at a person's head. That woman who died in Kent died in this way. She was slowly mesmerized to her death. I am gradually dying, and the substance of my body is being taken away. I have had thirteen doctors during the year. Mr. De Rutzen suggested that he should send an officer to the house. The applicant: Cannot you have my husband before you, and question him about it? Mr. De Rutzen said that he could not. The applicant: You are an English magistrate, and you connive at private murder! Good morning. She then left the Court.—*Pall Mall Budget, June 27th ult.*

It is doubtful if the history of criminal law can furnish a parallel to the crime for which Dye and Anderson were hanged at Sacramento last week. Dye was public administrator of Sacramento county, and in conjunction with Anderson and one Lawton, plotted the murder of several wealthy old residents of that county, supposed to be without heirs and intestate, in order that he might possess himself of their estates through the manipulations of his office. Killing a man in order to administer upon his estate is certainly a novelty. The scheme failed in execution in one instance, and through the discovery of a will or of heirs in others. At length the conspirators actually murdered one Tullis, who was thought to answer the requirements, but who turned out, like most men of property, to have heirs, namely, an afflicted brother and nephew waiting for his money. The discovery of the crime was equally singular. It was ascertained that the murderers had used a boat to go to the victim's residence, and on the boat, evidently a new one, were found pencilled figures and computations which proved to be the computation of the amount of lumber necessary to construct such a boat. Inquiry among the lumber-yards soon exposed the recent purchase of the exact kind and quality of lumber by the guilty parties, and Dye soon confessed. It is to be hoped that the new Constitution of California has made the office in question a salaried one, rather than dependent as formerly solely on the fees and perquisites derivable from the estates administered, and thus taken away such a fearful inducement to official diligence.—*Albany Law Journal.*

Prosecution of Offences Bill.—On Tuesday, May 27th ult., in the House of Lords, the Lord Chancellor, in moving the second reading of this bill, which had come up from the Commons, explained to their lordships that the measure had resulted from the recommendations of a royal commission. It was the opinion of those most conversant with the subject that in the administration of our criminal law there was no necessity for a general and thorough change; but some of the most eminent of the witnesses examined by the commission thought that some change was required. The object of this bill was to meet exceptional cases—such as large commercial frauds, in which private persons could not be expected to undertake the expense of prosecutions. The bill proposed that the Secretary of State should appoint an officer, who would be called the director of public prosecutions. It would be the duty of the latter, under the Secretary of State and the Attorney-General, to carry out prosecutions undertaken by the Government. Regulations would be made by the Attorney-General, with the approval of the Secretary of State, as to the exceptional cases in which prosecutions would be undertaken, and as to the mode in which the director of public prosecutions would give advice. The director of public prosecutions would be in the position of an Under-Secretary of State. Solicitors would be appointed for the assizes; and there would be a staff in the director's department, the number of which would depend on the work to be done. It would not be large at first. For the first time the law officers would have an office in London, and there would be a continuity of rules in their department. The noble and learned earl concluded by moving the second reading.—*The Law Journal, May* 31, 1879.