## ARKANSAS REPORTS VOL. 86

#### CASES DETERMINED

IN THE

# Supreme Court of Arkansas

FRO N

MARCH to JUNE, 1908

T. D. CRAWFORD

PUBLISHED
BY THE
STATE OF ARKANSAS
1909

# COPYRIGHT 1909 BY O. C. LUDWIG SECRETARY OF S. ATE OF ARKANSAS

#### LITTLE ROCK

DEMOCRAT PRINTING & LITHOGRAPHING CO 1909

Reprint 1956
Authority Act No. 429 of 1955
C. G. HALL
Secretary of State

#### **JUDGES**

OF THE

## SUPREME COURT

## DURING THE PERIOD OF THIS VOLUME

JOSEPH M. HILL,	CHIEF JUSTICE.
BURRILL B. BATTLE,	
CARROLL D. WOOD,	
JESSE C. HART	Associate Justices.
EDGAR A. McCULLOCH,	
WILLIAM F. KIRBY,	Attorney General.
P. D. ENGLISH	CLERK.

i

•

## **TABLE**

### OF CASES REPORTED

<b>A</b>	Boyd v. Lloyd 169
Allen (St. Louis, I. M. & S.	Brooke v. State 364
Ry. Co. $v$ .)	Brooks (Hamby v.) 448
Arkansas & La. Ry. Co. v.	Brooksher (St. Louis, I. M. &
-	S. Ry. Co. v.) 91
-	Brown (Improvement District
Arkansas Insurance Co. v.	No. 1 v.) 61
McManus 115	v. Nelms 368
Austin (Johnson $v$ .)	Bruce v. Matlock 555
В	Buchanan (Williams $v.$ ) 259
Batesville & W. Telephone Co.	
(St. Louis, I. M. & S. Ry. v.) 300	$\mathbf{c}$
Beasley v. Gravette 346	- -
Becktold Ptg. & Book Mfg.	Cain v. State 455
Co. (Jackson v.) 591	Calhoun (Gurdon & Ft. Smith
Bell (Hood v.) 366	Ry. Co. $v$ .) 76
$\longrightarrow$ (Willis $v$ .)	Cammack v. Newton 249
Bentley (Jacobs v.) 186	Caplinger (Western Develop-
Benton (Ultima Thule, Arka-	ment & Investment Co. v.). 287
delphia & Miss. Rd. Co. v.) 289	Carney v. Matthewson 26
Berger v. Miller 58	Carter v. McNeal 150
Berry (St. Louis, I. M. & S.	Cason (Sibly $v.$ )
Ry. Co. v.) 309	Celender v. State 23
Bigham v. Dover 323	
Bishop (Cherokee Construc-	Bishop 489
tion Co. v.)	Chicago, R. I. & P. Ry. Co. v.
Black (State v.) 567	Delaney 167
Bluff City Lumber Co. (Col-	- $v$ . Lannon $587$
lins $v.$ )	- $v$ . State
(Ritchie v.) 175	College Hill Light & Traction
Board of Dir. of St. Francis	Co. (Pillow $v$ .)
Lev. Dist. 2. Cottonwood	Collins v. Bluff City Lumber
Lumber Co 221	Co

Columbia County Bank v. Emerson	v. Remmel
	0.11
Dalhoff Construction Co. v.	· ·
Maurice 162	H
Day (St. Louis, I. M. & S. Ry.	77.4
Co. v.) 104	
Delaney (Chicago, R. I. & P.	Co. v.)
Ry. Co. v.) 167	
Dillard (North State Fire Ins.	Harris v. Graham 570
	Helena (McCall v.) 442
Co. v.) 561	
Dover (Bigham $v$ .) 323	
Dowdy (State $v$ .)	Home Ins. Co. v. North Little
Duckworth v. State 357	Rock Ice & El. Co 538
Dunnivan v. Hughes 443	
	Hopkins (McConnell v.) 225
${f E}$	Howell v. Jackson 530
Emerson (Columbia County	Hudson (St. Louis, I. M. & S.
Bank v.) 155	Ry. Co. v.)
Eureka Stone Co. v. First	
OI · · · OI ·	Hughes (Dunnivan v.) 443
Christian Church 212	<u>_</u>
$\mathbf{F}$	I
First Baptist Church (Pulaski	Improvement District No. 1 of
<b>O</b>	Wynne v. Brown 61
County v.) 202	l light of Brown
First Christian Church (Eu-	J
reka Stone Co. v.) 212	Toolsoon or Doolstold Day 9
Fondren v. Norton 410	Jackson v. Becktold Ptg. &
Fuller (St. Louis, Iron Moun-	Book Mfg. Co 591
tain & Southern Ry. Co. v.) 65	$ (Howell v.) \dots 530$
	(Jones v.)
G	Jacobs v. Bentley: 186
Galbraith (Murray v.) 50	James v. Western Union Tel.
Glover (Road Improvement	Co
District No. 7	1
District No. 1 $0.1$ 221	Johnson v. Austin 446

Johnston v. Schnabaum 82	I control of the cont
Jones v. Jackson191	, ,
K	Milham v. Pine Bluff & West-
<del></del>	ern Rd. Co 190
Kirst v. Street Improvement	Miller (Berger $v$ .) 58
District No. 120 1	Milenen D. Diate
L	Mount Nebo Anthracite Coal Co. v. Martin
Lannon (Chicago, R. I. & Pac.	
Ry. Co. v.) 587	.1
Latta (Gunnells v.) 304	muson (bomers e.)
Lillard (Western Union Tel.	Myane (bouthwestern Tele
Co. v.) 208	graph & Telephone Co. v.). 548
Lloyd (Boyd v.) 169	NY.
London & Lancashire Fire Ins.	Nelms (Brown v.) 368
Co. v. Ludwig 581	
Luck (Arkansas & La. Ry.	Co. v.)
Co. v.) 562	
Ludwig (London & Lanca-	North L. R. Ice & El. Co.
shire Fire Ins. Co. v.) 58:	
	North State Fire Ins. Co. v.
<b>M</b> .	Dillard 561
McCall v. Helena 44	Norton (Fondren v.) 410
McClintock (Robertson $v.$ ) 25.	
McConnell v. Hopkins 22	
McDonough v. Williams 600	19
McManus (Arkansas Ins. Co.	Overton (Turner v.) 406
v.) II	-
McNeal (Carter $v$ .)	
Mahoney v. Roberts 13	, , ,
Main v. Tracey	7 P
Mangan (St. Louis, I. M. & S.	D. H. Cinta
Ry. Co. v.) 50	
Martin v. Gregory 28	
(Mt. Nebo Anthracite	Paving District of Ft. Smith v.
Coal Co. v.)	D 1 (M) 1 (M) 1
Matlock (Bruce v.) 55	
Matthewson (Carry)	6 phone Co. v.)
Maurice (Dalhoff Construc-	Traction Co 36
tion Co. $v$ .)	Z Traction Co

