B. N. A. Act. The Manitoba Government undertook to make the railway under their Provincial Public Works Act, or of their own right. Exceedingly unpleasant litigation and bad feeling have been and are the consequence; and the Dominion Government has been violently abused for the disallowance, and I think improperly and unjustly. The Provincial Act seems to have been beyond the powers of the Provincial Legislature under sec. 92 of the B. N. A. Act (a), as relating to a railway "extending beyond the limits of the province," if not according to the *letter*, certainly according to the spirit of the said sec. 92, which expressly applies to railways connecting one province with another, and could hardly be intended not to apply to a railway connecting, as this was avowedly intended to do, a province with a foreign country. Sec. 91 of the B. N. A. Act expressly subjects ferries between a province and any foreign country to the *exclusive* jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament; and for good reason, any such ferry (and *a fortiori* any such railway as that in question) requiring attention and regulation by the Dominion Customs Department as a port of entry. At any rate, if there be doubt, the unquestionable duty of the Dominion Government was to use its power of disallowance, as well as others it might possess, to give effect to the contract between Parliament and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and to keep the faith and honour of Canada intact. And this duty will devolve also on any other Government succeeding that in power when the contract was made, or Canadian bonds will become of small account on the world's exchanges. Whether the contract was good and wise or not, does not affect this point. The contract must not be broken without the consent of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or its failure to perform the conditions it undertook. What any member or minister may have said in the House or out of it matters not; there is no doubt that Parliament, by the said Act, grants, and must have intended to grant, the twenty year monopoly, and it was part of the consideration for which the company undertook to make the railway, and made it.

G. W. W., *Ottawa.*

This is a work of some proportions upon a very interesting branch of the law. The author states that he has sought to cover the whole ground of the law relating to the custody of infants,—to collect and cite, in their proper places, all the important reported cases upon the subject that have been decided in the United States and Great Britain, —to arrange, in their proper sequence and relation, all the doctrines relating to the subject,—and above all, to set forth and emphasize, at every turn of the discussion, the true underlying principles that govern the subject. The chapters, ten in number, treat (1) of the nature and limitations of the right of custody; (2) Interference of Courts of Chancery in questions of custody; (3) & (4) Interference of the Courts upon writs of *habeas corpus;* (5) The remedy by *habeas corpus;* (6) Probate and testamentary guardians; (7) Disposal of the custody upon applications for divorce; (8) Illegitimate children; (9) Apprentices; (10) Juvenile institutions. About four hundred cases are cited, some of them very fully. The work appears to have been very carefully planned and executed, and cannot fail to be of service to the profession in their examination of questions arising under this branch of the law.'

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF OTTAWA.

AYLMER (Dist. of Ottawa), Sept. 28, 1887.

Before WURTELE, J.

Ex parte CHARTIER, applicant.

Quebec Election Law—42-43 Vict. (Q.) ch. 15— Recount—By Whom Asked For.

HELD :—*That a recount of votes need not necessarily be asked for by a candidate, but that it may be asked for either by a candidate or by any elector of the electoral district.*

An election for a member to represent the electoral district of Ottawa in the Legislative Assembly, took place on the 14th of Septem-