in evidence, expressed the opinion that the reverend gentleman should have done more than merely ask the age of the minor, the disparity of age and other circumstances being such as to awaken suspicion. He considered that a want of proper care had been manifested by the defendant, and on this ground he condemned the defendant to pay $100 damages, and the costs of the action as brought.

This decision seems to have been pretty generally approved by the public, as far as we have observed. It is certainly desirable that clergymen should not be in any uncertainty as to their responsibility in respect to the parties whom they marry.

BEAUDRY *V.* WORKMAN.

It is not surprising that attempts should be made to override or evade a statute which rigorously deprives an unsuccessful litigant of the right of appeal. Accordingly, notwithstanding all the decisions recently given, to the effect that, where the law has given no appeal, there is no right of revision, another attempt was made, in the case of *Beaudry* v. *Workman,* in the June term, to obtain the revision of a judgment in a case in which there was no appeal. A distinction was attempted to be drawn between final judgments and interlocutory judgments, it being contended that it was from a final judgment that there was no revision. This attempt, though supported by an able and ingenious argument, proved unsuccessful, the majority of the Court holding that there is no right of revision in the case of an interlocutory judgment in municipal cases. Mr. Justice Mondelet, however, dissented, as did Mr. Justice Smith, on a former occasion, and Mr. Justice Monk has several times given a reluctant assent to the principle established by previous decisions, so that we may expect to have the point presented again. We may add that the Court of Review called the Prothonotary's attention to a previous order directing him not to receive inscriptions for review in these cases.

WIGGINS *V.* THE QUEEN INSURANCE COMPANY.

On appeal by the plaintiff, the judgment rendered in this case by Mr. Justice Berthelot (3 C. L. J. 128), has been unanimously reversed by the full Court. This judgment does not touch the correctness of the verdict. The judges in appeal do not say that the jury were justified by the evidence in finding the verdict they did. This question did not come before them. They simply decide that the verdict found was really a verdict for the plaintiff, and not for the Company. They hold the words "but not in due form," inserted by the jury in one of their answers, to be mere surplusage and of no effect, and that their other answers constituted a good finding for the plaintiff.

EX PARTE GARNER.

The decision given in this case by Mr. Justice Drummond on the 15th of July, is deserving of some attention. It would appear that the police authorities in Montreal, having received certain information which led them to imagine that Garner could be extradited for an offence supposed to have been committed by him in the United States, caused him to be apprehended without any warrant being issued. Detective Cullen was in charge of the party that made the arrest, and this officer went so far as to tell Garner that there was something against him on the score of Fenianism. Garner accompanied the constables quietly at first, but on the way to the station, being asked by Cullen why he kept burglar's tools in his house, he shook off his captors and retreated some distance. Cullen having covered him with his revolver, and demanded his surrender, Garner fired his revolver at the detective and severely wounded him. Garner was recaptured, but no attempt was made to take proceedings against him under the Extradition Treaty. He afterwards made application to be admitted to bail, the detective having by this time recovered from his wound which was at first thought to be mortal. The application was rejected by