

He heard her through, he asked her wealth,
He pondered o'er her story,
And then he said he would consult
His volumes statutory.

She sighed and rose; he took her hand,
And sudden said, "how stupid!
I did forget the precedent
Of 'Hymen v. Cupid!'

"Just substitute my name for yours."
The maiden blushed and faltered,
But in two weeks she took her name
To church and had it altar'd.

—*Albany Law Journal.*

REQUIREMENTS OF A JUDGE.—A judge requires learning, integrity, industry, patience, courtesy and unruffled temper. He should be one whose firm purpose is to declare the law without fear, favor or affection, who looks for his highest reward in his own conscience and the veneration that will accompany him through life and follow him weeping to the tomb. Not only should our bearing toward the Court tell our disposition, but indicate to the assembled citizens the deference due those selected to expound the law and administer justice. We should be indulgent to their imperfections and peculiarities of temperament. They grow weary. We of the bar, when our case is argued or trial over, can leave the presence, the burden lifted from our brain; yet, with the judge the ending of one case is but the beginning of another.—*Dan'l Dougherty to New York State Bar Association.*

CATHOLIC CEMETERIES.—In *Dvoenger v. Geary*, it was held by the Indiana Supreme Court that where land is conveyed to the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church to be used as a cemetery for the interment of Catholics of a city within his diocese, and the land is laid off into lots immediately after the conveyance, and is consecrated as a Catholic cemetery under the laws and by the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and is used as a Catholic cemetery for a period of years, it passes under the dominion of the Church functionaries, and no man has a right of burial in such cemetery unless, under the laws or polity of the Church, he is a Catholic in good standing at the time of his death, and of this the ecclesiastical authorities are the exclusive judges.

LAWYERS IN HONGKONG.—A firm of solicitors in Hongkong write: "A local magistrate of Hongkong, who is not a lawyer, and seems to have an antipathy to legal gentlemen appearing before him in the Police Court, has openly expressed his determination to give his decision, if possible, against the side taking legal assistance. We wonder what he does in any case in which each side is represented."

PIGG'S PIG.—The following is a true copy of an indictment found by the grand jury of Lawrence county, Ky. at its October term of the Criminal Court, omitting the date and the defendant's name; "Lawrence Criminal Court. Commonwealth of Kentucky against —, Defendant—Indictment. The grand jury of Lawrence county, in the name and by the authority of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, accuse—of the offence of malicious mischief, committed as follows: The said—, on the —th day of—, A. D. 18—, in

the county and circuit aforesaid, did unlawfully, wilfully, and maliciously kill and destroy one pig, the personal property of George Pigg, without the consent of said Pigg, the said pig being of value to the aforesaid George Pigg. The pig thus killed weighed about twenty-five pounds, and was a mate to some other pigs that were owned by said George Pigg, which left George Pigg a pig less than he (said George Pigg) had of pigs, and thus ruthlessly tore said pig from the society of George Pigg's other pigs, against the peace and dignity of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. A. S. Auxier, Commonwealth's Attorney. A true bill: O. D. Botner, Foreman. Filed—, A. D. 18—. G. F. Johnson, Clerk."—*Washington Law Reporter.*

A SKULL AS AN EXHIBIT.—Quite a sensation was created by the production of a skull in Court, at Newton, N. J., during the trial of Robert T. Westbrook for the murder of Dennis J. Morris. The defense was that the deceased fractured his skull by a fall during the altercation. To prove that this was probable, Dr. Address was called as an expert. He had a large package which he fondly handled, and, while telling his story, unwrapped. He said that on January 9th, he visited New York and procured a head taken fresh from the body of a man sixty years old. Returning to Sparta he fastened it on an apparatus resembling a human body, the whole weighing about ninety pounds. This was dropped from an angle of forty-five degrees, the skull striking a round stone. It was fractured worse than that of Morris, although he weighed one hundred and eighty pounds. The prosecution were so surprised they forgot to object, and before any one knew what was coming, the shrunken and ghastly trophy of medical experiment rolled on the floor. The effect was electrical. Women shrieked, men shrunk backward, and the Court turned pale. One woman fainted, and for a few moments the room was filled with uproar, the persons in the rear striving to get a view, while those in front retreated from the grinning skull. When order was restored, the head was taken from the Court, and, on an objection, the whole evidence was stricken from the records. The Court said that the principle involved was unsettled in this State, and somewhat resembled the evidence on which the McPeck case was taken to the Supreme Court.—*National Law Review.*

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.—Where the testator by his will devised and bequeathed all his estate, real and personal, in trust for the uses and purposes set forth in the will, which were to pay certain legacies, amounting to about \$18,000, and to apply the residue, about \$10,000, "for the purpose of having prayers offered in a Roman Catholic Church, to be by them selected for the repose of my soul, and the souls of my family, and also the souls of all others who may be in Purgatory." Held,—That the trust thus attempted to be created by the second clause of the will is void; because there is no beneficiary in existence, or to come into existence, who is interested in or can demand the execution of the trust, and no defined or ascertainable living person has or ever can have any temporal interest in its performance, nor is any incorporated church designated so as to entitle it to claim any portion of the fund.—*Holland v. Alcock, ex'r, N. Y. Ct. App.*