

publique, ne s'engage pas personnellement, mais seulement comme commune ;

3. Que la renonciation à la communauté de biens que fait une femme en se séparant de biens judiciairement d'avec son mari, la libère entièrement de toutes les obligations qu'elle a pu encourir comme commune en biens avant la séparation.—*Bourgouin v. Roy, Jetté, J.*, 27 juin 1887.

*Sale—Jus disponendi—C. C. 1025.*

*Held*, Where a person who sells goods on time, shows by his acts his purpose to retain the property therein until the conditions of sale be complied with,—as, for example, by consigning the goods to his own agent in the city where the purchaser resides, with instructions not to part with the bill of lading until the purchaser shall have accepted a draft for the price,—the right of property does not pass to the purchaser, and the agent of the vendor may retain the goods in the event of the purchaser refusing to accept a draft for the price payable at the expiration of the term of credit.—*McGillivray v. Watt, In Review, Johnson, Torrance, Mathieu, J.J.*, June 30, 1886.

*Procedure—Summons—C. C. P. 69—Leave to serve writ in Ontario.*

*Held*, That leave to serve a writ of summons in Ontario under Art. 69 C.C.P., is sufficient, if annexed to the writ, on a separate sheet, without being endorsed in writing upon the writ.—*Kilburn v. Ward, In Review, Johnson, Rainville, Jetté, J.J.*, Dec. 30, 1880.

*Liste électorale de Québec—Révision par le conseil municipal—Nouveaux noms—Radiation d'Électeurs—Avis.*

*Jugé*, 1. Que le Conseil d'une corporation municipale n'a pas le droit de réviser la liste électorale sous l'Acte électorale de Québec et d'y ajouter et d'y retrancher des noms sans que des plaintes aient été déposées devant lui, et sans donner avis aux personnes dont les noms doivent être ainsi retranchés.

2. Que tout électeur a droit de se plaindre de cette illégalité et d'en appeler à un juge de cette décision du Conseil municipal.—*Robertson v. La Corporation de la Paroisse de St. Vincent de Paul, Tait, J.*, 28 juin 1887.

#### GENERAL NOTES.

A BIG Q. C.—A learned Queen's Counsel in the city of Winnipeg has, we are informed, put up at the doorway of his office a huge black signboard, four feet long and three feet wide, on which are printed in large gold letters; 'X. Y. Z——, Q. C., Barrister, &c.,' the letters Q. C., being three times the size of the others.—*Canada Law Journal.*

A prominent railway lawyer and another known for his antagonism to corporations, got themselves somehow elected delegates to a farmers' convention. The latter introduced a resolution condemning railroads for this, that and the other. Thereupon the railway attorney moved to amend the resolution so that it should read: "Resolved, that the Revised Version of the Scriptures be hereby adopted." The grangers roared, and the railway attorney felt himself to be the master of the situation. The other lawyer, however, arose very calmly and said: "Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to accept the gentleman's amendment; and, in fact, I am perfectly willing to do so on condition that one verse be left as it stands in the Old Version: 'The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master's crib.'"

'MALA FIDE' EXERCISE OF RIGHTS.—Plaintiff, a mulatto woman, purchased a ticket on defendant's railroad for a ten-mile journey. She passed through the front car, and attempted to enter the rear car, which, by a regulation of the company, was set apart for white ladies and gentlemen. She was stopped on the platform and told to ride in the front car, which she refused to do, and refused to give up her ticket unless allowed to ride in the rear car. She was ejected from the train. *Held*, that as plaintiff's purpose evidently was to harass the defendant with a view to bringing this action, and her persistence was not in good faith, with a view to obtain a comfortable seat for the short ride, the judgment in her favour in the Court below should be reversed (*The Chesapeake, &c., Railway Company v. Wells, Sup. Ct. Tenn.*, 4 S. W. Rep. 5).

ROSEBUDS IN COURT.—The dreary monotony of a divorce case was dragging its soiled length along in Judge Hick's court yesterday. The woful contestants were listening eagerly, when a handsome, broad-shouldered youth entered the room with a young lady on his arm. He was overflowing with joy. His face was constantly wreathed in smiles which seemed to fill the gloomy court room. She was happy, too; bashfully, surreptitiously happy, and she looked shyly from behind her stalwart lover's arm. They wanted to be married. The divorce suit was suspended at once, for the court will stop unmaking a marriage to make one any time. The ceremony was performed. The young man drew out a \$5 bill and placed it before the judge. With his brightest smile and a speech as gallant as a Chesterfield could make, he presented it to the bride. The little lady accepted the money, and with a quick, graceful movement, she drew the bouquet of roses from her bosom and placed it before the judge. With a bow he received the rosebuds, and a few minutes later he returned to the divorce suit, but the sweet odor pervaded the dingy court room all that day.—*Ex.*