Pine Bluff & Western Rd. Co.	v. Hudson 18
(Milham v.) 190	v = v. Mangan 502
Pine Bluff Lodge of Elks No.	v. Ozier 179
149 v. Sanders 291	
Pugh v. Texarkana Light &	v. Rush 325
Traction Co 36	
Pulaski County v. First Bap-	v. State 518
tist Church 202	v = v. Walsh
R	$ (York v.) \dots 244$
<del></del>	St. Louis Southwestern Ry.
Raines (St. Louis, I. M. & S.	Co. v. Warner 46
Ry. Co. v.)	Danders (Time Dian Longe of
Rankin (Schofield v.) 86 Reeder v. State 341	Eiks No. 149 $v$ .)
Reese (Sturdivant $v$ .) 452	$ (State v.) \dots 353$
Reidhar $v$ . State 525	Schnabaum (Johnston v.) 82
Remmel (Graham $v$ .) 535	Schofield v. Rankin 86
Ritchie v. Bluff City Lumber	Sewer District of Ft. Smith v.
Co	Sisters of Mercy 109
Road Improvement District	Shropshire v. State 481
No. 1 v. Glover 231	Sibly v. Cason
v. Glover 565	v. Thomas 578
Roane (Crow $v$ .)	Simon v. State 527
Roberts (Mahoney v.) 130	Sisters of Mercy (Paving Dis-
Robertson v. McClintock 255	trict of Ft. Smith v.) 109
Rosemond v. State 160	(Sewer District of Ft.
Rush (St. Louis, I. M. & S.	Smith v.)
S	Slocum v. Slocum
~	Smith v. Smith 284
Ry. Co. v.) 325	Snyder v. State 456
St. Louis & S. F. Rd. Co. v.	Somers v. Musolf
State 440	Southwestern Telegraph &
St. Louis, I. M. & S. Ry. Co. v.	Telephone Co. v. Myane 548
Allen 465	State v. Black 567
v. Batesville & Winer-	——— (Brooke v.) 364
va Telephone Co 300	(Cain v.) 455
v. Berry 309	——— (Celender v.) 23
v. Brooksher 91	Chicago, R. I. & P.
v. Day 104	
v. Fuller 65	—— (Cooper v.) 30

Pemberton ..... 329

Inspected By No. 23

# TABLE OF CASES

## CITED BY THE COURT

A	
Adamson a Com	Baltimore & O. Rd. v. Pittsburg,
Adamson v. Cummins, 10 Ark. 541. 3	
Ahern v. Board of Imp., 69 Ark.	etc., Rd., 17 W. Va. 812 237 Banks v. Directors of St. Francis Lev. Dist. 66 April
	= - CCCO13 ()1 X+ L' ·
Albert v. Gilbert, 105 N. W. 19 35	Lev. Dist., 66 Ark. 493 258
	7 Am. Dec 126
	- 100y, 40 ATK 1X2 405
	23 1/10, 70
Allison v. State, 74 Ark. 444 460	
	D 11 30 AIR. 78.
g v Cincago Ci n	
Archer-Foster Construction Co. v.	
Vaughn, 79 Ark. 20	
72 Ark 322 90	
v. Asman, 79 Ark. 284 90 Arkansas Central D 90	Black v. Brinkley, 54 Ark. 372 597
Arkansas Central Rd. Co. v. Bennett. 82 Arts are	
v. Smith, 71 Ark. 189315, 316	
Ark 100 V. Ratteree, 57	
Ark Ma 7: 82	
Arls 100 Co. v. Patterson, 70	
Armstron	
Atchison 70 0 1148ton, 8 Ohio, 552. 302	
Atking at C. S. 96121, 123, 427	
Avers - W 30 Ark. 528 104 B	
V 46 Mestern Rd. Corp., 49 N. B	ogle v. Bloom, 36 Kan. 512 324
300 278 B	ond v. State, 63 Ark. 504 324
Be	pynton v. Ashabranner, 75 Ark.
Bagley v. Fletcher, 44 Ark. 153 398 Br Baker v. State, 39 Ark. 180 361 Br Baldwin v. Williams 361 Br	975
Baldwin v. Williams 5. 180 361 Br	anton v. Branton 22 A.1. 17873, 74
Baker v. State, 39 Ark. 180 361 Br Baldwin v. Williams, 74 Ark. 316 283 Br.	azil v. Moran 8 M: 384
Baldwin v. Williams, 74 Ark. 316. 283 Br.	236 139

::	CASUS V
XII	Co., Choate v. Kimball, 56 Ark. 55 503
- Co a Svea Ins.	Co., Choate v. Kimban, 35 Choctaw, O. & G. Rd. Co. v. Craig, 513
Brehm Lumber Co. v. Svea Ins.	546 Choctaw, O. & G. Rd. 513
	79 Ark. 53
- Kirner 22 Wis. J	Dolte 70 Alk. 220
ford, 60 Kan. 62	36 533 City El. St. Ry. Co. 1
Brown v. Vancleave, 86 Ky. 36	
	Circuitney 1/ Comm. 5
Bryan v. Fattler, 124	
Bryan v. Patrick, 124 III Buchanan v. Rader, 97 Ind. 6	505 352 44 La. Ann. 092 237 204 560 Cleveland v. Tripp, 13 R. I. 50 237 21 Ark. 581. 386
76 Ark. 497	
	Commercial Fire Ins. Co. v. Board,
$\mathbf{c}_{-}$	
Calhoun v. Moore, 79 Ark.	
- 11 - Lohnson Ut IV	
Campbell v. Johnson, vs	H. 314. 140 Conger v. Cook, 50 lower Pine Co.,
Campbell v. Johnson, vs Carleton v. Haywood, 49 N.	H. 314. 140 Conger v. Cook, 50 Sower Pipe Co., 03130, 319 Connolly v. Union Sewer Pipe Co., 524
Carroll v. State, 71 Ark. 4	
T & M Ins. Co.	Tire Ins. Co. V. William
Doloney 38 N. I	. 170.21021 = - 11mner Co., 01
	321111111111111111111111111111111111111
a . Coston 54 Miss.	
Catterall v. Kenyon, 3 Q. I	3. 309 139 Corning v. 1109 1101 534 k 364 27 tory, 15 How. 465 534
Chaffee v. Landers, 46 Ar	k. 364 27 tory, 15 How. 405 Stockyards
Chaffee v. Landers, 40 11	k. 364 27 tory, 15 flow. 465 tory Stockyards 34 O. St. Cotting v. Kansas City Stockyards
Chamberlain v. Cleveland,	
565	County, 30 Alk. /3
m. hame at Michaels, 71	Alk. 3/3. 43   C. Francis Co., //
or the State 77 AIR	. 444 5-0
or man or Sims 53 Mil	o Cincinnati Diluge Co.
Chicago & G. T. Ry. Co	74 Covington & Chichiada S. 204 432
man, 143 U. S. 339	74 7. Kentucky, 154 5. 73
man, 143 U. S. 339 W	74 7. Kentucky, 534 73 Cox 7. Garvin, 6 Ark. 431
Chicago, R. I. & P. I	Chata DX ATK. 402
	Manuscher M Alk. 290.
m McCiitcheon, o	O Aik. 255. 7 / Chate 07 Ind. 389 552
Wallman 143	U. D. JUJ Thing Accord Of Fillian //
Chioman 7 Montgomery	7, 03 11. 2.
22I	279 N. W. 040
221	

