Schmid v. *Humphrey*, 48 Ia. 652). The case of the Scotch doctor's boy and his master's gig, to which we referred at p. 192 of our last volume, is given at considerable length. We learn that in Indiana it is wicked to take up a subscription for a religious purpose on Sunday, yet it is no harm to feed pigs, to cut ripe grain, to market ripe melons, to sell cigars at a hotel: (*Catlett* v. *Trustees*, 62 Ind. 365; *Edgerton* v. *State*, 67 Ind. 588; *Wilkins* v. *State*, 59 Ind. 416; *Carver* v. *State*, 69 Ind. 61). We think that the Court must have been particularly impecunious when it decided the first of these cases, and we find that in Michigan and Pennsylvania the judges were not quite so strict as to money transactions of that kind on Sunday: (*Allen* v. *Duffie*, 43 Mich. 1; *Dale* v. *Knapp*, 24 Alb. L. J. 432) Sunday shaving is dealt with at length, and our own case of *Reg.* v. *Taylor* referred to, but only in a foot note, such unimportant personages are we poor Canadians. While we are on religious topics, let us see what our author has to say on the privileges of the clergy. We will assume, and, of course, rightly, that our readers know all the English cases; such as the case of the parish schoolmaster, who, like daddy long-legs, would not say his prayers, (no, we mean would not teach in Sunday-school), and was, consequently, thrown, not down stairs, but out of employment; and the case of Wesleyan architect, who was accused of having no religious acquaintance with the work of restoring churches: (*Gilpin* v. *Fowler*, 9 Exch. 615; *Botherhill* v. *Whytehead*, 41 L.T. (N.S.) 588); where both master and architect taught their clerical opponents, by actions of damages, to be somewhat more *suaviter in modo*. Mr. Browne gives us a case where the Rev. Mr. Bennett wrote to a lady who had belonged to his choir, making uncomplimentary remarks about Count Joannes (born simple George Jones), who wished to marry the fair singer. The Count sued the parson, the jury mulcted him in damages, and the Court said the marriage was none of his business. Mrs. Farnsworth was not so successful against the minister who "read her out of church," according to custom: (*Joannes* v. *Bennett*, 5 Alb. L. J, 169; *Farnsworth* v. *Storrs*, 5 Cush. 412). A priest has a right to keep order in his church, even though the disorder has arisen from the personal nature of some of the remarks in his sermon, but he has no right to forcibly eject a person lawfully in a sick room in which he is about to administer the sacrament of extreme unction to a dying man: (*Wall* v. *Lee*, 34 N Y. 141; *Cooper* v. *McKenna*, 124 Mass. 284). We find the rule laid down that a clergyman cannot receive a pecuniary benefit from a parishioner, unless he shows the utmost good faith on his part, and freedom of action on the part of the donor. And this, although the Court said in one case, truly enough, "in this country the danger is that clergymen will receive too little rather than too much." A priest cannot safely advise his hearers "to tie a kettle to the tail" of an obnoxious parishioner; and, as we know in this Dominion, if he warmly espouses the cause of a parliamentary candidate, and refuses the sacrament to those who propose to vote for his opponent, the election will be set aside on the ground of undue influence and intimidation: (*McGrath* v. *Finn*, Irish C. P. 1877; *Maise* v. *Robillard*, 4 Can. Leg. News, 10). Mr. Browne does not think that a priest may properly tell his people from the pulpit how they should vote.

Under the law of "Necessaries" we find that in Montreal an £80 ball dress is not a necessary for a poor wife; an infant's board is a necessity, but not so with timber to repair his house: (*Sharply* v. *Doutre*, 4 Can. Leg. News, 185; *Bradley* v. *Pratt*, 23 Vt, 378; *Freeman* v. *Bridger*, 4 Jones, L. 1). Dentistry is necessary for an infant, and so are spurs, and sleeve-links, and a horse, and a pony: (*Strong* v. *Foote*, 42 Conn. 61; *Hill* v. *Arpon*, 34 L. T. (N.S.) 125; *Ryder* v. *Wombwell*, L. R. 3 Exch. 90; *Hart* v. *Brater*, 1 Jur. 623; *Miller* v. *Smith*, 20 Minn. 248).

Among "Wagers" we have the case of