
Flotsam and Jetsam.

The Shakespeare-Bacon controversy has always had a great attraction for lawyers, and several eminent judges have taken part in it. In this connection an amusing anecdote is related in Manson's "Builders of Our Law," of Baron Martin, who is said to have been a lawyer pure and simple. "Sergeant Robinson relates that on one circuit Baron Martin took Frank Talfourd round with him as his marshal. One evening after dinner, rousing himself from a short nap, the Baron found Frank reading Shakespeare. 'I find, Frank,' he said, 'you are always reading plays, and especially Shakespeare. I never found time to read him myself, but I suppose he is a big fellow.' 'Yes, Baron,' was the reply, 'he is generally acknowledged to be the greatest poet the world ever produced.' 'Well,' said the judge, 'I think I should like to read one of his works, just to see what it is like. Which do you recommend?' 'They are all admirable productions,' replied the marshal, 'but I have just been again reading "Measure for Measure," and I think that will, perhaps, please you as well as any.' 'All right,' said the Baron; 'lend it to me, and I will read it before I go to sleep.' The next morning he was of course asked how he liked the play. 'Well,' was the Baron's reply. 'I can't say I think much of it; it contains atrociously bad law, and I am of opinion that your friend Shakespeare is a very overated man.'"

UNITED STATES DECISIONS.

EXEMPTION.—A bicycle used by a painter, paperhanger and billposter to earn a livelihood is held in *Roberts v. Parker* (Ia.) 57 L.R.A. 764, to be within the provisions of a statute exempting from execution the team of a labourer who is the head of a family, and the waggon or other vehicle, by the use of which he earns his living, although the bicycle was not known when the statute was enacted.

FORGERY.—To add to a cancelled check the words: "In full of account to date" with intent to alter its effect as a receipt, is held, in *Gordon v. Com.* (Va.) 57 L.R.A. 744, to constitute forgery.

NEGLIGENCE—INFANT.—Negligence of an infant in performance of his contract to thresh grain which results in the destruction of the grain and the shed covering it by fire set by sparks from the engine is held, in *Lowery v. Cate* (Penn.) 57 L.R.A. 673, not to render him liable for the loss. With this case is a note, reviewing the authorities on liability of an infant for torts.