the other down to the last summons issued, and reaching back to the first summons issued before the claim was barred by the Statute, should be applied to Division Court suits? My opinion is that it should not. Suppose summonses were issued in this way in Toronto from Court to Court, for four years on a claim of $100. We would have ninety-six summonses issued to connect that of 1863 with that of 1867: or, if the Court were held six times in a year we would have 24 summonses. In the first case the costs could not be less than $200—in the last over $50. My idea is that if the plaintiff makes use of reasonable efforts to serve the defendant—sues him—enters his suit, but fails to serve him—that is a commencement of the suit, which if pursued within six years ought to stop the effect of the Statute.

The old doctrine of continuances applied to Courts of Record I think does not apply to Court not of Record.

Then, process issued from term to term—now it issues every six months. Continuances are abolished in Canada in Courts of Record, but the summons should no doubt in Courts of Record be issued and reissued or continued regularly every six months. I cannot see any necessity for this in Division Courts, where the action is once honestly commenced, and not abandoned, but only left in abeyance because the defendant has left the country, provided it is acted on within six years. What is your opinion Messrs. Editors?

The late Judge Harrison, I know, acted on the view I have taken.

"Scarboro."

Toronto, 12th Sept. 1868.

A Master's Right to order a Servant to go to Bed.—A singular case came before the County Court judge at Guildford (Mr. Stonor.) *Wheatly* v. *White*, was a claim of 16*s.* 8*d.* in lieu of notice. The defendant is the landlord of the Talbot Inn at Ripely. The plaintiff said she was in the service of the defendant, who had dismissed her without giving her any notice. The cause of her dismissal was that the defendant came down into the kitchen one night and told her to go to bed at a quarter to 10 o'clock. She refused to do so, as they never went to bed till half-past 10. On the following morning he threatened to kick her out of the house if she did not go. The Judge.—I think your master was quite justified in dismissing you When your master told you to go to bed it was your duty to do so, and as you did not obey his reasonable commands, he was quite justified in dismissing you. I shall find a verdict for defendant.—*Law Times.*

Bishop Burnet tells of Hale: "Another remarkable instance of his justice and goodness was, that when he found ill money had been put into his hands, he would never suffer it to be vented again; for he thought it was no excuse for him to put false money in other people's hands, because some one had put it into his. A great heap of this he had gathered together, for many had so abused his goodness as to mix base money among the fees that were given him." In this particular case, the judge's virtue was its own reward. His house being entered by burglars, this accumulation of bad money attracted the notice of the robbers, who selected it from a variety of goods and chattels, and carried it off under the impression that it was the lawyer's hoarded treasure.—*Jeaffreson.*

Wigs and Coats.—The heat in Court at Lewes assizes was productive, last week, of peculiar results. Baron Martin drove up to the Shire Hall without a wig, and sat all day on the bench with head uncovered. Several barristers imitated His Lordship's example, but no counsel addressed the Court or jury in that irregular habit. The jury were evidently infected by the contagion, for three or four of those gentlemen took off their coats, and considered their verdicts in their shirt sleeves. Mr. Serjeant Gaselee thinks that a man has a right to be hanged in public. On the same principle, we suppose, a criminal ought not to be sent into penal servitude by a wigless judge and a coatless jury. On Wednesday the Judge-Ordinary intimated that the barristers in his Court might dispense with their wigs, and set them the example. We do not know whether Sir. J. Wilde was aware of the precedent at Lewes, but it is to be hoped that no opportunity has been afforded for the intervention of the Queen's Proctor.—*Law Journal*

A Welsh Jury.—At the Montgomery Quarter Sessions, held at Newtown, last week, before Mr. C. W. Wynne, M.P., and a bench of magistrates, a tailor, named John Welsh, was placed in the dock, charged with stealing a milk-can, the property of David Davies, residing at Meifod. The prisoner was undefended, and the jury, after hearing the evidence, handed in a verdict of guilty, and Welsh was sentenced to three months' imprisonment, with hard labour. According to the local *Express* it has since transpired that, so far from finding the prisoner guilty, the jury were unanimous in the belief that he was innocent, and the foreman was charged with the delivery of a verdict accordingly, but that when he stood up to reply to the formal question of the clerk of the court the unfortunate man lost his presence of mind and delivered a verdict of "Guilty," and the prisoner was consigned to gaol in the presence of the jury, who were too frightened to interfere.—*Times.*

The *Times* cites the following from an Irish paper, the *Skibbereen Eagle*:—As Merry as Cricketers.—The first day of the Session at Bantry, judges, counsellors, lawyers, jurors, clients, and process-servers, for want of business, went cricketing."