	<b></b>
Cronin v. Fire Assoc. of Phila., 82	Edgewood Distilling Co. v. Shan-
N. W. 45	
N. W. 45	TT / C
Crooks v. State, 26 N. E. 193 352	
Crossland v. State, 77 Ark. 537 129	Emerson v. Edge, 80 Ark. 510 441
Cunningham v. Thief River Falls, 86	Emerson V. Edge, 60 Mr. 31011111
N. W. 763 45	Emery v. San Francisco Gas Co., 28
D	Cal. 345 114
	Employers' Liability Cases, 207 U.
Daily v. Houston, 58 Mo. 161 139	S. 463 431
Dale v. Gear, 38 Conn. 15 85	Enos v. Enos. 135 N. Y. 609 57
— v. Hall, 64 Ark. 221 139	
Damon v. Hammonds, 73 Ark. 608 562	$\mathbf{F}$
Daniel v. Garner, 71 Ark. 484 120	Faisst v. Waldo, 57 Ark. 270 61
Darden v. State, 73 Ark. 319 321	Fallbrook Irr. District v. Bradley,
Darden v. State, /3 Ark. 319.	Failbrook III. District v. Bradiey,
Darter v. Houser, 63 Ark. 475 58	164 U. S. 112237
Davies v. Robinson, 65 Ark. 219 278	Farmers' and Merchants' Ins. Co. v.
Davis v. Howell, 84 Ark. 29 533	Dabney, 62 Neb. 213 122
v. Lynchburg, 84 Va. 861 233	Farmers' Mut. Ins. Co. v. Cole, 93
v. Mason, 1 Peters 503 600	N. W. 730 122
v. Railway, 53 Ark. 117 240	Farrer v. St. Louis, 80 Mo. 379 115
Day v. Mill Owners' Mut. Fire Ins.	Fee v. Cowdry, 45 Ark. 410403, 405
Co., 70 Iowa, 710 540	Ferguson v. Hetherington, 39 Ark.
Deal v. State, 83 Ark. 58 36.	3 438 61
Deal v. State, of Ark. 50	438 Not
DeCamp v. Crane, 19 N. J. Eq. 166. 600	Fidelity Mut. Life Assoc. v. Met-
Dermott v. Jones, 2 Wall. 1576, 577	tler, 185 U. S. 308 121
Detroit City Ry. v. Mills, 48 N. W.	First Div. of St. P. & Pac. Rd. Co.
1007 4.	0. pt. 1 daily == -
DeWitt v. Lacotts, 76 Ark. 250 36	First Nat. Bank v. Prescott, 27 Wis.
Diggs v. Kirby, 40 Ark. 420 22	616 279
Dodson v. Fort Smith, 33 Ark. 508. 270	First National Bank v. Waddell, 74
Doe v. Rue, 4 Blackf. 263 32.	Ark. 241 27
Doolittle $v$ . Ferry, 20 Kan. 230 8	
Doonttie v. Ferry, 20 Kan. 230 5	Fletcher V. Eagle, /I Ark. 1 300
Doremus v. Hennessy, 176 Ill. 608. 13	
Dover Glassworks Co. v. Am. F.	v. Woman's Christian Nat.
Ins. Co., 1 Marvel 32 54	Lib. Assoc., 79 Ark. 550 218
Downs v. Dennis, 83 Ark. 71 32.	Fordyce Lumber Co. v. Wallace, 85
Driggs v. Norwood, 50 Ark. 42 48	Ark. 1
Duckwall v. Jones, 156 Ind. 685 12	Fountain v. Fountain, 80 Ark. 481 472
Duckworth v. State, 83 Ark. 192	Fox v. Davidson, 36 N. Y. App. 159. 576
343, 357, 35	
Dunnington v. Frick Co., 60 Ark.	Furgeson v. Jones, 17 Ore. 204 478
Dunnington v. Prick Co., 60 Prik.	Furgeson v. Jones, 17 Orc. 204 470
250	$\mathbf{G}$
Dyer v. Jacoway, 76 Ark. 176 29	<b>/</b>
E	Galligan v. Sun Ptg. & Pub. Co., 54
Earle Improvement Co. v. Chatfield,	N. Y. Supp. 471 57
81 Ark. 296 59	B Galliher v. Cadwell, 145 U. S. 368 598
-	•

•	
Garland Novelty Co. v. State, 71	v. Otterson, 52 N. J. Eq. 535 599
Ark. 138 350	Halpin v. Ins. Co., 120 N. Y. 73 548
Gates v. Winslow, I Mass. 65 224	Handy $v$ . Foley, 121 Mass. 259 130
Gatch v. Des Moines, 63 Ia. 718 237	Hare v. Shaw, 84 Ark. 32 180
George v. Norwood, 77 Ark. 216 258	Harper v. Tidholm, 155 Ill. 370 502
George Taylor Com. Co. v. Bell, 62	Hart v. Case, 46 Conn. 212 600
Ark. 26 152	Hartford Fire Ins. Co. v. Redding,
Gerrish v. Gerrish, 8 Ore. 351 388	
German-American Ins. Co. v.	Harvard College v. Board of Alder-
Brown, 75 Ark. 257 489	men, 104 Mass. 470 113
Gibson v. Richart, 83 Ind. 313 225	Hayden v. State, 55 Ark. 342361, 362
Gilmore v. Hentig, 33 Kan. 136 237	Hayes v. Michigan Central Rd. Co.,
Glass v. State, 45 Ark. 173 569	III U. S. 228 553
Glenn v. Glenn, 44 Ark. 46471, 472	Hays v. Emerson, 75 Ark. 551 398
Goodrum v. Ayers, 56 Ark. 93 581	Hayward v. Leonard, 7 Pick. 180 577
Gore v. Condon, 40 L. R. A. 382 139	Head v. Biscoe, 5 C. & P. 484 139
Gouverneur v. Elmendorf, 5 Johns.	Heilman v. Lebanon & A. St. Ry.
Ch. 79 224	Co., 37 Atl. 119 45
Gowen v. Harley, 56 Fed. 963 515	Henry v. State, 77 Ark. 453 569
Graham v. Remmel, 76 Ark. 140 200	Hershy v. Latham, 46 Ark. 542 230
Green v. Biddle, 8 Wheat. 79 403	Hightower v. Handlin, 27 Ark. 20. 324
v. State, 51 Ark. 189 162	v. State, 72 Ga. 482 438
Greenlee v. Rowland, 85 Ark. 101 143	Hockensmith v. Slusher, 26 Mo. 237. 387
Gregory v. Bartlett, 55 Ark. 30 91	Hoffman v. McFadden, 56 Ark. 217. 575
Grenada County Supervisors v.	Holden v. Hardy, 169 U. S. 366 524
Grogden, 112 U. S. 261 429	Holt v. State, 47 Ark. 196 361
Gribble v. Pioneer Press Co., 25 N.	Hoole v. Dorrah, 75 Miss. 257 438
W. 710 57	Houston & T. C. Ry. Co. v. Mayes,
Grider v. Driver, 46 Ark. 50 27	201 U. S. 321
Griffin v. Rhoton, 85 Ark. 89 276	Hundley v. Commissioners, 67 Ill.
Grissom v. Hill, 17 Ark. 483217, 218	559 352
Groton Bridge Co. v. Clark Press	Hunt v. Loucks, 38 Cal. 372 324
Brick Co., 68 C. C. A. 577 90	ī
Groves v. Louisville Ry. Co., 58 S.	<del>-</del>
W. 508 45	Illinois Cent. Rd. Co. v. Decatur,
Gulf, C. & S. F. Ry. Co. v. Ellis, 165	147 U. S. 190 113
U. S. 150424, 426	Inhabitants of Barkhamstead v.
v. Hefley, 158 U. S. 98432, 434	Case, 5 Conn. 528 224
н	International & G. N. Ry. Co. v.
	Rieden, 107 S. W. 661 513
Hadley v. Bryan, 70 Ark. 197 336	Iowa Life Ins. Co. v. Lewis, 187 U.
Haggerty v. Chicago, M. & S. P. Ry.	S. 335 121
Co., 73 C. C. A. 282	J
Haley v. Haley, 44 Ark. 429 472	_
Hall v. Bonville, 36 Ark. 491 74	Jackson v. Gorman, 70 Ark. 88390, 395
v. Doyle, 35 Ark. 445 324	v. State, 54 Ark. 243 358

