by him at the Law Institution, in the years 1873 and 1874.

Although the author states that his work is purely elementary and contains nothing which is not familiar to the practitioner, we have found it to be a valuable and reliable collection of modern conveyancing cases.

We hope to see this book, like Snell's Equity, a standard class-book in all Law Schools where English law is taught.

The first part, which treats of corporeal hereditaments, deals with the earlier tenures of land, an estate for years, an estate for life, an estate tail, an estate in fee simple, copyholds, the statute of uses, a reversion and remainder, an executory interest, estates in joint tenancy, tenancy in common, and caparcenary, husband and wife, and an equity of redemption.

The second part exclusively relating to conveyancing, treats of conditions of sale, purchase deeds, leases, mortgage deeds, settlements and wills.

The whole is preceded by a carefully compiled index of cases, and followed by a full and reliable index of subjects.

The New Ontario Digest. By C. Robinson, Q.C., and F. J. Joseph, Barrister. Toronto: Rowsell & Hutchinson.

The second part of Robinson & Joseph's Digest has been issued, and the third part is in type, and will be out shortly. We understand the delay has partly arisen from a re-arrangement and transposition of some of the principal headings.

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM.

Coughing in Court.—We have heard of a popular preacher who periodically reproved his congregation for coughing in church, and an incident which has just occurred in Liverpool shows that the prohibition ought to extend to all public places. Grave legal consequences very nearly resulted from a fit of coughing which lately overtook a member of the Bar in the Liverpool Court of Sessions. A prisoner charged with stealing a mackintosh coat, was on his trial, and the foreman of the jury was about to deliver the verdict, when the noise of the coughing caused the Clerk of the Peace to misinterpret the opinion of the twelve "gentlemen in the box." The learned Recorder at once proceeded to sentence the prisoner. With a suave approval of the judgment arrived at, he remarked that "the jury had found the prisoner guilty of the offence, and, so far as he (the Recorder) could see, very properly so." At this point, however, the unfortunate spokesman of the twelve became uneasy. The compliments of the Bench seemed to arouse him to an understanding of the situation, and he ventured to inquire whether the Recorder's kindly comments referred to the case just tried. The Recorder replied in the affirmative, and the luckless juryman could no longer conceal the fact that the verdict of himself and his brethren had been an acquittal. We think, on the whole, the conduct of the foreman is to be commended. By thus reverting to the actual verdict he lost, it is true, the approval of the Bench, but he might possibly have felt some little remorse if the prisoner had been condemned to a long term of imprisonment after the jury had taken pains to find him innocent.—*London Globe.*

Holding the opinion that the cultivation of a flower garden is one of the best of recreations for those professional men who cannot or do not care to indulge in more exciting or more athletic amusements, and that it is an employment very pacifying to a distracted brain, we make no apology for inserting the advertisement of a Floral Guide for 1875. We can well imagine that about this time it is being sought for by some we could name, whose opinions are as sound on the subject of floriculture as are their judgments on points of law in the Courts of Error and Appeal, Queen's Bench, or Common Pleas.

ANSWER TO CORRESPONDENTS.

[We omitted to append the following answer to the letter of J. R., published in our last number, p. 354.]

We assume that the facts are correctly stated. It would seem that sec. 220, of the C. L. P. Act does not warrant any such amendment at the trial as adding a plea. That amendment may be made under the 222nd sec. Section 220 applies only to amendments of "*variances*" and is one of a group of sections extending from sec. 216 to 221, all limited to such cases of amendments.

We think the application to review the amendment should be made in Court, not in Chambers. It would be very anomalous in itself, as well as a "variance" from the expressed provisions of the section. to move against the decisions of a judge at *Nisi Prius* before a judicial officer holding *pro hac vice* an inferior position in Chambers. A judge in Chambers has no power to stay the entry of judgment on the verdict nor to set it aside if entered up, pending an application to strike out a plea added at the trial. See an analogous point *Ross* v. *Grange*, 27 U. C. Q. B. 306. We are almost inclined to doubt whether the matter was properly brought before the learned County Judge, as his decisions on points of law are not often questioned.

Eds. L. J.