

STOCK LIST—Continued.

BONDS	Rate of Interest per annum	Amount outstanding	When Interest due	Where Interest payable.	Date of Redemption.	Latest quotations.	REMARKS.
Commercial Cable Coupon.....	4	\$18,000,000	1 Jan. 1 Apl.	New York or London.....	1 Jan., 1907.	100	Redeemable at 110
Registered.....	4	2,831,000	1 July 1 Oct.	Montreal, New York or London..	Oct., 1903.	101	
Canadian Pacific Land Grant.....	5	2,000,000	1 Apl. 2 Oct.	Bank of Montreal, Montreal.....	2 Apl., 1902.	101	
Can. Colored Cotton Co.....	5	200,000	1 May 1 Nov.	Merchants Bank of Can., Montreal	1 May, 1917.	101	
Canada Paper Co.....	5	1,200,000	1 Apl. 1 Oct.	Bank of Montreal, Montreal.....	1 Apl., 1925.	111	Redeemable at 110
Bell Telephone Co.....	5	2,000,000	1 Sep. 1 Sep.	Bank of Montreal, Montreal.....	1 Sep., 1910.	111	Redeemable at 110
Dominion Coal Co.....	4	\$ 308,200	1 Jan. 1 July	Bank of Montreal, Montreal.....	1 Jan., 1910.	93	Redeemable at 110 & accrued interest
Dominion Cotton Co.....	4	1,000,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Bank of Montreal, Montreal.....	1 Jan., 1925.	93	Redeemable at 110 & accrued interest
Dominion Iron & Steel Co.....	5	\$ 8,000,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Bank of Montreal, Montreal.....	1 Jan., 1910.	103	Redeemable at 110
Halifax Tramway Co.....	5	\$ 600,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Bk. of N. Scotia, Hal. or Montreal	1 Jan., 1910.	103	
Intercolonial Coal Co.....	5	314,000	1 Apl. 1 Oct.	Bank of Montreal, Montreal.....	1 Apl., 1910.	103	
Laurentide Pulp.....	5	1,200,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Company's Office, Montreal.....	1 July, 1921.	103	
Montmorency Cotton.....	5	1,000,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Company's Office, Montreal.....	1 July, 1921.	103	
Montreal Gas Co.....	4	880,074	1 Jan. 1 July	Company's Office, Montreal.....	1 July, 1921.	103	
Montreal Street Ry. Co.....	5	200,000	1 Feb. 1 Aug.	Bank of Montreal, London, Eng.	1 Feb., 1902.	104	
Union Bank, Halifax, or Bank of Nova Scotia, Montreal or Toronto	4	681,333	1 Feb. 1 Aug.	Bank of Montreal, London, Eng.	1 Feb., 1902.	104	
Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Co.....	6	2,500,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Union Bank, Halifax, or Bank of Nova Scotia, Montreal or Toronto	1 July, 1931.	103	
Proper Heat & Light Co.—First Mortgage.....	5	\$ 700,000	1 Apl. 1 Oct.	Royal Bank of Canada, Halifax or Montreal.....	1 Apl., 1917.	103	Redeemable at 110
Second Mortgage.....	5	100,000	1 Apl. 1 Oct.	Royal Bank of Canada, Halifax or Montreal.....	1 Apl., 1917.	103	Redeemable at 110
Richelleu & Ont. Nav. Co.....	5	471,580	1 Feb. 1 Aug.	Bank of Montreal, Montreal or London	1 Feb., 1914.	103	Redeemable at 110
Royal Electric Co.....	4	\$ 130,000	1 Apl. 1 Oct.	Bank of Montreal, Montreal or London	1 Apl., 1914.	103	Redeemable at 110
St. John Railway.....	5	\$ 675,000	1 May 1 Nov.	Bank of Montreal, St. John, N.B.	1 May, 1925.	103	5 p.c. redeemable yearly after 1910
Toronto Railway.....	4	400,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Bank of Montreal, St. John, N.B.	1 Jan., 1914.	103	
Windsor Hotel.....	4	310,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Bank of Scotland, London.....	31 Aug., 1921.	103	
Winnipeg Elec. Street Railway.....	5	1,000,000	1 Jan. 1 July	Windsor Hotel, Montreal.....	2 July, 1912.	103	
					1 Jan., 1927.	103	

RECENT LEGAL DECISIONS.

SOME FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS.—Financial transactions between doctors and their patients, and lawyers and their clients, are regarded by the law almost with suspicion.

Two recent English cases are examples of this. The owner of a patent right went to a solicitor and offered him a commission if he should find a purchaser. The solicitor introduced one of his own clients, and told him all about the promise of a commission from the other party; the client was interested and instructed his solicitor to make the purchase at as low a price as possible, and so the solicitor acted in a sense for both parties. He finally effected a sale and claimed the commission, he had to sue, and £210 was paid into court, and this he accepted from the vendor. He next rendered a bill to his client, and, the latter having died, his executor sought to set off against the bill the amount of the commission. On this issue the matter went to the Court of Appeal, where a decision was reluctantly given in favour of the solicitor, but without costs. Lord Justice Stirling said that all transactions between solicitor and client which result in the solicitor obtaining a benefit, are subjected by courts of law to the strictest scrutiny, when called in question by the client, and are treated as imposing obligations on the solicitor of greater or less stringency. In some cases the obligation goes so far as almost to bind the solicitor to abstain altogether from a transaction of this kind. In this case, I consider it my duty to express my great regret, that the solicitor should have made a bargain which was not merely improper in the eye of the law, but which placed him in a position in which it was scarcely possible for him to fulfil the duty he was undertaking to both vendor and purchaser.

In the doctor's case, he had been for eleven years regular medical adviser to a lady of humble origin, who had inherited a considerable fortune from her first husband, whose housekeeper she had been. She lived alone with one servant, apart from the second husband. For some months she required constant attendance, several visits a day at times, and some at night. The first gift to her physician was £500, partly in recognition of his past exceptional medical services, and partly in recognition of

his consent to accept a tutorship in connection with an institution to be founded as a memorial to her first husband; £100 was a Christmas gift; and two other cheques of £100 each were given at a time when the doctor had had a carriage accident, for the purpose of his buying a brougham and a new harness. There was no suggestion of any misrepresentation or pressure put to his patient by the doctor, or that she was not capable of managing her business transactions. After her death her executors sought to recover back these gifts, amounting to £800, from the doctor, on the ground, that as she had taken no independent advice the transactions could not stand. The judge, in this case gave judgment against the doctor. He cited the equitable doctrine, that a substantial gift made by a person in a relationship to the donee, where he is likely to be under influence, cannot stand, unless the donee acts under independent advice, or the gift is afterwards confirmed. This doctrine applies to relationships of master and servant, guardian and ward, lawyer and client and doctor and patient. He thought that it was incumbent on the doctor to have seen that the lady had independent advice. (Times Law Reports *In re Haslam and Evans*, p. 461, *Radcliffe v. Price*, p. 466).

COLLAPSES.—The Western Home Insurance Co., of Sioux City, which did a large fire business in Iowa, has been finally closed up. The State Mutual Life of Illinois has gone into hands of a receiver. A last dividend has been declared in settlement of the affairs of the Republic Life of Chicago.

A REMARKABLE CASE is before the King's Bench Court, London, England. A clerk is suing a firm of shipowners for wrongful dismissal. The firm charges him with larceny, but the ground of his dismissal is alleged to have been making public certain frauds on underwriters practiced by shipowners. It is alleged that when ships are damaged, one account is sent in for repairs which has to be paid and a second one is sent for a much larger amount, which is merely made out as the basis of a claim against underwriters.