James v. Mallory, 76 Ark. 509	283	Lancashire Ins. Co. v. Bush, 60 Neb.	
Jersey City v. Vreeland, 43 N. J. L.		116	122
638	σı	Landon v. Morris, 75 Ark. 6	446
Jett v. Shinn, 47 Ark. 373	324	Lanigan v. Sweany, 53 Ark. 185	399
Jewell v. St. Louis, I. M. & S. Ry.		Larrimer v. Murphy, 72 Ark. 555	178
Co., 82 Ark. 598	107	Lasater v. State, 77 Ark. 468	31
J. F. Hartin Com. Co. v. Pelt, 76		Laurence v. Stonington Bank, 6	
Ark. 177	458	Conn. 521	85
Johnson v. State, 84 Ark. 95104,	363	Lawson v. State, 32 Ark. 220	363
Jones v. Glidewell, 53 Ark. 161267,	270	Lebanon Mut. Fire Ins. Co. v. Erb,	
v. Graham, 36 Ark. 383280,		112 Pa. 149	546
•		Lee v. State, 73 Ark. 148	362
K		Leep v. St. Louis, I. M. & S. Ry. Co.	
Vancas & T. Casl Ca a Chandles		58 Ark. 407	149
Kansas & T. Coal Co. v. Chandler,		Leonhard v. Flood, 68 Ark. 162	230
71 Ark. 518	515	Lewis v. Cherry, 72 Ark. 254	34
	٠.٤	Limburger v. San Antonio Rapid	
Flippo, 138 Ala. 487	240	Transit St. Ry. Co., 30 S. W. 533.	45
Kansas City So. Ry. Co. v. Embry, 76 Ark. 589	.06	Little Rock & F. S. Ry. Co. v. At-	
v. Morris, 80 Ark. 528104,		kins, 46 Ark. 423	328
v. Murphy, 74 Ark. 256		—— v. Evins, 76 Ark. 261	96
Kelly v. Keith, 77 Ark. 31		Little Rock Vehicle & Implement	
Kendall v. J. I. Porter Lbr. Co., 69	340	Co. $v$ . Robinson, 75 Ark. 548	61
Ark. 442	202	Long v. Chas. T. Abeles & Co., 77	
Kentucky Vermillion M. & Co. v.	202	Ark. 157	299
Norwich Union F. Ins. Co., 146		Louch v. Orient Ins. Co., 176 Pa.	
Fed. 695	547	638	546
Kersten v. Milwaukee, 48 L. R. A.	34/	Louisiana & Ark. Ry. Co. v. Miles,	
851	19	82 Ark. 534	
Kinkead v. State, 45 Ark. 536		v. State, 85 Ark. 1275,	435
Kinman v. State, 73 Ark. 126	32	Lovejoy v. Citizens' Bank, 23 Kan.	_
Kirby v. Tompkins, 48 Ark. 273	61	331	
TZ1 1	581	Lowe v. Walker, 77 Ark. 103	
Klein v. Insurance Co., 104 U. S.	501	Lumley v. Gye, 2 El. & Bl. 216	
88	500	Lyons v. Green, 68 Ark. 205	597
Knowlton v. Des Moines Edison	500		
Light Co., 90 N. W. 818	553	M	,
Kosminsky v. Goldberg, 44 Ark. 402	130	36.1 0.11	
3, 1)	0,	Mabry v. State, 80 Ark. 405361,	
${f L}$		McCabe v. Emerson, 18 Pa. St. 111.	
T. C.11 C	_	McDonald v. Shaw, 81 Ark. 235	218
Lacefield v. State, 34 Ark. 275361,	302	McDonnell v. State, 58 Ark. 242	T.0.0
LaFayette v. Merchants' Bank, 73	0	M-Denough a Coulo S In 172	_
Ark. 565 Lawre Water & Floatric Light Co.	178	McDonough v. Goule, 8 La. 473	85
Lamar Water & Electric Light Co.	- 1	m Williams - A -1- area	600
		McGehee v. Mathis, 21 Ark. 40	

McKenzie v. Scottish Union & Nat.	Mitchell v. Raleigh Electric Co., 85
Ins. Co., 112 Cal. 548 546	Am. St. 735 553
McMillan v. Tacoma, 67 Pac. 68 115	Moelle v. Sherwood, 148 U. S. 21 398
McRae v. Merrifield, 48 Ark. 100 61	Moore v. Green, 71 Ark. 527 529
McWhirt's Case, 3 Grat. 500. 162	Morris v. Dooley, 59 Ark. 483 479
Main v. Tracey, 76 Ark 371	Morton v. McCanless, 68 Miss. 810. 396
Malpas v. Lowenstein, 46 Ark. 552. 278	M. T. Jones Lbr. Co. v. Villegas, 28
Mammoth Vein Coal Co. v Bub-	S. W. 558 299
liss, 83 Ark. 567	Munroe v. Armstrong, 96 Pa. St.
Martin v. Hunter, 1 Wheat. 355 534	307 502
— v. State, 79 Ark. 236 236	Murray v. Lardner, 2 Wall. 110 201
Mason v. Thornton, 74 Ark. 46 199	Mutual Life Ins. Co. v. Hillmon,
—— v. Wilson, 43 Ark. 172 189	145 U. S. 285 138
Mathews v. State, 84 Ark. 73104, 322	
Mayfield v. Creamer, 39 Ark. 460 412	N
Mayo v. Mayo, 79 Ark. 570 388	Narramore v. Cleveland, C. C. & St.
Maxey v. State, 76 Ark. 276 315	L. Ry. Co., 96 Fed. 298 515
Meadows v. Rogers, 17 Ark. 361 278	Neal v. Peevey, 39 Ark. 337 104
Meeks v. State, 80 Ark. 579 144	Neff v. Elder, 84 Ark. 277 394
Meisenheimer v. State, 73 Ark. 407	New York Life Ins. Co. v. Orlopp,
25, 315	61 S. W. 336121
Merchants' Life Assoc. v. Yoakum,	v. Statham, 93 U. S. 24 499
98 Fed. 251	New York, N. H. & H. Rd. Co. v.
Merchie v. Gaines, 5 B. Mon. 126 324	New York, 165 U. S. 628 426
Meredith v. Scallion, 51 Ark. 361 390	Norfolk, etc., Ry. Co. v. Penn, 136
Merrill v. Harris, 65 Ark. 357 396	U. S. 114 423
Midland Valley Ry. Co. v. Hamil-	Norwood v. Baker, 172 U. S. 2698, 241
ton, 84 Ark. 81 365	
Miller v. Fraley, 23 Ark. 735 398	<b>0</b>
v. Nuckolls, 76 Ark. 485 454	Odin Coal Co. v. Tadlock, 216 Ill.
Milner v. Freeman, 40 Ark. 62 451	624 517
Milwaukee & S. P. Ry. Co. v. Kel-	Ogden v. Ogden, 60 Ark. 70154, 600
logg, 94 U. S. 469248, 291	Old National Bank v. Marcy, 79
Milwaukee Mechanics' Ins. Co. v.	Ark. 149200, 201
Rhea, 123 Fed. 9 120	O'Hair v. O'Hair, 76 Ark. 389 451
Minneapolis & St. L. Ry. Co. v.	Olive Cemetery Co. v. Philadelphia,
Beckwith, 129 U. S. 26 524	93 Pa. St. 129
Minneapolis F. & M. Ins. Co. v.	Oliver v. M. & L. R. Rd. Co., 30
Norman, 74 Ark. 190 289	Ark. 128 112
Minn. Iron Co. v. Kline, 199 U. S.	Organ v. Memphis & L. R. Rd. Co.,
593 524	51 Ark. 235 303
Missouri, K. & T. Ry. Co. v. Haber,	Orient Ins. Co. v. Daggs, 172 U. S.
169 U. S. 613 433	557 423
— v. May, 194 U. S. 267 425	Otis v. Nash, 26 Wash. 39 324
Missouri Pac. Ry. Co. v. Mackey,	Ozan Lumber Co. v. Union County
127 U. S. 205 524	Bank, 145 Fed. 344 159
12/ 0. 0. 203	Dank, 145 Feu, 344

