

The study of sacred literature by men of the lowest class was checked by these two laws: If a man of the Sooder (lowest order) reads the Beids of the Shaster (the most sacred of their scriptures), or the Pooran (the historical scriptures), to a Brahmin, a Chehteree, or a Bice, then the magistrate shall heat some bitter oil and pour it into the aforesaid Sooder's mouth; and if a Sooder listens to the Beids of the Shaster, then the oil, heated as before, shall be poured into his ears, and tin and wax shall be melted together, and the orifice of his ears shall be stopped up therewith. If a Sooder gets by heart the Beids of the Shaster, the magistrate shall put him to death. According to the laws of Menu, the forgetting the texts of the scripture by one entitled to learn them was a crime nearly equal to that of drinking spirits; and drinking spirits was a crime of the highest degree, like killing a Brahmin. (Sir Wm. Jones, Vol. III., c. 11, ss. 55, 57.)

R. V. ROGERS.

CURRENT ENGLISH CASES.

The Law Reports for June comprise (1895) 1 Q.B., pp. 769-948; (1895) P., pp. 177-219; (1895) 2 Ch., pp. 1-135; and (1895) A.C., pp. 117-327.

CRIMINAL LAW—PERJURY—MATERIAL STATEMENT—EVIDENCE AFFECTING CREDIT OF WITNESS.

In *The Queen v. Bager*, (1895) 1 Q.B. 797; 15 R. May 380, the question for the decision of the court for Crown cases reserved was whether a person indicted for perjury could be convicted on proof of false statements made by him as a witness in a cause as to matters merely affecting his credit, and the question was unanimously answered in the affirmative by the court (Lord Russell, C.J., and Hawkins, Cave, Grantham, and Lawrance, JJ.). In this case the defendant had been charged with selling liquor without a license, and he had falsely sworn that when previously charged with a similar offence he had not authorized a plea of guilty to be put in, and that such plea had been put in without his authority and against his will.

LANDLOR AND TENANT—SUB-LEASE—IMPLIED COVENANT FOR QUIET ENJOYMENT—DURATION OF COVENANT.

In *Baynes v. Lloyd*, (1895) 1 Q.B. 820; 15 R. June 233, an interesting point in the law of landlord and tenant is discussed.