

LORD ESHER AND MRS. CATHCART.—In one of the innumerable appeals brought by Mrs. Cathcart recently, the Master of the Rolls indulged in some plain speaking. He reminded her he listened to her because she was born a lady, and was still a woman, and, in giving judgment, said the truth was this lady was not mistress of her mind. She brought frivolous appeals, and tormented a number of suitors with litigation which was perfectly despicable. What ought to be done by people against whom she brought actions was to apply to the courts for security for costs. If one-tenth part of what she said was true, she could, if she had any sense at all, have gone on with the counterclaim, but she had persistently disobeyed every rule of the court applicable to the cause. She would not have counsel and solicitor, and naturally in consequence everything she did was wrong. He believed she would ruin herself, for she was a terribly obstinate woman.—*Law Journal*.

LARCENY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—The Lord Chancellor, in moving the second reading of this bill (which has since passed through all its stages), explained that its object was to make a small but important change in the criminal law of England. As the law now stood, property might be stolen outside England and received in England with the full knowledge that it had been stolen, without the person so receiving it being amenable for any offence in this country. He might, in fact, hold the stolen property without being subject to any proceedings under the criminal law of England. The view taken by the judges had been that, inasmuch as a person could only be punished here for receiving with a guilty knowledge goods which had been feloniously stolen, and inasmuch as, outside this country, there was no such thing as "felony," a person in England could not be held to have feloniously received goods which had been stolen abroad. That was a technicality of an extreme kind, and one which he thought their lordships would agree ought not to stand in the way of justice. The object of the bill merely was to provide that if goods were stolen abroad and were brought to this country under circumstances which, if the offence were committed here, would render the receiver liable to conviction under our criminal law, such person should no longer be able to escape, on the mere technicality at present existing.

ENJOINING A PRIZE FIGHT.—The spectacle of a judge at Jack-