

The constitutionality of Sunday laws has been contested in several States of the Union. A body small in numbers but active in supporting their creed, called Seventh Day Adventists, take the ground that there is no scriptural authority for the substitution of Sunday for the Jewish Sabbath. They declare the observance of the latter to be still binding on their conscience, and they deny the right of states and governments to make laws compelling the observance of a different day. This question has been decided adversely to their pretensions in two recent cases, *People v. Bellet*, 22 L. R. A. 696, and *Judefind v. State*, ib. 721, the former by a Michigan Court and the latter by a Maryland Court. From a note to this case it appears that the former decisions on the subject, with the exception of one or two early cases which have been overruled, are unanimous in supporting the constitutionality of the Sunday laws.

---

Our Court of Appeal, in the November term, heard appeals in ordinary course, from decisions which had been delivered on the last day before the long vacation. This shows that the arrears which have existed in this court for twenty years have actually disappeared, and there is little doubt but that in future the Court will clear the roll every term. This change in the condition of things may make it necessary for the Court to adopt a rule requiring one factum at least to be filed before the cases are put on the list for the term, as at present considerable confusion results from the fact that the list is encumbered with many cases in which there is no intention to proceed during the term. Thus, in November, there were so few cases ready that on the first day of the term, the thirty-second and thirty-third cases on the list were heard.

---

"*The Barrister*" is the name of a new law journal published at Toronto, of which the first number appears