

but the fact that they receive it as evidence, and even allow him to tell what some other person also believes, is sufficient to shew that they are ready to give at least some weight to those beliefs. But every person who has any acquaintance with the unreasonable prejudices and unaccountable beliefs that are by no means uncommon among men can see that any tribunal which takes into account the beliefs of witnesses on the question of the guilt of an accused person is in great danger of doing injustice. The exhibition of French character made in this prosecution has been strikingly unfavorable. The conspiracies, the prejudices, and the forgeries revealed in this prosecution are enough to set the world aghast. Probably no other trial ever disclosed so many evidences of corruption among officials to aid a prosecution. It seems difficult to escape the conviction that there was a deliberate and cold-blooded purpose on the part of some of them to work the ruin of an innocent man. Still more significant, perhaps, is the avowed justification of infamous acts on the ground that the good of France required them. It is not a compliment to the character of the French people to have a sane person offer them such a defense for polluting the fountains of justice. To make such a claim of justification pre-supposes some idea that it will be thought a respectable one; and according to all reports it seems to be taken seriously by many of the French people. In seeking for the reasons why the French people are losing their prestige among the nations we may well believe that the chief of all these reasons is a lack of deep and strong moral character, of which one of the noblest attributes is a sturdy sense of justice.—*Case and Comment.*—U.S.

The performance of the duty of a street railway company to maintain and operate its road for the benefit of the public is held, in *State ex rel. Bridgeton v. Bridgeton & Millville Traction Co.* (N.J.) 45 L.R.A. 837, to be enforceable by mandamus.

The liability of a sleeping-car company for theft of a passenger's effects while he is asleep is denied in *Pullman's Palace Car Co. v. Adams* (Ala.) 45 L.R.A. 767, if the company has exercised reasonable diligence; but the mere fact that the porter did not go to sleep during his watch is not deemed sufficient proof of such diligence. The theft of a ring carried in a pocket book, and which is not capable of being used on the journey, is held not to make the company liable, even if its loss was due to the company's negligence.