Ozan Lumber Co. v. Union County	Q
Bank, 207 U. S. 251159, 523, 524	Quertermous v. Hatfield, 54 Ark. 16. 104
Ozark v. Adams, 73 Ark. 227 500	R.
Ozark Ins. Co. v. Leatherwood, 79	D 1 1'0 C Anto of
Ark. 252 278	Railway v. Combs, 51 Ark. 324 96
Oxley Stave Co. v. Staggs, 59 Ark.	1 n 1 n 1 n 1 n 1 n 1 n 1 n 1 n 1 n 1 n
370 10.	387
<b> </b>	v. Fire Assoc., 55 Ark. 163 291
Pace v. Crandell, 74 Ark. 417 31	5 v. Gill, 54 Ark. 101 529
Patten v. Pearson, 57 Me. 428 8	
Patterson v. Soc. for Establishing	v. Smith, 60 Ark. 221211, 236
Useful Manufactures, 4 Zab. 385. 11.	
Patterson Coal Co. v. Poe, 81 Ark.	v. Yarborough, 56 Ark. 612. 409
343513, 51	
Paul v. Virginia, 8 Wall. 168 42;	r =
Paulsen v. Portland, 149 U. S. 30236, 237, 238	109 Mich. 699 547  Ratcliff v. Adler, 71 Ark. 269 303
Pembina Consolidated Silver Min-	Raymond v. Yarrington, 62 L. R. A.
ing Co. v. Pennsylvania, 125 U. S.	967
181 42	
People v. Buffalo, 107 N. Y. S. 281. 26	
v. Forbes, 52 Hun, 30 350	
v. Jefferson Co. Court, 55 N.	Remmel v. Griffin, 81 Ark. 269 286
Y. 604	Rhodes v. Cissel, 82 Ark. 371 598
—— v. Kilbourn, 68 N. Y. 479 56	
v. Reis, 96 N. Y. S. 597 20	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
v. Sargeant, 8 Cowen 139 350	
Perry v. State, 37 Ark. 54361, 361	Ricketts v. Pendleton, 14 Md. 320. 85
Peters v. Bowman, 98 U. S. 56 22.	
Pettigrew Machine Co. v. Harmon, 45 Ark. 290	21 Gratt. 604
Phenix Ins. Co. v. Hart, 112 Ga.	Road Imp. Dist. No. 1 v. Glover, 86
765 12	1
v. Holcombe, 57 Neb. 622 54	
v. State, 76 Ark. 180 54	
Plant v. Plant, 63 Ark. 128 47	
Porter v. Cook, 114 Wis. 60 22	Robinson v. Arkansas Loan & Trust
Potter's Appeal, 7 Am. St. 279 54	Co., 72 Ark. 475 562
Powell v. Hays, 83 Ark. 448 7	
Pratt v. State, 75 Ark. 350 31	
Price v. St. Louis, I. M. & S. Ry.	Rockford Ins. Co. v. Winfield, 57
Co., 75 Ark. 47981, 10	9 Kans. 576 544
v. State, 71 Ark. 180 35	
Public Parks Amusement Co. v. Embree-McLean Carriage Co., 64	meier, 72 Ill. 267 316 Rodman v. Sanders, 44 Ark. 504
	rodinan v. Sanders, 44 Ark. 504
111K. 29	-

Roosevelt Hospital v. New York, 84	Schlemmer v. Buffalo, Rochester &
N. Y. 108 115	P. Ry. Co., 205 U. S. 1 24
$\mathbf{s}$	Schuman v. Sanderson, 73 Ark. 187. 26
<b>.</b>	Scott v. State, 77 Ark. 455 36
St. Charles v. O'Mailey, 18 Ill. 407. 279	Seaboard Air Line Ry. Co. v. See-
St. Louis & N. A. Rd. Co. v. Cran-	gers, 207 U. S. 73 12.
dell, 75 Ark. 90315, 316	Shaw v. State, 97 Ind. 23 35.
—— v. Wilson, 85 Ark. 257 485	Sheehan v. Good Samaritan Hospi-
St. Louis & S. F. Rd. Co. v. Hale,	tal, 50 Mo. 155 11
82 Ark. 175, 50	Shepherd v. Jernigan, 51 Ark. 275., 40.
v. Townsend, 69 Ark. 380 309	Shirey v. Clark, 72 Ark. 539 404
St. Louis, Ark. & Tex. Rd. v. An-	Shotwell v. State, 43 Ark. 345 243
derson, 39 Ark. 167	Sibly v. Cason, 86 Ark. 32 581
St. Louis, I. M. & S. Ry. Co. v. Anderson, 60 Arts, 260	Sims v. Cumby, 53 Ark. 418 405
derson, 62 Ark. 360	Simonson v. Stachlewicz, 82 Wis.
	339 297
v. Ayers, 67 Ark. 371 96 v. Batesville & W. Tel. Co.,	Simpson v. Shackleford, 49 Ark. 63. 61
86 Ark. 300	Smith v. Alabama, 124 U. S. 465
v. Biggs, 52 Ark. 240 408	432, 433
v. Bragg, 69 Ark. 402248, 291	v. Bowman, 9 L. R. A. (N.
v. Broomfield, 83 Ark. 288 138	S.) 889 219
v. Cantrell, 37 Ark. 519 328	v. Brady, 17 N. Y. 173 576
v. Harris, 47 Ark. 340 94	v. Brown, 99 N. C. 377 391
v. Hendricks, 48 Ark. 177 211	v. Hollis, 46 Ark. 1773, 74
v. Hoshall, 82 Ark. 387 409	v. Moore, 49 Ark. 100 306
v. Jacobs, 70 Ark. 401 96	v. Smith, 80 Ark. 458 448
—— v. Law, 68 Ark. 218 96	v. State, 12 S. W. 412 356
v. Leamons, 82 Ark. 504 328	v. Stephens, 82 Ark. 50 153
v. Martin, 61 Ark. 549 185	v. Wait, 39 Wis. 512 279
v. Pickett, 70 Ark. 226 149	Smithee v. Campbell, 41 Ark. 471 529
—— v. Stephens, 72 Ark. 127 409	Greth 22 Arls 17
v. Walbrink, 47 Ark. 330 94	v. Garth, 33 Ark. 17 529
v. Wynne Hoop & Cooper-	Smyth v. Ames, 169 U. S. 466 424
age Co., 81 Ark. 373 182	Southern Cotton Oil Co. v. Spotts,
—— v. Morris, 76 Ark. 542 409	77 Ark. 458
Salinger v. Gunn, 61 Ark. 41434, 581	Southern Ry. Co. v. Jackson, 38
Sanders v. Brown, 65 Ark. 498 112	Miss. 334
Sanger v. Upton, 91 U. S. 60 586	Spare v. Home Mut. Ins. Co., 19
San Marcos Electric Light & Power	Fed. 14 544
Co. v. Compton, 107 S. W. 1151 554	Sparks v. Mack, 31 Ark. 671 231
Santa Clara County v. Southern Pa-	Spencer v. Merchant, 125 U. S. 345. 238
cific Ry. Co., 118 U. S. 394 424	Springfield F. & M. Ins. Co. v.
Sapp v. State, 116 Ga. 182 365	Hamby, 65 Ark. 14 73
Scheffer v. Railroad Co., 105 U. S.	Standard Life & Acc. Ins. Co. v.
249248, 291	Schmaltz, 66 Ark. 588 315

