balance of purchase money due and then proceed to subject the property to lien as the property of the vendee, at whose instance the repairs have been made.

This position concedes that a lien is in some sort acquired by the mechanic as to such property, but its enforcement merely cannot be proceeded with unless the title in the vendee is first made absolute.

Whether this manner of procedure pointed out by the court would be exclusive is to be doubted. Why should not the property be placed, when lien is recognized sub modo, in custodia legis and be sold with the vendor's balance to be deducted first from the proceeds, preferably even to costs, at least where it is reasonably apparent that the chance of the vendor of collecting his balance is not only not diminished, but increased?

Some courts may differ as to construction of mechanics' lien statutes being liberal or strict, but they seem quite one way that, as to enforcement, the former rule prevails. Here the court allows the lien to attach. The mechanic enhances the selling security. The article is of a character that will reasonably need repair. Equity, therefore, ought to assist towards a rule which is not only just, but operates to the interest of all concerned.— *Central Law Journal.*

CROSS-EXAMINATION AS TO CHARACTER.

On the 4th March last, the English Court of Criminal Appeal quashed the conviction of an appellant who had been found guilty of robbery with violence, upon the ground that the learned judge who presided at the trial wrongly admitted evidence of the prisoner's character. As is well known, the Criminal Evidence Act, 1898, s. 1 (*f*), provides that "a person charged and being a witness in pursuance of this Act shall not be asked, and if asked shall not be required to answer, any question tending to shew that he has committed, or been convicted of, or been charged with any offence other than that wherewith he is then charged, or is a bad character, unless (1) the proof that he has committed or been convicted of such other offence is admissible