

JUDGMENTS—SUNDAY LAWS.

Crawford v. Great Western Railway Company.—(Plaintiff's rule). Rule nisi discharged.

Same v. Same.—(Defendants' rule). Rule absolute to enter verdict for defendant on 1st, 2nd and 3rd issues, and verdict for plaintiff on 4th issue to stand, and verdict for plaintiff on 5th issue.

Buchanan v. Cunningham.—Rule discharged.

Eakins v. Christopher et al.—Judgment for plaintiff on demurer.

In re Burrows.—Rule discharged with costs, to be paid Mallory.

Dunlop v. Burnham.—No judgment; notice of setting down having been set aside.

Purtell v. Buchan.—To be re-argued.

Ball v. Town of Niagara.—No judgment. Case in course of settlement.

We subjoin a table, compiled by an official in one of the courts, which will be of much use to those concerned in the transaction of business in the Courts of Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, during

EASTER AND MICHAELMAS TERMS.

DAYS.	FIRST WEEK.	SECOND WEEK.	THIRD WEEK.
Monday	Motion Rule Nisi in Q. B. or C. P.	Paper Day, Q. B. New Trial Day, C. P.	Paper Day, Q. B. New Trial Day, C. P.
Tuesday	ditto	New Trial Day, Q. B. Paper Day, C. P.	New Trial Day, Q. B. Paper Day, C. P.
Wednesday ..	ditto	Paper Day, Q. B. New Trial Day, C. P.	Open Day, Q. B. New Trial Day, C. P.
Thursday ...	ditto	Open Day, Q. B. Paper Day, C. P.	Open Day, Q. B. Open Day, C. P.
Friday	Paper Day, Q. B. New Trial Day, C. P.	New Trial Day, Q. B. Open Day, C. P.	New Trial Day, Q. B. Open Day, C. P.
Saturday	New Trial Day, Q. B. Paper Day, C. P.	Open Day, Q. B. Open Day, C. P.	Open Day, Q. B. Open Day, C. P.

Hilary Term lasts only two weeks, and business is disposed of during these two weeks in the same manner as during the first two weeks of the other Terms.

County Court appeals must be set down for the first or second Paper Days of each Term, after the date of the Appeal Bond; and on those days are placed first on the paper.

SELECTIONS.

SUNDAY LAWS.*

Among theologians, in their ever recurring discussions upon the so called Sunday questions, two leading points of controversy have arisen,—the one as to the origin of the appointment of the first day of the week for peculiar observance; the other, as to what the nature of such observance should be. In regard to the first, the law has taken no heed: it found the first day of the week already selected for observance, which observance was enforced by legislation; but, as to the second, we find an almost infinite variety of provisions, shaped, it would seem, to meet the popular feeling and mode of life of the people by whom they were made, and changed from time to time according as that feeling and mode of life changed. Indeed, a study of the Sunday laws of the different portions of the United States, it is thought, would furnish, in a measure, some indication of the peculiar characteristics of its people. Thus we are not surprised that the strong religious feeling of Massachusetts compelled, by its early legislation (1791), the attendance at some church of every able bodied person, under the penalty of a fine; while its regard for freedom of religious thought is shown by the proviso, that such attendance was not required where there was no place of worship at which such person could conscientiously attend.

A similar compulsory attendance was required by an earlier statute of Connecticut (1751), which contains the following stringent provision: "No persons shall convene or meet together in company in the streets, nor go from his or her place of abode, on the Lord's day, unless to attend upon the public worship of God or some work of necessity or charity." This is followed by the provision, that "no person convicted of any offence under this act shall be allowed any appeal." So in Georgia.

* This article will be read with interest in view of a recent high-handed proceeding of a Toronto policeman, who entered the room of a stranger in the city, on a Sunday, without any warrant, and took him into custody and confined him all night in a filthy cell, because he heard him playing some simple airs on a violin at the back window of his lodgings on Sunday. The unconscious victim was heavily fined and admonished by the Police Magistrate the next day. The extraordinary conduct of this ardent protector of the public morals was fully discussed by the public press, and probably will not occur again for some time. It was suggested at the time that the musical talent of Toronto policemen must be of a high order when an otherwise uneducated "Bobby" could at once discern the exact line where sacred music ends and secular music begins. — [Eds. L. J.]