In *Lahay* v. *Lahay*, decided by Mr. Justice Tait at Sherbrooke, March 6, 1894, an interesting question of status came up. The mother of the plaintiff, when he was about seven years old, was married by the defendant. Six years later the plaintiff was baptized, and in the act of birth he was described as the son of the defendant and his wife, who were both present at the ceremony and signed the act of birth. Plaintiff continued to live with them as a member of the family until he was 18 or 19 years of age, when he went away to the United States. After his mother's death he claimed not only the real estate owned by her before her marriage, but also one half of the community which had existed between her and the defendant. The latter pleaded that the plaintiff was not his child, and that he had never intended to recognize him as such. There was evidence that the plaintiff had always retained the name of his mother up to the time of her death, and had married in that name, which was also that of a cousin with whom it was rumored that his mother had been intimate before the plaintiff's birth. The question was whether plaintiff had established that he was the son of defendant. The court held that it was not competent to the defendant to contradict the acknowledgment of paternity made by him in the act of birth, by parol evidence of public rumor, or statements made by plaintiff's mother in the course of conversations. It was held that there was no evidence to sustain the plea, and therefore the plaintiff was entitled to his rights as a child legitimated by the marriage of his parents.

NEWSPAPERS AND CONTEMPT OF COURT.

It is to be hoped that the decision of Mr. Justice Mathew and Mr. Justice Cave in the case of *Duncan* v. *Sparling and others* will do something to check the feverish eagerness of litigants to invoke the aid of the process of contempt of Court whenever their disputes are commented on by the press in terms of which they disapprove. The facts were simple and amusing. The