persons accused were indicted under the Post Office Act (1) for stealing chattels in a postal packet, and (2) or receiving property knowing it to be stolen, and to have been sent by post, and (3) under the Larceny Act or receiving property knowing it to be stolen. They were convicted, and a motion on their behalf was made to the Court of Criminal Appeal (Isaacs, C.J., and Bray and Lush, JJ.) to quash the conviction, on the ground that the judge who tried the case should either have put the prosecutor to elect on which count he would proceed, or in default of his so electing, to have quashed the indictment. The Court of Appeal held that although as a matter of practice and procedure the judge at the trial has a discretion to quash an indictment or call on the prosecutor to elect upon which count he will proceed in order to safeguard the interests of the prisoner and to prevent his being embarrassed; yet the court held that there is no rule of law to prevent two or more separate and distinct felonies being tried together on one indictment. In exercising the discretion above referred to the court held that the material thing to be considered is whether or not the overt acts relied on as proving the different offences charged are the same in substance. In the present case the court found that the overt acts were substantially the same, and, therefore, the judge at the trial had properly exercised his discretion and the appeal was accordingly dismissed. It appears from this report that the way in which the robbery was committed was not discovered. One of the culprits was proved to have forged the seal with which the packet was sealed.

PRACTICE—JUDGMENT AGAINST MARRIED WOMAN—AMENDMENT—ACCIDENTAL SLIP—RULE 319—(ONT. RULE 183).

Oxley v. *Link* (1914) 2 K.B. 734. This was an action against a married woman on a contract in which the plaintiff signed judgment in absolute form against the defendant in default of appearance. The judgment was signed in 1903, but no steps to enforce it were taken till 1913, when the plaintiff applied to examine the defendant as to her means. On this an objection was taken on 21 October, 1913, that the judgment was wrong. On 28 October, 1913, the plaintiff applied to amend the judgment and to make it conform to the form given in *Scott* v. *Morley*, 20 Q.B.D. 120. The plaintiff relied on the accidental slip Rule 319 (Ont. Rule 183). The Master refused the application and his