

transact their business without independent advice, provided no fraud or deceit is practised upon them and they understand the nature and effect of what they are doing. Such was the view of Mr. Justice Mabee, who tried the case, and of course it holds good in the meantime; but, as the case has been appealed to the same court which decided *Cox v. Adams*, the profession and public will look with much interest to having fresh light thrown upon a confessedly difficult and important question, upon which it will be safer at present to adopt Addison's view in the *Spectator* in another cause célèbre, that "much might be said on both sides."

There are probably some husbands who will sympathize more or less with the bitter complaint of Mr. Bumble in "Oliver Twist," when he was told that "in the eye of the law," his wife was supposed to act under his direction. "If the law supposes that, the law is a ass—a idiot. If that's the eye of the law, the law is a back-biter; and the worst I wish the law is, that his eye may be opened by experience!"

DEFAMERS BY TRADE.

Under the above heading a writer in the current number of an American legal journal of learning and repute (*Case and Comment*, p. 173) thus describes a certain section of the newspaper press in the United States:—

"A puny man behind a loaded 13-inch gun may work terrible havoc. So, with the use of a powerful newspaper, a man of mediocre ability and no conscience may greatly endanger the public welfare. It is all the worse when men of ability prostitute their talents and conscience to the work of a sensational and venomous press. Every public man recognizes that unselfish and patriotic service is no shield against outrageous attacks by unscrupulous journals. Sometimes their attacks are malignant; sometimes they are merely sensational, aiming to profit by pandering to suspicion, jealousy, envy, and other base passions of their readers. They have great ingenuity in torturing a simple