	_
State v. Book, 41 Ia. 550 355	Treakle v. Vaughan, 83 Ark. 258 108
	Trimble v. Allen-West Com. Co., 72
	Ark. 72 34
v. Fort, 18 Ark. 202280, 61.1	Turner v. Turner, 30 Miss. 428 396
	Turner v. Turner, 30 12121 4
v. Harwood, 104 N. C. 725	<b>U</b>
438, 440	
v. Hill, 50 Ark. 461 597	Ultima Thule, A. & M. Rd. Co. v.
v. Jackson, 39 Mo. 420 356	Benton, 86 Ark. 289 248
v. Johnson, 38 Ark. 568 73	Tinion Central Life Ins. Co. v.
v. Leighton, 3 Foster, 167 355	Chowning, 86 Tex. 654 121
v. Lewis, 12 Wis. 434 356	Union County Bank v. Ozan Lum-
v. Miller, 53 Ia. 154 355	ber Co., 127 Fed. 206 159
Warmerle of N I I 185	Union Saw Mill Co. v. Felsenthal,
v. Newark, 27 N. J. L. 185	85 Ark. 346 345
v. Newark, 36 N. J. L. 478. 113	United States v. Cal. & Oregon
Detabard of N. I. I. 101 560	Land Co., 148 U. S. 31 398
v. Pritchard, 36 N. J. L. 101. 560	Updegraff v. Marked Tree Lumber
v. Shaw, 64 S. C. 566 162	Co., 83 Ark. 160
v. Trenton, 23 Atl. 281 45	Co., 83 Ark. 100
Stoddard v. Prescott, 58 Mich. 542. 224	v. Palmer, 107 Ind. 181 352
Stone v. Howard Ins. Co., 153 Mass.	Utley v. Donaldson, 94 U. S. 47 538
475546	
Sturdivant v. Cook, 81 Ark. 284 597	${f v}$
Sturges v. Stetson, I Biss. 246 585	Vanata v. State, 82 Ark. 203 319
Sugar Pine Lbr. Co. v. Garrett, 42	Van Etten v. Daugherty, 83 Ark.
Pac. 129 279	534
Sunderlin v. Aetna Ins. Co., 18 Hun	Vaughan v. State, 57 Ark. 1 482
522 548	Vaugnan V. State, 5/ 11th. 1 42
<b>3</b> . –	Vick v. Shinn, 49 Ark. 70 178
${f T}$	
m 1 State 70 Ale 271 438	$\mathbf{W}$
Tarpley v. State, 79 Ala. 271 438	Wade v. Goza, 78 Ark. 7 104
Tatum v. Croom, 60 Ark. 487 446	Walker v. Cronin, 107 Mass. 555 139
Tartt v. State, 86 Ala. 26 440	Walker v. Cronin, 10/ Mass. 555 139
Temple v. Lawson, 19 Ark. 148280, 614	Walnut Ridge Merc. Co. v. Cohn,
Thomas v. State, 85 Ark. 138 343	79 Ark. 338
Thomas Mfg. Co. v. Prather, 65	Walston v. Nevin, 128 U. S. 578 238
Ark. 27 218	Wann & Wann St Ark 471 US
Thompson v. Love, 61 Ark. 81199, 200	**************************************
	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 1290, 597
v. Traders' Ins. Co., 68 S.	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 1290, 597  —— v. State, 17 O. St. 32 356
v. Traders' Ins. Co., 68 S. W. 889	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 1290, 597  v. State, 17 O. St. 32 356 v. Ward, 36 Ark. 586 451
W. 889 124	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 1290, 597  v. State, 17 O. St. 32 356  v. Ward, 36 Ark. 586 451  Waters v. Pool, 130 Cal. 136 175
W. 889 124 Thorkildsen v. Carpenter, 120 Mich.	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 1290, 597  —— v. State, 17 O. St. 32 356  —— v. Ward, 36 Ark. 586 451  Waters v. Pool, 130 Cal. 136 175  Waters-Pierce Oil Co. v. Burrows,
W. 889	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 12
W. 889	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 1290, 597
W. 889	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 12
W. 889	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 12
W. 889	Ward v. Magness, 75 Ark. 1290, 597

v. Burns, 84 Ark. 79	v. Fussell, 60 Ark. 194
Wilks v. vaugnan, 73 Ark. 174 230	
Williams v. Buchanan, 84 Ark. 404. 267         v. Buchanan, 86 Ark. 259 614         v. Detroit, 2 Mich. 560 237         v. State, 85 Ark. 464 523	Home, 13 L. R. A. 668

#### AMENDMENT TO RULE VII

For reasons which are explained in the case of North State Fire Insurance Company v. Dillard, infra, p. 561, Rule VII is amended so as to read as follows:

#### **RULE VII**

In all civil cases when the appeal has been taken more than ninety days and a supersedeas bond filed, and the appellant has not filed in the office of the clerk an authenticated copy of the record, the appellee may, at any time, file in this court a certified transcript of the judgment, order or decree appealed from, the order granting the appeal and the supersedeas bond, with his motion to dismiss the appeal or affirm the judgment; and the appeal shall be dismissed or the judgment affirmed by the court at the cost of the appellant, unless the appellant pays the costs incurred on his motion and offers in good faith to prosecute his appeal and tenders an authenticated copy of the record, or shows good cause for a failure to tender the record entitling him to an extension of time for filing it under sec. 1194 of Kirby's Digest; provided, a notice of ten days of such intended motion be given the appellant or his attorney of record; and provided further, that the judgment will not be affirmed when the appeal has been voluntarily dismissed before the submission of said motion. 

## APPENDIX

I.

#### IN MEMORIAM

#### WILLIAM SIMONTON McCAIN

On February 11, 1908, there passed away the Honorable William Simonton McCain, a member of the bar and sometime Special Judge of this court.

