direction could not be too soon placed within well-defined limits. Such an incident, however, being extremely rare, we are less concerned for the result of Mr. Lewis's coming motion on the subject.—*Law Times.*

A Long Imprisonment.—There is a pauper debtor named Kelly, in the county gaol of Roscommon, whose incarceration dates from 23rd June, 1853. This man costs the county £53 a year for his support. Very shortly he will have completed twenty-one years' confinement, at a cost to the ratepayers of £1,166. At the late assizes, one of the Board of Superintendence brought the matter before the grand jury, and a representation was made of the fact to Judge O'Brien, who asked for the production of the warrant under which the man was detained, but it was found that this was not explanatory of the cause, and the Governor of the gaol informed His Lordship he believed is was for contempt of Court, for non-payment of costs in the Court of Probate. As the order of the Court, which was asked for, could not be produced, His Lordship requested the Crown Solicitor to inquire into the matter. The man by this time may have become reconciled to his quarters, but the cesspayers complain of the expence.

A striking illustration of the fallibility of the Court of Exchequer Chamber is afforded by a case which was before the House of Lords on the 9th inst. The case also shows that the Judges of the intermediate court of appeal are disinclined to learn, or to apply, the doctrines of equity, however plain or however controlling they may be. A person who held certain shares in the Shropshire Union Railway Company, as trustee of the company, in breach of the trust, transferred them to one Robson, on whose death his executrix applied to have the shares transferred into her name. The company refused, on the ground that the shares were their property. On application to the Court of Queen's Bench on a *mandamus*, and on a special case being stated, that Court decided in favour of the company. The executrix appealed, and the Court of Exchequer Chamber unanimously reversed the decision of the Court of Queen's Bench. This unanimous court of appeal has now had the satisfaction of learning from Lord Cairns that the case was very simple, and could hardly admit of argument. His Lordship said, and with most admirable candour, "unless the whole of the well-known system of trusts in this country was to be held applicable only to the case of infants, married women, and persons with limited interests, the decision of the Court of Exchequer Chamber could not be upheld."—*Law Times.*

The following are the examples of the attacks of English newspapers on English judges :—The *Morning Post* says : "Mr. Justice Denman will have rendernd an immense service to the nation if the result of the recent committal of Craddock for contempt of court should be that a similar act is rendered impossible for the future." The *Times* says : "We do not say that Mr. Justice Denman was not acting at Hertford within his powers, but we do unhesitatingly say this : 'That the case proves that such powers ought not to be vested in any Judge.'" The *Pall Mall Gazette* says : "We trust that the discussion in parliament will induce the Judges to set bounds for themselves to the authority which they at present exercise with respect to contempt of court. Arbitrary authority of any kind is a dangerous possession, and is apt to grow by invisible accretions in the hands of its possessors ; it is only by the jealous supervision of those for whose ultimate benefit it is conferred, and by the wise self-restraint of those who wield it, that it can be prevented from degenerating into a scandal, if not into an absolute instrument of oppression." The *Morning Advertiser*, commenting on the same case, remarks, "that it hopes to see it made the pivot of re-action, and Sir Alexander Cockburn's pleasant theory and practice of contempt stamped with all the reprobation it merits at the hands of a free people."

Judicial Arrears.—A Parliamentary return ordered on the motion of Sir Sydney Waterlow, shows that in the legal year ending with the Long Vacation of 1874, there were 416 causes tried at Guildhall before judges of the Superior Courts, and there were as many as 786 causes made "remanets." Of Queen's Bench causes there were only 115 tried and 554 remanets. In the same year there were 838 causes tried at Westminster, and 447 remanets ; in the Queen's Bench 236 tried and 270 remanets. In the return from the Court of Exchequer it is stated how many of the causes were made remanets "by consent," viz., 28 of the 59 remanets in London, and 22 of 121 at at Westminster.

Respect for the Bench.—The members of the State of New York practising in the Court of Appeals have resolved, at a meeting specially held for the purpose, that "as a mark of respect to the Chief Justice and associate Justices of this Court, and as an indication of the veneration at all times due to justice, the crier of this