

sion, remarking, "I cannot think that a custom of that character can be binding in law. Unless, either expressly or tacitly, the proprietor has given authority to an agent to sell, I cannot adopt the rule that he incurs the obligation of paying a commission."

---

Another case of interest, decided by the same learned judge, is *Cusson v. Delorme*. In this case the plaintiff, by mere inadvertence and in ignorance of the line of his property,—ignorance which seems to have been shared by his neighbour—built his wall a few inches beyond the true division line as subsequently ascertained. He had called his neighbour in to see the line drawn, and no objection was made, but after the wall was erected the neighbour complained of the encroachment, and asked for the demolition of the wall. The value of the land taken does not appear to have been proved, but it is certain that it was extremely small, while, on the other hand, the cost of the wall was far from being inconsiderable. The court, in view of the fact that there had been something like acquiescence and renunciation of right on the one hand, and that the maxim "*de minimis*," etc., might almost be applied on the other, declined to maintain the action for demolition.

---

The Society of Comparative Legislation, founded in 1894, has issued the first number of the journal the main object of which is to record the result of its researches. Half of the number is occupied by a review of the legislation, in 1895, of the sixty legislatures throughout the empire. At the suggestion of the society, a number of questions were recently addressed by Mr. Chamberlain to the colonies, requesting information as to their modes of legislation and the form of their laws. The answers obtained are published in the first number of the society's journal, and form a valuable addition to the accessible information on the subject.