

that defendant's wall *embarque* on plaintiff's pignon. This being the opinion of the Court the judgment will be reversed with costs of all the courts against the respondent.

The judgment is in the following terms:—

“La cour, etc.,

“Considérant que l'appelant ne s'est pas servi du mur de pignon de l'intimé pour soutenir son mur;

“Considérant que le mur de pignon de l'intimé n'est pas exclusivement bâti sur son terrain; mais que le dit mur de pignon surplombe le terrain de l'appelant, et qu'il est en preuve que l'exhaussement du mur de l'appelant au-dessus du pignon de l'intimé n'excède pas la division des terrains des parties en cette cause;

“Considérant qu'il y a erreur dans le jugement de la Cour Supérieure siégeant en révision à Montréal le 31^{me} jour de mai 1880, par lequel le dit appelant, défendeur en cour de première instance, est condamné à payer au demandeur, intimé, la somme de \$55.46, moitié de la valeur du dit mur de l'intimé, et les dépens; et que le jugement de la cour de première instance, savoir, le jugement rendu par la Cour Supérieure siégeant à Montréal, le 30^{me} jour de septembre 1879, était bien fondé, renverse, casse, et annule le dit jugement de la Cour de Révision, savoir le dit jugement du 31 mai 1880 et, procédant à rendre le jugement que la dite cour de révision aurait dû rendre, renvoie l'action du dit intimé-demandeur, avec frais tant en cour de première instance et en révision que sur cet appel.”

Judgment of C. R. reversed.

Robidoux & Fortin, for Appellant.

Béique & McGoun, for Respondent.

GENERAL NOTES.

Mr. L. W. Coutlee has been appointed Deputy Attorney-General in Manitoba. Mr. Coutlee was admitted to the bar of Manitoba during Easter term, 1882, and has since practised in Winnipeg; he is also a member of the bar of Quebec, admitted midsummer 1873, a member of the bar of Ontario, admitted during Hilary term, 1875, and a graduate of McGill University, Montreal.

Some time ago a number of barbers were summoned before Police Magistrate Denison, charged, under an Act of Charles II., with shaving on Sunday. The magistrate discharged them on the ground that shaving had become an act of cleanliness and therefore of necessity. More recently three barbers of Oldham, England, for the same offence were fined five shillings each.—*Mail*.

A step of some importance was taken during the last session of Parliament towards the redemption of the national debt of Great Britain. A large amount of terminable annuities will become due in 1885, and it is proposed to replace these by others, which will extinguish £173,000,000 in twenty years. This, with the occasional reduction effected by surpluses, will probably reduce the debt in 1905 to £550,000,000. At the close of the Napoleonic wars in 1815 the national debt was only £110,000,000 greater than it is now, but the debt *per capita* was £46, against £22 now, and the annual interest charged was about 32 shillings per head of the population against 14 shillings now. In the Queen's speech at prorogation it was said: “The provision which you have made for further continuous redemption of the national debt will materially aid in the maintenance of public credit.”

The London *Standard*, an independent journal, referring to the prolonged debates of the Commons, after admitting that at one time the House of Lords might be described as a mere court of registry, goes on to say: “But affairs are very different now. The relative position of the House of Lords and the House of Commons has been reversed. The House of Lords is now the abler and more statesmanlike of the two. If this be an accident, it is what may be called a durable accident, for it has lasted for some years, and shows no signs of coming to an end. And under these circumstances, any attempt to oust the House of Lords from the discharge of its allotted functions in our constitutional economy ought to meet with the instant reprobation of all impartial men.”

The following is the official text of the decision in the Canon Bernard case:—“This tribunal is not competent to adjudicate upon the acts committed in America which are charged against the Canon. As regards his proceedings in Belgium, he acted in good faith and according to orders of his superiors when he carried off the treasury. This good faith is attested by the letter of Canon Bouvry, pointing out to Canon Bernard the danger of suffering the treasury to remain at Tournai, by the silence of the bishop, and by the fact that no proceedings were taken against Canon Bernard. Admitting that he allowed himself to be carried away by his zeal, still no fraudulent intention has been proved.”

The election cases in Ontario have yielded a crop of humorous incidents, to compensate for their intrusion upon the summer vacation. In the Muskoka case, before Mr. Justice Ferguson, a witness stated that “he was introduced to the mysterious stranger by Edward Miller.” Mr. BETHUNE—“What was the mysterious stranger?” WITNESS—“Why, he was as like him as two peas.” (Pointing to Mr. Justice Ferguson.) This, we are told, excited uncontrollable laughter in court, in which the learned judge joined heartily. Counsel thought it necessary to elicit the further answer that “the stranger was not Mr. Justice Ferguson.” In the East York case, before Mr. Justice Galt, a witness distinguished with some ingenuity the stages of inebriation. He admitted “that in consequence of having just seen some old friends he was a little the worse for liquor, and all that passed was said by him jokingly and in fun; he was not drunk, but just half and half, perhaps a little on the drunk end.”