Mr. Hall will thank us for endeavouring to give a practical illustration of the "elasticity and general grace of movement" of these "most prominent lawyers" of courtly Virginia, as one chopped the other with a knife and proceeded to enlarge the scope of his "facial gesture" by slitting his mouth from ear to ear, and the other, scorning that silly "monotony and artificiality" of the English Bar, and "fettered only by the innate dignity of a gentleman," tried to blow holes through his adversary with a gun. Yes, Mr. Hall, you have proved your point; we quite agree with you that your system "tends toward freedom and naturalness in thought and speech," and, permit us to add, action. We appreciate the good qualities of the Bar of our neighbours across the line, but Mr. Hall makes a very poor trumpeter: he blows too loud.—Western Law Times.

LIBEL—PRIVILEGED PUBLICATIONS—PUBLIC OFFICERS.—To print and publish of a person that he "is said to have been in the workhouse and to have had a criminal record " is libellous per se. While it is the right of the press, as it is of individuals, to freely criticize and comment upon the official action and conduct of a public officer, false and defamatory words, spoken or published of him as an individual, are not privileged on the ground that they related to a matter of public interest, and were spoken or published in good faith. The real ground on which the alleged privilege is claimed in arguments is that inasmuch as the investigation of the conduct of the police commissioners was a matter of public concern in the city of Cincinnati, and the character of their appointees on the police force was incidentally involved, the defendant, so long as it was not actuated by malice, had the right to publish as an item of news, and in the public interest, any criticism, comment, or statement concerning the personal character and standing of the plaintiff, as well as his official action and conduct as a policeman. It is said in support of this position that the press owes a duty to the public to keep it informed about its public servants, to the end that abuses may be corrected and the public welfare subserved; and that the press, in the performance of that duty, is privileged to speak as freely of the private character of the person holding the office as of his