the respectable sum of £1,249, and the other took to himself the nice little sum of £2,211. Pretty good for a man named "Christian," to make away in a year with eleven thousand dollars of his creditors' money, while his partner spent six thousand, and neither of them making any profit but rather a loss. Canadian cheeky rascals are not pre-eminent.

FINANCIAL MATTERS.

A man who occupied prominent positions in his day in the financial world of Canada, died recently after a short illness. This was Mr. David Fisher, best known to Toronto people in the seventies and eighties, as general manager of the Ontario Bank. The deceased gentleman was collector of customs at Bowmanville when the Ontario Bank was founded by the late Hon. John Simpson, and in 1857 was made its cashier, and later general manager. He was one of the principal promoters and directors of the Upper Canada Furniture Co., and was also a large stockholder in Port Darlington Harbor Co., having been president for several years. Since his resignation in 1888 of the general management of the bank, Mr. Fisher has lived a retired life at Bowmanville, where he was much esteemed.

Winnipeg city council has introduced a new feature into municipal politics by passing a unanimous vote of censure on the Ottawa Government for its Manitoba railway policy.

Four gold bricks valued at about $6,500 were on exhibition in the Bank of Montreal at Nelson, B.C., last week. They, with about $2,000 worth of concentrates, represent the first month's run at the Yellowstone mine.

The following question and answer appear in the April number of the New York Banker's Magazine. Question:—If a depositor shall give his cheque after bank hours on a day before a legal holiday, and the bank should remain open on the holiday and pay the cheque, can the depositor hold the bank for an illegal payment, if he should be at the bank at the opening for business on the day following the holiday for the purpose of stopping payment of the cheque? This is a question upon which there is a difference of opinion among the bankers in Pennsylvania. Answer—We know of no decision upon this point; but upon principle, we think there would be no liability on the part of the bank. The bank, like any other drawee, has the right to pay upon the order of the drawer at any time after the delivery of the instrument, and may do so at any time it sees fit. It is under no obligation to assume that the drawer may countermand the order.

Bimetallism, national or international, dies hard, as may be seen from the financial bill which became a law by the signature of the President on March 14. Nobody really supposed that the provision in the bill favoring international bimetallism had any practical meaning. It was put there for political effect and to ease the consciences of certain senators who wished to be in line with their party, but who had heretofore been ardent advocates of the proposition to coin silver at the immutable ratio of sixteen to one. Whoever drew up the original House bill must have been lacking in a sense of humor. The bill, after declaring all obligations to be payable in gold, solemnly proclaimed that "nothing herein contained shall impair the legal tender quality of the silver dollar." This is like issuing an order for cutting off a man's head, with a proviso that the act shall in nowise interfere with the work of the organs of circulation or respiration, and is similar to Portia's exposition of the Venetian law, which under the terms of the contract awarded Shylock his pound of flesh, but forbade the shedding of any drop of Christian blood.—Banker's Magazine.

It is mournful reading, the tale of a married bank clerk of twenty years' standing in his bank, 37 years of age, living quietly in Toronto with his wife, to all appearances comfortable and respectable, suddenly discovered to be a defaulter for thousands of dollars, and placed in the clutches of the law. Had he been speculating? Was he leading a double life? What impelled him to steal? These are questions that are being asked, but the culprit will say nothing, and no evidence has yet been found to explain the disturbing condition of things. This man was not in the fast set; he had no "society" requirements, real or imagined, such as drive some silly people into dishonest expenditure: he had a reasonable salary. The melancholy affair is another lesson to the trusted bank teller not to tamper for a day, or to the extent of a ten dollar bill, with the funds of a bank or other institution entrusted to his care.

Damase P. Riopel, who was manager of the Hochelaga branch of the Ville Marie bank was fined $100 by Judge Desnoyers at Montreal for making preferred payments to certain creditors of the bank after it had suspended. The judge remarked that the accused was entitled to clemency as he did not derive any personal benefit from the transaction.

It is so far satisfactory to hear that two men, named Smith and Marshall respectively, were arrested last week at Truro, N.S., in connection with the counterfeiting of Dominion $2 notes that the authorities have been unearthing. It was for having been implicated in the same case that Davis, of Boston, was sentenced, and that Chisholm, of Truro, is now in gaol at Dorchester, N.B.

THE HISTORY OF A LIBEL SUIT.

(Continued from our last).

Part Three.

An appeal was taken against this judgment by the creditors of "Rondot & Co.," in the name of the claimant, to the Court of Appeal for Ontario; and this is the closing chapter of the story. The principal ground of appeal was an alleged misdirection of the jury on the part of the trial judge. The appeal was argued on the 7th April last, and the court were unanimous in dismissing it with costs. So clear were they as to the justice of the verdict and the judgment appealed against, and as to the points of law involved in the appeal, that the defendants' counsel, Mr. King, Q.C., who has acted for the defendants during all this litigation, was not even called upon to answer the arguments presented in favor of the appeal. It should also be stated, as one of the incidents, and about the only comforting one to us, in this narrative of a harassing law suit, that, before the sheriff gave up possession of the goods on the second seizure, The Monetary Times was fully secured for its judgment debt, and for all its costs of the proceedings, including the sheriff's costs and possession money, and the costs of the Court of Appeal. At one stage of the proceedings any such security seemed as near at hand as the farthest fixed star.

As additional evidence, if necessary, of the justice of the jury's verdict, the defendants filed in the Court of Appeal an affidavit of the sheriff of Essex in which he stated, that, a few days after the interpleader verdict at Sandwich, the execution debtor, who was the principal witness for the claimant at the trial, told him that the goods and business at Amherstburg were really his own, and that he was merely carrying on the business in his brother's name, as many others were doing. A stronger admission of the justice of the verdict could hardly be desired; but what, in the face of this admission, is to be said of the determined effort that was made to prove the opposite, and thereby snatch a verdict for the claimant? An adverse verdict would have meant the loss of a large sum of money, honestly due The Monetary Times, and the saddling of its publishers with enormous costs, which would probably have been increased by another action against the paper for damages for alleged illegal seizures. Defendants took all these chances in the contest which closed in the Court of Appeal; but, believing at the outset that they were right they resolved, on the advice that was given them from time to time, to fight the battle to the end. The fact that the proceedings were carried on almost altogether in a distant part of the province added not a little to the attendant inconvenience and expense. Our antagonists trusted a good deal to local prejudice in their favor as against an outsider; but in this they miscalculated. In demanding a jury at both trials, they builded for the defendants better than they knew. If there was any prejudice against the paper, it certainly found no place in the jury box. The Essex jurors did their duty on both occasions with perfect impartiality; they could come to no other conclusions than they did on the evidence.

The experience of The Monetary Times in this litigation has given its publishers a pretty fair insight into the practice of the courts generally. So far as libel actions are concerned, we have been led to place a good deal of faith in boldly pleading the truth of statements complained of, whenever it is possible to do so. It is a risky defence, but, with reasonable evidence to sup-