

they were arrested and lodged in jail. Evidence was rapidly gathered and sifted, and within ten days the preliminary examination before the magistrate took place, thirty-five witnesses being examined at the three sittings. On May 14th the prisoners were committed for trial. The indictment for the offence for which the prisoners were charged was presented to the Grand Jury on the 23rd of May, and a true bill found. On the morning of the Queen's birthday (which, by the way, the presiding Judge, Chancellor Boyd, said "Although a holiday was an appropriate day to do the Queen's business") the case was called, and within one hour the jury panel was selected and the trial begun. During the first day the evidence of thirty-three witnesses was taken between 11.30 a.m. and 7 p.m. On the second day the case was finished, the Judge's charge being concluded at 6 p.m. At 6.35 the jury brought in a verdict of guilty against all three prisoners. By 6.45 the prisoners were sentenced to the penitentiary for life, and within a few hours were removed to their present abode at Kingston. The detective department did its work well, and was most energetically and intelligently aided by the United States authorities. Too much praise cannot be given to Mr. E. F. B. Johnston, Q.C., for his skilful management of the case for the Crown, whilst Mr. German deserves his meed of praise for loyal devotion to the interests of his client, Dullman. One can imagine that the culprits and their instigators may now have come to the conclusion that whilst British justice gives absolute fair play to anyone charged with crime it is an act of folly to trifle with a machine which, with ceaseless activity and unimpassioned precision, works out an adequate and just conclusion.

SUPREME COURT PRACTICE.

In the case of *Farquharson v. The Imperial Oil Co.*, lately decided by the Supreme Court of Canada, a question of practice was raised which is of great importance to the Ontario profession. A report of the case will appear in the next number of the reports, but a brief summary may enable the profession to understand the situation more clearly.

The plaintiff in the case appealed from the decision at the trial to the Divisional Court, and, being unsuccessful there, had no appeal as of right to the Court of Appeal. He therefore applied to the Registrar of the Supreme Court in Chambers for leave to