there a happier combination of the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re;* and often when he seemed to make a damaging admission he won by his frankness and candour. Of Mr. Webster, the new Attorney General, everybody is glad to speak with praise for his unfailing courtesy and generosity, and his learning and accomplishments. The nomination of Mr. Gorst as solicitor general is, in some respects, unpopular at the bar, because he has for many years given himself wholly to politics; but it will be remarkable in the colonies inasmuch as he held some years ago a responsible post in one of the Australian dependencies.

Another circumstance that will, doubtless, be of interest in the distant parts of the empire, is the elevation of Sir Arthur Hobhouse to the House of Lords. This distinguished man, who is a Barrister of Lincoln's Inn, served many years in India, and since his return has regularly sat as one of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

In speaking of the House of Lords I am reminded of the unusual number of peerages that have lately been called in question. Within a month the honours of Lauderdale, of Lovat and of Aylesford have been contested; of which the second is like a chapter of romance, the last has been already before the public by means of the Divorce Court, and the first is like an ordinary Scottish pedigree inquiry,—long, intricate, and doubtful.

The case of Mr. Louis de Souza, of Lincoln's Inn, was this morning before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. This learned gentleman, as your readers are aware, had claimed to be heard as of counsel in Ontario; but the Court of Appeal refused to try his right, refused to record their decision, and ordered the sheriff to turn him out.

Mr. de Souza now appeared in support of his petition to the Queen in Council for special leave to appeal; but the Judicial Committee thought that the case of *Mr. D'Allain* (11 Moo. P. C. 64) was not a precedent for their interference. Mr. de Souza has only this consolation, that he defeated the Law Society of Ontario on the question of their power to exclude him altogether from practice, as they had assumed to do by an ordinance of 1882.

Lincoln's Inn, 4th July, 1885.

GENERAL NOTES.

Governor Rusk, of Wisconsin, recently vetoed a bill providing for the sentence of vagrants for ninety days and confining them to a bread-and-water diet. The governor holds that imprisonment for that period on the diet prescribed would be "cruel and unusual, and thereby violates the constitutional provision which forbids the infliction of cruel and unusual punishment."

An old lawyer in Paris had instructed a very young client of his to weep every time he struck the desk with his hand. Unfortunately the barrister forgot himself and struck the desk at the wrong moment. The client fell to sobbing and crying, "What is the matter with you?" asked the presiding judge. "Well, he told me to cry as often as he struck the table." Here was a nice predicament; but the astute lawyer was equal to the occasion. Addressing the jury he said: "Well, gentlemen, let me ask you how you can reconcile the idea of crime in conjunction with such candor and simplicity? I await your verdict with the most perfect confidence."—*Criminal Law Magazine.*

J. R. Porter, of the State of New York, now famous for his brilliant attainments, when a young man, was assigned by the Court the defence of a man charged with assault in the second degree, to give the accused the best advice he could under the circumstances, and to bring the case to a trial with all convenient speed. Porter immediately retired to an adjacent room to consult with his client, and returned shortly without him. "Where is your client?" demanded the judge, "He has left the place," replied Porter. "What do you mean, Mr. Porter?" "Why your Honor directed me to give him the best advice I could under the circumstances. He told me he was guilty, so I advised him to run for it. He took my advice, as a client ought, opened the window and skedaddled. He is about a mile away now." The audacity of the young barrister deprived the court of the power of speech, and nothing came of the matter.—*Criminal Law Magazine,*

Bankers and business men generally have suffered considerable inconvenience by the delayed payment of drafts and orders presented for payment after the death of the drawer. The Legislature of Massachusetts has just passed a law, by which savings banks can pay for thirty days after the date of the order, and later, if no actual notice of the drawer's demise has been received, and national banks, trust, safe deposits and all other depositories are allowed to pay out for ten days after the drawer's death. This law applies to single-name checks, of course. Henceforth, therefore, the only thing to be considered in taking and depositing such single checks is the drawer's financial standing and character. Hitherto the taker had reason to be afraid that the drawer might die before payment, and if known to the payee, the holder would have to wait one or two years until the estate could be settled, and it might then be proved to be insolvent. Hence a man alone in business had not the same facilities (at least so far as giving out checks in the settlement of accounts) as he who had a partner. The amendment of the law just enacted was certainly called for, and business men will be glad to know that it has been made.—*Boston Traveller.*