

statute. Its policy is not only to discourage stale demands, but to quiet titles and end litigation; and, though in the *Severn Case* there was no adverse possession, no quieting of title, we cannot sever the elements which make up the policy of the statute, and say, 'This or that element was not present; therefore the statute does not apply.' 'Vigilantibus non dormientibus' is a principle which is worth inculcating, even at the expense of some lost dividends.—*Law Journal (London)*.

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Regina v. Mortimer (the World's Great Marriage Association case), heard at the last sittings of the Central Criminal Court, involved considerable detail and much exposure of folly and cupidity, but raised only one point of any interest as to the law of evidence.—Sir Frank Lockwood, Q. C., for the defence, asked for the ruling of the Recorder (Sir C. Hall) on the following point: 'Counsel was in a position to call a large number of witnesses to prove that a genuine business was being done by the association—a large number of witnesses who were introduced to persons through the association, and in some cases he was in a position to prove that marriages resulted. He gathered from the opening statement for the prosecution that it was not suggested, so far as the routine business was concerned, that the prosecution raised any question that the association was doing a genuine business. There was one count in the indictment to which he himself wished to call the Recorder's attention, and that the second part of the fourth count, "that the more select, well-to-do, and advantageous marriages of the said association were then and had been effected through the medium of the said fashionable and high-class marriage department." He asked for a ruling whether under that count the Recorder would allow him to call general evidence of there being a genuine business done by the association. If the Recorder would allow that, he was in a position to call a large number of witnesses who were introduced to persons by the association. Mr. Mathews submitted that the evidence was not admissible. The Recorder said he did not see how it could be admissible. The indictment charged, in specific cases, conspiracy to obtain money; it charged some of the defendants with attempting to obtain money by false pretences in individual cases, and it also charged the obtaining of