

ments made in answer to police questions about the time of arrest are made to persons of authority, and under fear, compulsion, or inducement, and that if admitted in evidence at all the circumstances under which they were made should be carefully scrutinized in accordance with the rule in *Regina v. Thompson*, 62 Law J. Rep. M. C. 93; L. R. (1893) 2 Q. B. 12, and the strong opinions of Mr. Justice Cave in *Regina v. Male*, which being expressed after *Regina v. Thompson*, appear with that case to justify the conclusion that *Regina v. Brackenbury* can no longer be regarded as of any authority. It is curious that the cases of *Regina v. Jarvis*, L. R. 1 C. C. R. 96, and *Regina v. Reeve*, L. R. 1 C. C. R. 362, do not seem to have been cited in *Regina v. Thompson*, and their authority or applicability seems to be considerably shaken by the late decision.—*Ib.*

PREPARATION FOR THE BAR.

At a Bar dinner in Philadelphia Mr. Richard Vaux, in responding to the toast of "The Bar," dwelt on the years of discipline which Chief Justice Gibson devoted to reading the writings of "the fathers," years which tended to weld the iron of his genius by the well directed blows of knowledge, so that genius, treated by knowledge, was converted into the steel of wisdom; so that, to use Mr. Vaux's words, "he became able to write those matchless opinions which have been and always will be looked upon as *authority*." "How," asked Mr. Vaux, "was he able to do this? He lived in a country village, he had no clients and had to occupy his time in diligently practising economy; he read Blackstone ten times a year; he read Coke five times a year, and studied Ferne on Remainders till he knew what a remainder was."

"I always fear," says another great lawyer, "the young man who knows one book."

The other side of the question is presented in a story told of a late Chief Justice, famous for erudite knowledge. The person who relates the incident had occasion to visit him in chambers, when the conversation turned on a noted cause recently heard before the Chief Justice at *nisi prius*. Mr. B. had been of counsel, and speaking of his argument with half concealed contempt, the Chief Justice said: "B. took up the time of the court in arguing on general '*principles*,' and discussing Coke and Littleton—but when I returned to my library, I took down my reports and found a '*case*' which was on all fours with the one at bar."