

honest lawyer. I took them, and am trying to find one. (Sensation.)" This seems to have "brought down the house." But, after all, there should have been no sensation; for, when one comes to think about it, how *could* even this very remarkable person find an honest lawyer when, according to his own statement, there are none to find? It is really very sad about this dear lady and her little claim. The sum, however, involved is only \$100,000, and she doubtless put the matter into good hands when she confided her difficulty to her pastor. And so it is all right now, and we all feel quite satisfied and happy about it. If, however, resort must be had to the law, it may be necessary for the pastor to go outside the circle of his own legal friends for what he wants; for it is also reported that he understands from numbers of them (meaning, we presume, these legal friends) "that you cannot be a lawyer and an honest man." Of course, the reverend gentleman would not exaggerate, and his veracity is above suspicion. We can, therefore, only deplore that, so far as *his* legal friends are concerned, he has "fallen among thieves"; though we think it just a little unkind to advertise them after this fashion. If, however, he is right in his estimate of them, there is great reason for the manner in which he exhorts them to repentance. This exhortation (in which we entirely concur) was doubtless delivered with great dramatic force, and in tones of righteous indignation. It reads thus: "If you cannot be honest and succeed in your profession, *get out of it!*"

We would also conclude with a similar exhortation to those pastors to whom it may apply: "If you cannot fill your church without slandering your neighbours, or without turning a house of God into a sort of dime theatre, *get out of it!*"

CRIMINAL JURISDICTION OF THE CHANCERY DIVISION.

The question whether or not the Divisional Court of the Chancery Division is entitled to exercise a general criminal jurisdiction was again under discussion in the recent case of *The Queen v. Davis*. The defendant in that case applied to Ferguson, J., for a *certiorari* to bring up a conviction, and asked that the writ might be made returnable in the Divisional Court of the Chancery Division; but acting on the views expressed by him in *The Queen v. Birchall*, 19 O.R. 696, the learned judge refused that part of the application, and from his decision on that point the defendant appealed to the Divisional Court of the Chancery Division. The appeal was heard in June last before the Chancellor, and Robertson and Meredith, JJ., and judgment was given on the 1st December instant. Robertson, J., agreed with the view expressed by Ferguson, J., in *The Queen v. Birchall*, *supra*, and Meredith, J., agreed with the Chancellor, who retained his former opinion. The result of the matter was that although the court, as then constituted, was in favour of entertaining jurisdiction, yet, as there was an equal division of opinion between the four judges of the Chancery Division, the court dismissed the appeal, inasmuch as the defendant would not be deprived of any remedy or right, but could still prosecute his application under the *certiorari* before the Divisional Court in which it had been made returnable.

We referred to this question of the criminal jurisdiction of the Chancery