The Legal News.

Vol. I. OCTOBER 19, 1878. No. 42.

THE IRISH BAR.

It is stated that students who are desirous of being called to the Irish Bar, are required to keep a number of terms at one of the London Inns of Court, and also to pay certain fees which go into the funds of the Inns. But, notwithstanding this keeping of terms in England and contribution to English Bar funds, Irish barristers are not recognized by the London Inns, nor admitted to practice before the English Courts. An effort has been made recently to introduce reciprocity, but it has proved a failure. A proposal was made by the Benchers of King's Inn, Dublin, to admit English barristers to practice before the Irish Courts, on condition of a similar privilege being accorded to Irish barristers wishing to practice in England. It seems, however, that few or no English barristers are desirous of appearing in the courts of the sister isle, and the committee of the four London Inns of Court, believing that the advantages of such an arrangement would be all on the side from which the offer proceeded, rejected the proposal.

SELF-CRIMINATION.

A good deal has been heard lately about witnesses declining by their answers to furnish evidence against themselves. While the point is engaging attention, reference may be made to a somewhat dramatic incident which occurred a short time ago in a court of Tennessee. In a prosecution for murder, an over-zealous Attorney-General, with a view to establish that a foot-print, observed near the scene of the murder, was made by the prisoner, caused a pan of soft mud, which was proved by a witness to be of the consistency of the mud where the track was made, to be brought into court, and the prisoner was asked to put his foot in it. In complying with this invitation he might have done so in a double sense. At all events, the case was carried, on a writ of error, to the Supreme Court of the State, and that tribunal has held that, notwithstanding the trial court told the prisoner, he need not put his foot in the mud unless he chose to do so, the fact that the mud was brought into court, and the prisoner asked to put his foot in it, was calculated to influence the jury improperly against him, and was, therefore, error, for which the verdict against the prisoner should be set aside. The desired evidence might probably have been obtained without objection from a detective, or other intelligent witness, who had carefully compared the prisoner's boot or foot with the track.

A DIES NON.

Why the 29th of February should be blotted out from the book of days juridical it would be hard to guess. Coming only once in four years it might seem to be worthy of special honor. It might be conjectured that at some remote time it was regarded on that very account as a high festival, and therefore not to be counted as a business day. Cowell's Law Dictionary, however, states that it was to prevent ambiguity. Leap-year was called bissextile, "because the sixth day before the Calends of March is twice reckoned, viz., on the 24th and 25th of February: so that the bissextile year hath one day more than other years, and happens every fourth year: . . . and to prevent all ambiguity that might grow therefrom, it is ordained by the statute *De Anno Bissextili*, 21 H. 3, that the day increasing in the leap-year, and the day next before, shall be accounted but one day." The Supreme Court of Indiana, in the case of *Helphinstine* v. *The Vincennes National Bank*, had the point before it recently, and the ancient statute just referred to was quoted to support the rule followed by the Court. The action was to set aside a judgment in favor of the defendant, on the ground of insufficient service of summons. The service, it was admitted, would be good, if the 29th February, 1876, which intervened between the service and the return day, was to be counted as an ordinary day. The common law of England and statutes passed prior to 4th James I. being in force in Indiana, the judge held that the statute 21 Henry III. was in force in the State. By this statute, he remarked, it was provided, in refer-