

judicial relation of a cow to a constable, and of both to a policeman, demands more elaborate consideration than Courts usually bestow upon litigation originating before justices of the peace.'

"An Old Bailey Sessions Paper of Two Hundred Years Ago" is the title of an article in the *Westminster Review*, and the extracts given by Mr. Vellacott, who contributes the article, show that the offences tried differ but little from those with which modern judges are accustomed to deal. He says: "If we compare these sessions papers with any of our own time, we shall notice points of both likeness and unlikeness—likeness, because human nature is very much the same in all ages, and there is in legal phraseology a rugged conservatism; unlikeness, because criminal law and criminal procedure have altered with the embracing fabric of civilization. Some offences are now obsolete; other new ones have sprung up. If the clippers of coin are no longer hanged and burned, the counterfeiter and the utterer are sent to hard labour and penal servitude. The murder of a husband is no longer petty treason, benefit of the clergy is gone, and the infamous branding which was its outcome. No more is the convict transported to the American plantations or the West Indian sugar islands. The receiving of stolen goods is more dangerous than in times of yore. The acquisition of money by false pretences, if thoroughly established, receives a more specific, if not more effective, punishment than the pillory."

Sir William Leece Drinkwater, first deemster of the Isle of Man, who this month has completed fifty years' service as judge of the Manx High Court, will at the end of the month send in his resignation of the office of deemster. Sir William, who is eighty-five years old, has seen longer judicial service than any judge in the United Kingdom. Since his appointment he has been *ex officio* a member of the Legislative Council or upper branch of the Manx Legislature. He is a native of Liverpool, but is Manx by descent.

The trial, in England, of a man named William Lennox Watson, for manslaughter, in causing the death of a lady, whom he assumed to treat for cancer, has resulted in the acquittal of the prisoner—greatly to the dissatisfaction of the medical profession. His treatment consisted in the application of a plaster containing arsenic. The patient died of arsenical poisoning. The defence was that she kept the plaster on longer than he directed, and that his services were wholly gratuitous.