

Under what circumstances contributory negligence is a good defence has been discussed in *Siner v. G. W. Ry. L. R. 4 Ex. 119* (largely overruled), *Robson v. North Eastern Ry. Co.*, 2 *Q. B. Div. 85*; *Rose v. North Eastern Ry. 2 Ex. Div.*; *Jackson v. The Metropolitan Ry. Co. L. R. 3 App. Ca. 197*, *Haldane v. Great Western Ry. Co. 30 U. C. 97*; *Jones v. Grand Trunk Ry. Co.*, 45 *U. C. 198*; *Edgar v. Northern Ry. Co. 4 Ont. R. 201*; *Bliss v Boeckh*, 8 *Ont. R. 451*; and in the cases above noted.

THE LAW REPORTS.

UNDER the present regulations of the Law Society the Editor of the LAW REPORTS is restricted to 32 pages per month. The consequence is that the reporting is falling very much in arrear, and that the profession is deprived of the advantage of a prompt perusal of many valuable judgments. We would recommend the Law Society to remove all limitation—to require that all cases worth reporting should be reported, and reported without delay.

That the delay may be the less prejudicial we give below a synopsis of the points determined during the last Term. The reports, unless some new arrangement be made, cannot be published for three months to come.

PARENTEAU v. HARRIS. *Husband and wife.—Execution.—Purchaser for value without notice.* A husband and wife owned adjoining farms. That of the wife was worked entirely by the husband; his horses and implements being used for the purpose, and the wife in no way interfered, or took part, in it. The seed grain had been paid for partly by the husband and partly by the wife. A man employed at