

ADDENDA

P. 49, after paragraph ending on *line 2*.

The Governor of the Straits Settlements is High Commissioner of the Protectorate of the four Federated Malay States, Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan, and Pahang. In each State a British resident is a member of the State Council and controls the State's foreign relations. A Federal Council—consisting of the High Commissioner (President), the Chief Secretary, the Sultans of Perak, Selangor and Pahang, the Yam Tuan of Negri Sembilan, the four British Residents, and four unofficial members nominated by the High Commissioner—meets once a year to arrange matters of common interest to the Federation or affecting more than one State, to enact laws intended to have force throughout the Federation or in more than one State, and to consider the annual estimates of revenue and expenditure of each State.

The adjacent States of Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu and Johore also form a Protectorate under the High Commissioner.

P. 65, *line 10*.

And s. 1191 (c) of the Succession Duty Act of Quebec, 1906, so far as it taxes property, movable or immovable, locally situate without the province of persons dying domiciled within the province, is *ultra vires* of the provincial legislature, not being direct taxation within s. 92, sub-s. 2, of the British N. America Act, 1867. *Cotton v. R.*, *Times*, Nov. 12, 1913.

P. 143, *line 23*.

A person born in one of the colonies does not become a subject of that colony so that the judgments of its courts obtained against him in his absence are binding upon him in the English courts. *Gibson & Co., Ltd. v. Gibson*, (1913) 3 K. B. 379.

P. 152, *line 16*.

When a marriage in Ceylon had been proved in a suit in England for restitution of conjugal rights, further proof in a subsequent suit in England for divorce was dispensed with, the validity of the marriage not being in issue. *Cowley v. Cowley*, (1913) P. 159.

P. 153, *line 22*.

In *Lanier v. R.*, *Times* L. R. xxx. 53, the sentence pronounced formed such an invasion of liberty and such a denial of the just rights of the appellant as a citizen, that their Lordships felt called upon to interfere.

P. 167, *note 1*.

For an unavailing attempt by one of the parties to a suit to avoid or impugn an Order in Council determining the litigation, *vide Corporation of Toronto v. Toronto Railway Co.*, (1910) A. C. 312.

P. 350, *top*.

Add *Low v. Routledge*, L. R. 3 H. L. 100 ; 37 L. J. Ch. 454 . . . 30

ERRATA

P. 19, note 4.

For *Poluskie v. Zacklynski* read *Zacklynski v. Polushie*.

P. 309, line 6 from bottom.

For *Routledge v. Low* read *Low v. Routledge*

P. 358.

Delete top line beginning *Routledge v. Low*.