On October 12, 1908, the Honorable George B. Rose, a member of the bar, presented to the court the following:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE LITTLE ROCK BAR ON THE DEATH OF JUDGE McCAIN. "Rarely have we been called upon to mourn so great a loss as that which afflicts us to-day; for our departed brother was not only a leader at the bar, but he was the friend of us all. He was a man of such gentleness, of such all-embracing charity, of such innate kindness and purity of heart that he drew all his colleagues to him and held their affections with nooks of steel. No matter how strenuous the contest or how trying the conduct of his opponent, he never lost his temper, never uttered an acrimonious word. When all around him were wrought up to fever heat, he remained serene and gentle, ignoring all personalities and seeking only to protect his client's rights. He was the pleasantest man with whom any of us ever practiced. He was vigilant on behalf of his client and indefatigable in urging his cases to an early hearing. There is perhaps none of us who equalled him in the promptitude with which he brought his suits to trial. But he did it all with such urbanity, with so much consideration for others, that we could never take offense. The rest of us in the heat of argument sometimes say unkind and ungenerous things to one another; but there is no living man who ever heard Judge McCain say a harsh thing about or to any worthy member of the bar; and, even when he spoke of those unhappy individuals who have brought dishonor upon our profession, it was in a tone of pity and regret.

"Whether as an associate or as an adversary, to practice law with him was a delight. In him you found an opponent who sought only law and justice, frank and open as daylight; who scorned tricks and technicalities, and strove only to reach the merits of the controversy; always courteous and conciliatory, never descending to personalities nor suffering himself to become the mouthpiece of his client's malevolence. As an associate, he was charming. Possessed of a mind of striking originality, he illuminated every discussion without seeking unduly to force his views upon his colleagues. His sterling worth and his great legal attainments commanded the respect of all his brethren, and the unalterable sweetness of his disposition won their love. His death comes to us all as a deep personal loss.

"As he was in dealing with his professional brothers, so was he in all the relations of life. He was a man of unlimited moral courage, and was free in the expression of his views; but there was always about him such evident purity of motive, and there was in his manner such gentleness and good will—a perfect urbanity that could only spring from a heart of gold—that no one took offence. His great abilities, his varied learning and his lofty character commanded the reverence of all, and his evident love for his fellow men brought universal affection in return.

"He was a model in all the relations of life. As a lawyer, his candor, his courtesy to bench and bar, his diligence and his fidelity to every trust were beyond all praise. As a citizen, he was progressive and enlightened, interested in everything that tended toward the uplifting of the community, and ne was especially concerned for the education of the young. As a man, he was always on the right side. He made no mistakes in questions of morals. "Blessed are the pure in heart," saith the Lord; and truly the cup of our brother's blessings should be running over; for a purer and a cleaner heart was never lodged in the bosom of man. With such qualities it was inevitable that he should be perfect as a husband and father, loving and patient, forgiving all offenses, encouraging every good impulse and ever pointing the upward way.

"When such a man passes from amongst us, it is proper that some memorial of his worth should be left by his associates who knew him so well and loved him so much. Therefore, be it resolved:

- "I. That in the death of Judge McCain our bar has been deprived of one of its most distinguished members, whose many noble and amiable qualities endeared him to us all; that our State has lost one of its foremost citizens, a man who always stood for the highest ideals of right, justice and morality, and who was a leader in every movement for the upbuilding of our commonwealth and the elevation of its people; while his bereaved family must mourn for a husband and father who was kind, patient, loving and helpful to an almost unexampled degree.
- "2. Resolved, further, that we endeavor to profit by the example of our departed brother, to live up to his high ideals of professional ethics, and when in the heat of forensic strife we are tempted to say something unkind or unjust, let us think of him and hold our peace.

[Signed] "G. B. Rose, "J. M. Moore,

"W. L. TERRY,
"J. E. WILLIAMS,

"W. E. ATKINSON."

In presenting these Resolutions, Mr. Rose spoke as follows:

Judge William Simonton McCain was born in Tipton County, Tennessee, on May 31st, 1848. He was left an orphan without means at the age of twelve, and his education was obtained under great difficulties. In 1867 he came to Arkansas, settling at Monticello, where he began the study of the law. When only nineteen years of age, he was licensed to practice, and entered into partnership with Judge W. T. Wells. On July 4th, 1876, he removed to Pine Bluff, and formed a partnership with Major Herman Carlton, who was then one of the leaders of the bar. Two years later Major Carlton died, and he then became associated with Mr. John W. Crawford. In 1886 he went to Paris, Kentucky, and began to practice in partnership with his nephew, Mr. Emmett Dickson. At the end of two years, however, he returned to Pine Bluff, and shortly afterward removed to Little Rock, where he continued to reside until his death.

While living at Monticello, he married Miss Eliza Chestnutt, of that place, who survives him, as do also four sons.

Judge McCain was one of the most remarkable personalities that ever adorned our bar. He was tall and handsome in person, and there was upon his smooth-shaven face an expression of benevolence and candor that won the hearts even of casual strangers. His kindly smile, however, was only a faint indication of the treasures that lay beneath.

He was, without exaggeration, one of the best men that ever lived. No one was ever kinder, more charitable, or more generous in his estimate of others. He was absolutely without malice. He saw the faults of men, but they excited his pity, not his abhorrence, and he desired their amendment, not their castigation. And of the actions of all men he took the most charitable view possible, excusing their shortcomings and throwing over their pardonable transgressions the mantle of forgiveness. And, as he was without malice, so was he without envy. He rejoiced with all his soul in the prosperity of others. No spirit of rivalry embittered his forensic contests. He was glad to see his brother lawyers prosper, and rejoiced with them in their successes as much as he regretted their failures.

I have never known any man whose manner was so conciliatory. So far as I can learn, he never had a difference with a brother lawyer. He was vigorous and efficient in the conduct of his cases, pushing them on to an early hearing more effectively perhaps than any of us, and yet he never gave offense. When he was on the other side, you had to get ready for trial; but, however reluctant you were to do so, you could not resent his firm insistence, so kind and courteous was it; and, no matter how heated the argument, he never said anything that could wound the most sensitive opponent. Yet there was about him no weakness. He was a strong man, who insisted firmly upon his client's right; but the kindness of a heart of gold made discourtesy impossible.

There was never a lawyer who cared less for technicalities. He brushed them away as mere cobwebs that encumbered the path of justice, and went straight to the merits. He possessed no florid eloquence. He spoke fluently and well, but his appeal was to the reason, never to passion or prejudice. It was justice that he sought, not an unworthy victory, and he did his best only when convinced that his cause was just.

He maintained in its absolute perfection the ethics of his profession. It was no trouble for him to do right. He was simply incapable of doing a wilful wrong. He could not have taken an unworthy advantage of an opponent if he had tried. Nature had so made him that the straight path of conscience and duty was the only one that he could follow. He was born a perfect gentleman, with high, pure instincts, and during years of close friendship I could never perceive that there was any dross in his composition.

Soon after I came to the bar I was struck with the generosity of his nature. I was associated with him for the first time in a case that came to this court. He was much older than I, and he naturally prepared the brief here, and handed it to me. I was a very young man, with more than the average presumption and folly of youth; and I was foolish enough to think that I could improve on his manner of presenting his ideas. So I wrote the brief over again, changing its whole arrangement and scarcely leaving a paragraph as it had stood. I had sense enough to know that he would in all likelihood be very angry, and I took it back to him with great trepidation, escaping before he could see what I had done. But in a little while he came to me and told me that he thought the brief was greatly improved, and that he would print it exactly as I had written it. I was foolish enough then to feel much flattered; now I know that I should have hung my head in shame. And as he acted then, so was he on every occasion, always appreciative of the efforts of others, generous alike to adversary and associate.

