

years ago respecting the death of Mr. Bravo, in what is generally known as the Balham mystery, when he represented the Crown at the inquiry.

Sir Henry Thurstan Holland, Financial Secretary to the Treasury, is the eldest son of the late Sir Henry Holland, M.D. He was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1849, and is a bencher of his Inn. He was legal adviser to the Colonial Office from 1867 till 1870, Assistant Under-Secretary for the Colonies from 1870 till 1874, and has been M.P. for Midhurst from the latter date.

Mr. Aretas Akers-Douglas, Patronage Secretary to the Treasury, is the eldest son of the Rev. Aretas Akers, of Malling Abbey, Kent, and was born in 1851. He was educated at Eton and at University College, Oxford, and is a barrister of the Inner Temple. He was elected M.P. for East Kent in 1880. Mr. Akers assumed the additional name of Douglas, under the will of his kinsman Mr. Alexander Douglas.

Mr. Charles Dalrymple, Junior Lord of the Treasury, is the second son of the late Sir Charles Dalrymple Ferguson, and was born in 1839. He assumed in 1849 the name of Dalrymple, on succeeding to the estates of his great-grandfather, Lord Hailes, of Newhailes, Midlothian. Mr. Dalrymple is a barrister of Lincoln's Inn and a magistrate for Haddingtonshire, Midlothian, and Ayrshire. Mr. Dalrymple was M.P. for Buteshire from 1868 till 1880, and was re-elected in July of the latter year in place of Mr. Russell, whose election was voided.

The Hon. Edward Stanhope, Vice-President of the Council, is the second son of Philip, fifth Earl Stanhope, and was born in 1840. He became a barrister of the Inner Temple in 1865, Secretary of the Board of Trade from 1875 till 1878, and Under-Secretary of State for India from the latter date till the last dissolution. He was first elected to Parliament as member for Mid-Lincolnshire in 1874.

The Right Hon. Robert Bourke, who has been re-appointed Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs—a post which he held from 1874 till 1880—is the third son of the Fifth Earl of Mayo. He was born in 1827, and was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in

1852, and has sat for Lynn Regis since 1868. Mr. Bourke is a magistrate and deputy-lieutenant for Haddingtonshire. He was sworn a Privy Councillor in 1880.

Baron Henry de Worms, F.R.A.S., Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, is the youngest son of the late Baron de Worms. He was born in 1840. He was educated at King's College, London; was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1863, and joined the Home Circuit. He is a magistrate for Middlesex, and has sat for Greenwich since the last general election.

Mr. Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, Civil Lord of the Admiralty, is the eldest son of the late Mr. Ellis Bartlett, of Plymouth. He was born in 1848, and was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1877, and was for some time one of her Majesty's inspectors of schools. He has sat in Parliament as member for Eye since 1880.

Mr. Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley, Under-Secretary of State for the Home Department, is the second son of the late Right Hon. James Archibald Stuart-Wortley, Q.C., M.P., sometime recorder of London and Solicitor-General. He was born in 1851, and was called to the Bar at the Inner Temple in 1876, and is a member of the North-Eastern Circuit. From February, 1879, till March, 1880, he acted as secretary to the Royal Commission on the Sale, &c., of Benefices. Mr. Stuart-Wortley has sat for Sheffield since the last general election.—*Law Journal* (London).

GENERAL NOTES.

CRIMINAL LAW BILL.—A County Justice's Clerk writes as follows to the *Times* in regard to the Criminal Law Amendment Bill: Before it is too late I should like to ask the following questions: 1. Is it seriously intended that under the forthcoming Act a stout young woman of 15½ years may accompany, perhaps inveigle, a foolish lad, say, twelve months her junior, to a casual immorality, and that the result to him may be a commitment for trial and to her absolute impunity? 2. Suppose, on the hearing of an affiliation summons, it "transpires" (as they call it) that the complainant was under sixteen at the time when the cause arose, will it be the duty of the justices to commit the defendant for trial for an offence against a charge for which consent cannot be pleaded? 3. Will the clergyman who marries a couple, the bride being under sixteen, incur any legal responsibility? A stalwart old blacksmith in my neighbourhood was born in lawful wedlock, seventy-two years ago, when the united ages of his parents were under thirty-one, that of his mother being little over fourteen."