

charge of malfeasance in office has wrongfully been brought, should be restricted to his remedy against the newspaper itself in a libel suit, and not be permitted to obtain the name of his true accuser.

On the whole, it seems better not to attempt to restrict the inquiry of a court any more than is absolutely necessary, and the present case scarcely seems to be one which is sufficient to warrant any extension of the doctrine of privileged communication.

---

### GENERAL NOTES.

INSTRUCTIONS TO JURIES.—The Chicago Bar Association, through its president and secretary, recently took a postal-card ballot upon the question of "Oral Instruction to Juries." A postal-card was mailed to each member of the association requesting answers to the following questions: 1. Are you in favour of oral instruction to juries? (a) On the law alone? or, 2. If so: (b) On the law and the facts? Of the 550 cards mailed there were 290 replies; 181 voted in favour of oral instruction to juries, and 109 voted against oral instruction. Of the 181 who voted in favour of oral instruction 42 were in favour of instruction on the law alone, 119 were in favour of instruction on the law and the facts, and 20 qualified in various ways.

POLICE POWERS.—The evil ways of the police die hard. Again and again judges have pointed out that the police are not entitled to arrogate to themselves a right to question accused persons in private, which is not possessed by judge, jury, or counsel at any public hearing of the charge. At Warwick Assizes Mr. Justice Cave again expressed his well known views on the subject, and stated that he should certainly exclude all evidence obtained by this system of private interrogation, which is more appropriate to French than to English judicial procedure. He believes that most, if not all, of the judges agree with his opinion; and it is full time that the Home Secretary issued general instructions to the police throughout the country on this question, and on another of almost equal importance—the police practice of stripping and searching persons taken into custody irrespective of the nature of the charge or the improbability of any stolen property or weapon being concealed on the person of the accused.—*Law Journal (London)*.