He was a learned lawyer, who stuck to his office and read the books; but the most striking thing about his mind was its originality. No matter what subject was under discussion, he could suggest some view that had not occurred to others. They seemed to fly from his mind like sparks from an anvil. Of course, they were not all well taken. Some of them were in the teeth of the authorities. It is the nature of originality that it cannot follow the conventions. But they were always suggestive, often illuminating. There was no member of the bar with whom it was pleasanter to be associated. In consultation you were sure to get some ideas that would not have occurred to you, and he did not seek to force his views on colleagues to whom they were not acceptable.

With all these endearing qualities it was natural that he was well beloved. All of his bretaren regarded him with a singular affection. And he was particularly kind to the younger members of the profession, never too busy to listen to their troubles and to enlighten their perplexities. Rarely in the annals of any bar has a death been felt as a personal loss by so many.

Not alone at the bar was he honored. He was a leader in the community, and his moral instincts were faultless. On any question of right or wrong he was always on the right side. He was an elder in the First Presbyterian Church, and he was sincerely religious; but his religion was the religion of sweetness and light, with none of that austerity that too often accompanies the profession of Calvinistic doctrines. He held firmly to his own faith; but his toleration of the religious opinions of others was perfect.

He was thoroughly public spirited and a leader in every thing that looked to the upbuilding of our State. He had a large practice and was a busy man; but he could always find time to attend meetings where serious public questions were to be considered, to serve on committees, and to discharge to the utmost his duties as a citizen. Though so mild in his manner, he was posessed of great moral courage, and never shirked responsibility nor avoided an issue. He did not look on those who differed from him as bad men, but he maintained what he believed to be the right with a firmness equal to his courtesy.

He was greatly interested in young people and their education. His heart was always young and responded to theirs; and they instinctively recognized that he was their friend. In his own family he was perfect. No better husband or father ever lived, none kinder, wiser, more generous and devoted.

He has left us now, and our hearts are sad because of our loss. But there is no danger of his being forgotten. His personality was so striking that the memory of him is planted deep in the bosoms of us all. And we shall be better men because we knew him. The good that he has done will not be interred with his bones. The example of his courtesy, his kindness, his patience under provocation, his devotion to duty, will not be lost upon us. Perhaps none of us will attain his moral excellence, but we shall come nearer that ideal because he showed us the way.

#### The Chief Justice responded as follows:

The professional life of Judge McCain was worthy of emulation and set a standard so high that it would infinitely benefit our profession to live to it. To his reverent mind, "law had its seat in the bosom of God," and its object was to enforce Right and redress Wrong. To him municipal law was formed and administered to secure as near as humanly possible its supreme end—equal and exact justice. He was ever interested in perfecting our code of laws, and drafted and influenced into enactment many important statutes.

His indefatigable energy, keen intellect and great learning were at the fullest service of his clients in the assertion or defense of their rights, but their rights were under the law and not in opposition to it nor evasion of it. He made his client's cause "as strong as the law, no stronger; as weak as the law, no weaker." He was courteous, affable and just in his daily intercourse with his brethren of the bar, and considerate of and helpful to the courts.

He followed the elder traditions of the American Bar, which made the lawyer a leader in public affairs, and carried this unthankful but patriotic burden. His lifework is left upon the statute book, upon the records of this Court, occasionally as a judge, constantly as a lawyer; and in a wider way his impress is upon the Bar and the people as a lawyer of the highest character and a patriotic citizen, standing always for the Right as God gave him light to see it.

The pre-eminent characteristic of Judge McCain's life was that in every walk of it he was a Christian gentleman. He was a charming companion and drew friends to him with the strongest ties of affection, and among those friends were all the members of this Court. The Court is gratified at the just and beautiful tributes paid his memory at the Bar, and these Resolutions and the address will be preserved in the records of the Court, so that posterity may know what a splendid gentleman has passed before us.

#### II.

#### OPINIONS NOT REPORTED.

Rogers v. State; error to Sebastian Circuit Court; Daniel Hon, judge; affirmed April 20, 1908; per McCulloch, J.

Luxora Banking Co. v. Riley; appeal from Mississippi Circuit Court; Frank Smith, judge; affirmed May 4, 1908; per Hill, C. J.

Head v. Cook; appeal from St. Francis Chancery Court; Edward D. Robertson, chancellor; affirmed May 25, 1908; per Hill, C. J.

Franklin v. Hill; appeal from Ashley Circuit Court; Henry W. Wells, judge; affirmed June 1, 1908; per Hill, C. J.

Thompson v. Lonsdale; appeal from Garland Chancery Court; Alphonzo Curl, chancellor; affirmed June 1, 1908; per McCulloch, J.

Robinson v. State; appeal from Conway Circuit Court; Hugh Basham, judge; affirmed June 8, 1908; per Battle, J.

McAdoo v. Conner; appeal from Madison Chancery Court; T. H. Humpnreys, chancellor; affirmed June 22, 1908; per Battle, J.

#### III.

#### CASES DISPOSED OF ON MOTION.

Interstate Medical Association of Arkansas v. Lizzie N. Elliott; Carroll Circuit Court; J. S. Maples, judge; appeal dismissed for non compliance with Rule nine, May 4, 1908; per curiam.

Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Company v. Lula A. Duke, Admx.; Saline Circuit Court; W. H. Evans, judge; settled and cause dismissed by consent, May 11, 1908; per curiam.

623

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company v. Lesser-Goldman Cotton Company; Nevada Circuit Court; Jacob M. Carter, judge; settled and judgment by consent, May 11, 1908; per curiam.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company v. W. B. Waller et al.; Nevada Circuit Court; Jacob M. Carter, judge; settled and judgment by consent, May 11, 1908; per curiam.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company v. Prescott Hardware Company et al.; Nevada Circuit Court, Jacob M. Carter, judge;

settled and judgment by consent, May 11, 1908; per curiam.

Byron Upton v. The State of Arkansas; Columbia Circuit Court; George W. Hays, judge; appellant pardoned and appeal dismissed on his motion, May 18, 1908; per curiam.

E. E. Hudspeth v. The State of Arkansas; Pike Circuit Court; James S. Steel, judge; appellant pardoned and appeal dismissed on his motion,

May 25, 1908; per curiam.

St. Louis, Iron Mountain & Southern Railway Company v. The State of Arkansas; Crawford Circuit Court; Jeptha H. Evans, judge; appeal dismissed on motion of the attorney general, May 25, 1908; per curiam.

St. Louis & San Francisco Railroad Company v. The State of Arkansas; Sebastian Circuit Court, Greenwood District; Daniel Hon, judge; appeal dismissed on motion of the attorney general, May 25, 1908; per curiam.

Will Gideon v. The State of Arkansas; Izard Circuit Court; J. W. Meeks, judge; appeal dismissed on motion of the attorney general, May

25, 1908; per curiam.

Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Company v. F. M. Jaco et al.; Perry Circuit Court; Edward W. Winfield, judge; settled and appeal

dismissed, May 25, 1908; per curiam.

Frank H. Dodge, Receiver Peoples' Fire Insurance Company v. R. D. Plunkett et al.; appeal from Pulaski Chancery Court; Jesse C. Hart, chancellor; appeal dismissed for non compliance with rule nine, June 29, 1908; per curiam.

i