

several of his own children were available in support of the proceeding. The facts come out incidentally in an action of libel which was instituted subsequently. The case illustrates how widely the ideas of people may differ as to what constitutes insanity, and the care which is necessary in dealing with such statements.

---

The will case of *Schiller v. Schiller*, decided by the same learned judge on the same day, was another litigation with singular features. In this case the testator, Mr. C. S. Schiller, was a gentleman well known to nearly the whole bar, and the will impugned was made by him twenty-one months before his death. In the interval he was attending to both official and private business, yet his will was attacked on the ground of captation and suggestion, and undue influence. The will was maintained by Mr. Justice Davidson, and the decision, we understand, will not be appealed from.

---

In *Cushing v. Fortin*, the Court of Review, Montreal, Nov. 30, affirmed the decision of Davidson, J., as to what is required to sustain a charge of secretion. A restaurant-keeper sold his effects and business, and the leasehold of his restaurant. It appeared, however, that he acted with the concurrence of his lessor who was his principal creditor, and whose privileged claim was sufficient to absorb all the assets. The charge of secretion was held to be disproved, but as the defendant had acted imprudently in divesting himself of his estate without the knowledge of his other creditors, the *capias* issued by one of them, though not maintained, was set aside without costs.

---

In *Groulx v. Wilson*, Court of Review, Montreal, Oct. 8, it was held, affirming the decision of Pagnuelo, J., that a carrier who has put the thing transported in a particular place specified in the contract of carriage, is not considered to have thereby dispossessed himself of it, and