the statement if these loans had been put under the head of "due to other banks," because that would mean the balances on the transactions —what was called in England the clearing house balances. However in this case he went no further than this, that the Judge who presided at the trial ventured to give a ruling to which after consideration by the full Court, it was not thought well to adhere strictly.

MONK, J., said it was not necessary for him to state that he did not intend or desire to dissent from the judgment which had just been rendered. With regard to the indictment the objection was taken on a demurrer, but it was overruled, and the defendant's counsel did not think it desirable to have that point reserved. With regard to the questions reserved, no doubt the points involved were of some difficulty. As to the first point, he had felt doubts, but he did not think proper to communicate them to the jury. He had told them it was a matter of law, but entertaining doubts as he did, he had reserved his ruling for the opinion of the full Court, and the Court had held that this ruling in law was wrong: that it was not a pure question of law but one of fact, or, at all events, a mixed question of law and fact, whether the classification was right or wrong. On the second point, he had also had doubts, and he had communicated his doubts to this Court, and this Court was of opinion that it was a matter of fact. It was proper, as he had no opportunity of consulting his colleagues at the time, that he should reserve these points, and he was satisfied that the ruling of this Court on them was one that would command respect. Out of deference to his colleagues he would not enter a dissent, and though he would not go the length of saying that his opinion was entirely altered, yet he appeared as concurring in the judgment of the Court.

Verdict quashed and set aside.

T. W. Ritchie, Q.C., for the prosecution.

W. H. Kerr, Q.C., for the defendant.

CURRENT EVENTS.

FAUTEUX v. MONTREAL LOAN & MORTGAGE CO. —In this case the judgment of the Court of Queen's Bench at Montreal, 21st December, 1878, (See 2 Legal News, p. 15; 22 L. C. J. p. 282), has been affirmed by the Supreme Court. The point decided was that a sale by the Sheriff of Montreal, at his own office, of land situate in the Parish of l'Enfant Jésus, a duly erected parish for all civil purposes formed out of the Parish of Montreal, was void, and that such sale could be legally effected only at the Church door of the Parish of l'Enfant Jésus. These sales at the Sheriff's office, with the exception of those attacked in pending suits, have been made valid by the statute passed last session: see p. 328 of this volume.

GENERAL NOTES.

WIGS.—A Scotch advocate writes to a New York journal concerning the peculiarities and traditions of his profession. "I find," he said, "that nothing interests an American so much as my wig. I only wish the person who thus derives amusement from the fashion had to experience its inconvenience. To begin with, they are by no means cheap. A horsehair wig costs about $50, and an ordinary one—they are now all made out of whalebone shavings—about $30. They very soon get dirty, and to powder them, as some men used to do, only makes one's coat perpetually greasy. Then in summer they are hot and tight on the head. Yet we all wear them. We are not compelled to do so. We must wear a gown; that is our mandate. The abolition of the gown I should regret. Its several parts involve not a little curious history. For instance we carry at the back of the gown a little pocket which, though still worn, is now sown up. That appendage takes you back more than 300 years, to the days before the Reformation, when the advocates were churchmen. No churchman was allowed to accept a regular payment for his services. But, if he was prohibited from handling the money, that was no reason why you, if you wanted your case particularly well attended to, should not put a couple of gold pieces in the bag which he carried at his back. So you see we have still some relics of the past surviving in this reforming age. Many of our names, even, strike an American as peculiar. The official head of the bar is called 'The Dean of Faculty.' 'Ah,' said Sydney Smith, when he heard the title for the first time, 'that's very odd now; with us in England our deans have no faculties!' Absurd as these old customs and names may be, it cannot be denied that the country has reason to be proud of her judicial arrangements, not merely in the Supreme Court, but down to the humblest judicatory."