

from a court in Quebec.—*In re Queen City Refining Co., Williamson & Calcutt, Mathieu, J.*, June 16, 1886.

Dommage—Injures.

JUGÉ :—Qu'un maître de poste qui retarde injustement d'expédier une lettre à lui confiée, et qui, lorsque la personne qui lui a remise cette lettre, se plaint de ce retard, lui reproche de vouloir lui faire du chantage," et ajoute "qu'elle avait besoin d'argent et qu'elle se servait de faux prétextes pour en obtenir," peut être poursuivi en dommages, et une somme de \$10.00 par lui offerte, n'est pas suffisante.—*Chartrand v. Archambault, Torrance, J.*, 20 novembre 1886.

Prescription—Assessments—City of Montreal—C. C. 2250—Civil Fruits.

HELD :—1. That the prescription of three years, under the Act 42-43 Vict. (Q.) ch. 53, s. 10, is not applicable to arrears of assessments exigible before the passing of said Act.

2. Municipal assessments are included under the term "civil fruits," which are prescribed after five years by C. C. 2250.

3. The fact that the name of the person assessed did not appear in the books of the Corporation as owner, does not preclude a demand for assessments as owner, where it appears that he was, in fact, owner.—*City of Montreal v. Robertson, Torrance, J.*, November 10, 1886.

Prescription—Assessments, City of Montreal—C. C. 2250—Civil Fruits—Collection under warrant—C. C. P. 15.

HELD :—1, 2 and 3, as in *City of Montreal v. Robertson, supra*.

4. The collection of the assessment for one year by a bailiff under a warrant is not a bar to an action for the assessment due for an anterior year.—*City of Montreal v. Fleming, Nov. 10, 1886.*

INSOLVENT NOTICES, ETC.

Quebec Official Gazette, Feb. 19.

Judicial Abandonments.

Milton Pennington, Montreal, Feb. 11.

Germain E. Robitaille, Sherbrooke, Feb. 3.

Spensard & Bedard, Montreal, Feb. 11.

Curators appointed.

Re John O'Neill.—A. W. Stevenson, Montreal, curator, Feb. 9.

Re Narcisse Pilotte, Wotton.—Kent & Turcotte, Montreal, curator, Feb. 10.

Dividend.

Re Mulholland & Baker, Montreal.—Final dividend, payable March 9. Arch. Campbell, Montreal, assignee (under Ins. Act of 1875).

Separation as to Property.

Dame Elizabeth Paulet vs. Louis Beland, trader, Sorel, Feb. 1.

Dame Mary Elizabeth Reuter vs. Job Wallace Taylor, trader, Cowansville, Feb. 16.

GENERAL NOTES.

In *Morse v. Mayo* (Boston) the plaintiff recovered \$150 damages against a dentist who extracted a sound tooth and left the decayed tooth in.

The shrewdness, humor and decisiveness of Vice-Chancellor Bacon were the characteristics which made his popularity with the profession. His humor was not only in his tongue and in his manner, but extended to his pen, which sometimes was unable to refrain from reproducing on the margin of an affidavit or elsewhere the features of a witness which offered provocation. If this talent had been less under control, he might have relieved the Court of Appeal of the difficulty under which they labor in deciding questions of fact upon appeal, namely, that they have not the advantage of seeing "the demeanor of the witnesses." It was supposed that a long-winded counsel would sometimes hardly escape being placed open-mouthed in the pictorial pillory of the judge's note-book, if so much may be revealed of the contents of a volume of high privilege and even of sanctity. The vice-chancellor's pen was less likely to spare the advocate if under his wig he wore a beard, which the vice-chancellor thought obscured the voice. In any case, Vice-Chancellor Bacon did not like long speeches at the bar, and did not indulge in long judgments, although perhaps he had the fault of over-taciturn judges, that his silence sometimes induced his deciding on a ground which would have been shown to be erroneous if known to have been in his mind.—*Law Journal* (London).

Great lawyers are seldom good witnesses. When Lord Selborne stepped into the witness-box, in *Adams v. Coleridge*, he was asked, "Did you know that your solicitor was acting for Miss Coleridge?" And he answered, "I should prefer to state what passed." The statement was so little what the plaintiff wanted to know, that at last Lord Selborne confessed, "Perhaps I had better answer the question put to me," which a good witness would have done at first. Sir Charles Russell's lapse of memory in regard to John Baptist's Day was perhaps precipitated by the discomfort of having so accomplished a man and subtle an advocate by his side as a client. If so, the disturbing influence was its own remedy, as, no doubt, it was the distinguished defendant himself who brought back the Court to the consciousness that the day was identical with a familiar quarter-day.