

REVIEWS.

THE AMERICAN LAW REVIEW. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 110 Washington St., Boston. \$5 00.

The October number commences with an interesting sketch of the life and times of Lord Brougham, which may be usefully read in connection with the notices of that eminent man, to be found in the English periodicals.

A large space is devoted to the discussion of the "Erie Railroad Row;" certainly a curious name for a legal article, but probably a correct one, if the reviewer is to be credited; of this we may hereafter speak more at length.

This number contains, in addition, the Digest of English Law Reports for May, June, and July, which we continue to extract for the benefit of our readers—A Selected Digest of State reports, which must be invaluable to Americans, and, considering our near proximity, often useful to us—Book Notices—A list of new law books published in England and America since July, 1868, excellent as an easy and reliable reference; and, lastly, a summary of events of professional and legal interest. We most heartily commend this magazine to our readers in Canada. The price is merely nominal, and the contents excellent.

A ROMANTIC LAW CASE.—The courts of law will in all probability be occupied early in the ensuing session with one of those remarkable cases which so often occur in romances, and so seldom in real life. It appears that about a hundred and twenty years ago a large estate close to one of the most important of English manufacturing towns, was in the possession of the great-grandfather of the parties to the present litigation. Since that time the land has been built upon to a great extent, and now forms the most wealthy suburb of the town in question. At the death of the owner, his eldest son, finding that there was no will, naturally claimed the estate. The children of a second marriage, however, who had never lived on good terms with their half-brother, protested against his title on the ground that his parents had never married, and that he was consequently illegitimate. It seemed at first that there was no ground for this statement. The parents had always been received in society, and no one had ever heard of any scandal in connection with them. On making inquiry it was, however, found impossible to discover any trace of the marriage, and the eldest son was forced to submit, and leave the home he had always considered his own, without a shilling. He went into town and embarked in trade, apparently without much success, for his grandson is at the present time a shoemaker in a back street, and in a very small way of business. The tradition of the lost estate has, however, always

been preserved, and some time since this descendant of the elder son recommenced the search for proof of the marriage in question. After much trouble he succeeded in getting at the copies of the registers which are preserved in the Chancery at Chester, and there, in the index, he discovered, somewhat easier than was expected, the names of the original possessor of the estate and his first wife. There was, however, no such entry in the body of the book. At last, however, in going through it for the last time, it was discovered that two leaves had been fastened together, and on their being separated a copy of the entry of the marriage from the books of a Manchester church was duly found. On referring back to the church itself, the book was produced, but the entry was not there. Further examination showed, however, that this book had been tampered with, but in a different way—a leaf had been cut out with scissors, and the marks were even then distinctly visible. On these facts the action will be brought, and when it is remembered that the present family have been in possession for nearly a century, and that they are highly respected, and their members married amongst the wealthiest people in the county, it may readily be imagined that the matter is creating a good deal of interest. The value of the property at stake is between one and two hundred thousand pounds.—*Western Morning News (English)*.

A few days since a wag wrote and placed the following pretended rule of court in the courtroom of one of our courts of record, where the rules of practice were wont to be posted: "Whenever any attorney shall frequent saloons as a habit, and cannot be found at his office, if he has any office, it shall be necessary for such attorney to file with the clerk of the court a list of the saloons so frequented by him; and notice, of any motion left at such saloon or saloons shall be considered as sufficient notice to such attorney of any motion in a case pending in this court." A certain attorney who loved a social glass, and was in the habit of frequenting a certain saloon in the city more than his office, seeing this notice and supposing it to be genuine, left word with the clerk that he could be found at the saloon of —. Judge of the surprise of the aforesaid attorney on the following day, when he moved the court, under the above rule, to reinstate an important case of his that had been dismissed in his absence, on the ground that no notice had been left at the saloon where he had been waiting the whole of the day before, and was informed by the good-natured judge, with a smile, and amid roars of laughter from the entire bar, that the rule was a *hoax*.—*Chicago Legal News*.

Lord Campbell tells how, at the opening period of his professional career, soon after the publication of his "Nisi Prius Reports," he on circuit successfully defended a prisoner charged with a criminal offence; and how, whilst the success of his advocacy was still quickening his pulses, he discovered that his late client, with whom he held a confidential conversation, had contrived to relieve him of his pocket-book, full of bank-notes. As soon as the presiding judge, Lord Chief Baron Macdonald, heard of the mishap of the reporting barrister, he exclaimed, "What! does Mr. Campbell think that no one is entitled to *take notes* in court except himself?"—*Jefferson*.