

It was contended that the communications were privileged and therefore inadmissible, but the court considered that this privilege no longer existed after the testator's death, and that the attorney should be allowed to testify as a matter of public policy.

---

LENGTHY JUDICIAL CAREERS.—In your reference to Lord Bramwell (Vol. 34, p. 485), you speak of his judicial career, etc., of thirty-six years, which brings to my mind a case which I believe has no parallel, at least in modern times. Brenton Halliburton was appointed to the Bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, now a part of Canada, January 10, 1807, and retained the seat until his death in July, 1860—fifty-three and a half years. On the 31st January, 1833, he was made chief justice of the same court, and was knighted late in his life. He was not at all related to Thomas C. Haliburton (Sam Slick), who sat on the same bench from 1st April, 1841, to August, 1856. Sir Brenton had two "l's" in his name; Thomas C. had only one. I think you will not find any other case of a judge sitting the same length as Sir Brenton in an English-speaking country. —*Correspondence in Central Law Journal.*

---

FIREWORKS—INJURY TO SPECTATORS.—In *Scanlon v. Wedger* (Mass. Sup. Jud. Ct., June 21) the defendant unlawfully set off fireworks in a public highway, and the plaintiffs, who had been attracted by the display and were lawfully in the highway, were injured by some of the fireworks. The majority of the court held that, as there was no negligence shown on the part of the defendant, and the plaintiffs being voluntary spectators, they must be presumed to have assented to a chance of personal injury and to have been willing to take any risk there might be, and the court drew a distinction between this case and that of an ordinary traveller merely passing along the highway. In a strong dissenting opinion, Morton and Knowlton, JJ., say that where the defendant was using the highway for a dangerous and unlawful purpose he is liable to the plaintiffs, who were lawfully upon the highway and shown to have been in the exercise of due care, and that only if the plaintiffs aided in the display and contributed by their own conduct to their injuries—which is not claimed—would they have been guilty of contributory negligence. It seems difficult to understand how the majority of the court came to the conclusion they did.

---

JUDICIAL ORIGINALITY.—In the very felicitous "Letter to Posterity" of Chief Justice Bleckley, of Georgia, printed in the *Green Bag* for February, 1892, occurs this passage: "My trouble is to become fully persuaded that I know. I seem not to have found the law out in a reliable way. I detect so many mistakes committed by others, and convict myself of error so often, that most of my conclusions on difficult questions are only provisional. I reconsider, revise, scrutinize, revise the scrutiny, and scrutinize the revision. But my faith in the ultimate efficiency of work is unbounded. The law is too often unknown, but is never