General Correspondence.

a barrister's vocation does the "sale of Lehigh Egg Coal" belong? I find that the word egg (Sax. *æg*. G. and D. *ei* Dou. *eg* Qu. L. *ovum* by a change of *g* into *v*) is a "body formed in the body of the females of fowls and certain other animals, containing an embryo or fetus of the same species, or the substance from which a like animal is produced." But as applied to coal, I can find no description of the word in any law book of authority that I possess. Supposing, however, that "Egg Coal" means coal that is produced from eggs, *i. e.*, from a body formed in the body of females, &c., I am utterly at a loss to understand the meaning of the word "Lehigh" as applied to "Egg Coal" thus defined and thus understood. Le, Lea, or Lay (Sax. *legh* or *ley*), means, I, find, a meadow or plain. This being so, "Lehigh" must, I take it, mean a high meadow or plain, and so have reference to locality of some kind. Hence we have it that "Le high Egg Coal" is coal produced from an egg on a high meadow or plain. But this, as connected with the profession of an advocate, is not satisfactory to my mind. It appears to me, on further consideration, that the prefix Le (Sax. *legh* or *ley*) must mean Law (*vide* Termes de la Ley). Still I yet find it difficult to connect the words "Egg Coal" with the word *Le* or *Ley* in the latter sense. It must be that this business (sale of Lehigh Egg Coal) is not intended to be denoted by the word "Barristers" at the foot of the advertisement, but by the "&c." which follows the word "Barristers." And if so, the word "Barristers" had better be dropped from such an advertisement. Can you assist me? If so, any assistance will be thankfully received by your anxious correspondent. Enquirer.

Toronto, Dec. 17, 1868.

[We really cannot assist our correspondent, but hope that the gentlemen whose advertisement has caused him so much trouble will give him some light. It seems to us that our correspondent is "heaping coals of fire" on their heads.—Eds. L. J.]

Quashing conviction—Chairman and Justices at Quarter Sess.—Their respective positions.

To the Editors of the Law Journal.

Gentlemen,—At a late Court of Quarter Sessions, an application was made to quash a conviction made by two Justices of the Peace against A, for obstructing B when performing labour on the highway. A made an affidavit of the fact of his being convicted, and also swore that the Justices had no jurisdiction. The notice of appeal appeared to have been regularly served. No record of the conviction was returned by the convicting Justices, neither did they or the complainant appear.

On this affidavit of the appellant, the court, against the opinion of the chairman, quashed the conviction and ordered the complainant to pay costs.

It is the first instance that I am aware of in which a court has, on affidavit, quashed a conviction, when neither the record or a copy of it was before the Justices.

The complainant had no power to compel the Justices to return the record of conviction, neither had the Court of Quarter Sessions; yet the Justices assumed the power to compel the complainant to pay the costs of the appeal.

The best of the joke is that when the notice of appeal was served, the convicting Justices became alarmed and gave a written notice to A that the conviction had been abandoned and would not be acted upon, and this previous to his attending the court.

Since the sitting of the court, the convicting Justices have been into town to the County Attorney, to see if the order for the payment of the costs could not be set aside, and they were told that they must apply to the Court of Queen's Bench in Term. Please insert this with your comments thereon.

Yours, J. P.

January 1, 1869.

[We think the Justices acted without authority in quashing this conviction. There was nothing before them to quash, the conviction, not having been returned to the Sessions. There is another view of the case, which it is important to notice, assuming that the County Judge was the acting chairman, and it is this: if the Justices set at naught the opinion of the chairman upon a point of law, their conduct was most presumptuous. It is simply absurd for magistrates to set up their opinion in matters of law against that of the County Judge; and if the law gives them power to pronounce on questions with which, such as this, they are in all probability profoundly ignorant, it is time some change were made to prevent the recurrence of such acts.]—Eds. L. J.