

(30 How. St. Tr. 1131). In that case, almost exactly analogous to the present case, upon a conviction for libel the defendant was awarded imprisonment and ordered to find security for his good behaviour, and the unanimous opinion of the judges was that the court could take that course in all cases of misdemeanour. It is true that in *Rex v. Hart*, the trial and conviction was in the King's Bench, but the principle was held to apply to a conviction and judgment at the Central Criminal Court in *Reg. v. Dunn* (12 Q.B. 1025). Both of those cases related to misdemeanours at the time punishable at common law only, whereas the indictment in question was under the statutory provisions of the Libel Act, 1843. That Act, however, does not appear to remove or qualify the common law power of the court to require sureties, so that the contention of the appellant was very properly held not to be well-founded.

THE SUFFRAGISTS' TRIAL.

The ruling above referred to has received the practical sanction of Mr. Justice Phillimore, who, on sentencing the defendants convicted on Tuesday last at the Old Bailey, in connection with the suffragist conspiracy, required them to enter into recognizances and find sureties as in the case which came before the Court of Criminal Appeal. The case was somewhat remarkable for the open avowal by the learned judge as to what his attitude would be, if consulted by the Home Secretary, in connection with the necessity of applying to the case of either prisoner the provisions of the recently passed Prisoners (Temporary Discharge for Ill-health) Act, 1913. One cannot but think that in the interest of public order and decency a good effect should be produced by the outspoken expressions of the learned judge, and the well-merited, although severe terms of the sentence imposed on the prisoners.

THE AGE FOR WHIPPING.

The curious and novel situation of a prisoner appealing for the substitution of a sentence of whipping in lieu of that of