

seem to be to establish the following propositions: (1) That a mortgagee or other incumbrancer has an insurable interest in the security notwithstanding the existence of prior incumbrances, provided the aggregate amount of the incumbrances is not greater than the value of the security. (2) A subsequent incumbrancer insuring his interest will have a right to recover in the event of a loss where the security is so reduced in value by the fire as to leave his debt uncovered. (3) This reduced value is the market value of the site and salvage of buildings, and not the value for the purposes of reinstatement, which is, in general, much greater. (4) Insurance, by creditors, of their independent interests is not to be treated as double insurance by the owner, in respect that he is made a party to each of the creditors' policies for his reversionary interest."

---

THE LUXURY OF APPEALS.—We gather from the *Indian Jurist* that litigants in the Madras courts are great on appeals; in fact, the legal profession must be largely supported by a praiseworthy desire to "see it through." The writer puts the question as to whether a judge of an inferior court is a sound lawyer into the form of a syllogism, thus:

"Many suitors filed appeals against his decisions,

Therefore he is a bad judge.

Many of these appeals were unsuccessful,

Therefore he is a good judge."

And points his moral by the following anecdotes from the Madras High Court: "The Rani of Bobbili had a suit with Messrs. Arbuthnot & Co. about some indigo, and a decree was given against her by the District Court of Vizagapatam. She appealed because she was called the third defendant, and not Sri Rama something or other. The appeal came on before the High Court, and Sir Walter Morgan, looking down from the bench, said: 'You don't seem to have much of a case!' 'Well, my lord,' said Willie Grant, 'I suppose my client can appeal if she likes.' The judges grinned, and dismissed the appeal with costs. Mr. Tarrant told us that he received by post the papers in a hopeless appeal, and he wrote to advise his up-country client not to waste his money. The answer came: 'I did not ask for your opinion. I do not want your opinion. God only knows what is in the minds of the judges.' So the appeal was filed."