it is the duty of the applicant to show specifically that the creditor's debt appears on the schedule."

Now I end this article by saying, "Quinte" has attacked my article to very little purpose, and has caused me to look into cases thoroughly confirming me in my view, that "a debt due from an insolvent before his assignment, to be barred, must be included in his schedule, else the liability remains."

I think, moreover, every lawyer in Canada will agree with me in the opinion, that the insolvent laws of Canada require to be read over a great many times before we can get a proper knowledge of the true meaning of them and that it is difficult to understand some clauses at all. I also venture to say that my remarks as to assignees will be assented to, by the legal profession throughout Ontario.

SCARBORO'.

Toronto, June 22, 1868.

Bill Stamps.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL.

GENTLEMEN,—Is a promissory note, draft or Bill of Exchange for an amount less than $25 liable to duty under part 1, Dominion Statutes, 31 Vict. Cap. II. Some of the profession here hold that it is. By inserting this short letter in your next issue and giving your opinion on the subject you will oblige

Yours, &c.,

A STUDENT.

Goderich, June 3rd, 1868.

A FASTIDIOUS JUDGE.

We take this from a newspaper:

"At the last sitting of the Tunbridge County Court, the judge, Mr. J. J. Lonsdale, made the following observations:—In consequence of several parties having business in the court coming in their working apparel, he wished to state that all persons who came to that court, which was the Queen's court, should be properly dressed, and not in their working clothes, and had they any claim for expenses he should disallow them. He considered the court had dwindled down in this respect as bad as the old court of conscience. Of course, if parties had no better clothes to put on they were to be pitied, but generally speaking persons when they went out on the slighest occasion put on their best clothes. Very frequently people came to the County Court just as if they had been fetched out of the street to a police court. It was very disrespectful to himself, and very annoying to a well-dressed person to sit beside a miller or a baker who was in his working clothes. He certainly should be very strict in this matter in future, and should most decidedly disallow any person expenses who came to the court dressed in a manner which he considered was disrespectful both to himself and the court."

It is difficult to believe that Mr. Lonsdale was in earnest when he decreed that nobody should come into his presence unless clothed in his "Sunday best." A baker hot from the bake-house, a miller fresh from the mill, is not a pleasant neighbour in a crowded court; still less so is a chimney sweep; but courts of justice are for all classes and all callings, and the well-dressed and fastidious must submit to an occasional dusting of their coats, or offending of their noses, in return for the advantage they derive from the existence of tribunals which secure to them possession of the good things with which a happier lot has blessed them. Certainly a judge travels out of his proper province when prescribing how suitors and witnesses shall be clothed, and to refuse costs to a man because he wears a dirty coat is a stretch of power which would invite grave censure were it not so utterly ludicrous. We trust Mr. Lonsdale will reconsider his hasty resolution, and we are sure that no judge will follow his example.—*Law Times.*

One or two curious decisions have been lately given by magistrates in England as to what constitutes cruelty to animals. Some months ago a bench of Glocestershire justices held that to cause great agony to a dog by pouring spirits of turpentine upon the roots of its tail, did not amount to "cruelly torturing" within the statutory provision thereto relating. We do not expect to have statutes particularly well interpreted by county J. P.s, but we own to being considerably surprised at a conclusion recently arrived at by Mr. Trafford, stipendary magistrate at Salford, who determined that several men who engaged in a "pig hunt," the fun of which appears to have consisted in peppering the carcase of an unfortunate pig with small shot until its hide was riddled like a cullender, in order to make it run, were not guilty of cruelty to the pig. Since neither of these acts was held to amount to cruelly torturing, it would be curious to know what would.—*Exchange.*