

Jurors are no longer deprived of food and fire while deliberating on their verdict, but a judge in Chicago has gone further and set an evil precedent by ordering the bailiffs, in a recent case, to provide the jurors with a drink of intoxicating liquor at each meal. It is possible that this indulgence might do no harm in the case of those jurors who are accustomed to a beverage of this kind with their meals. But it is intrusting too much to the discretion of the officers of the court, and the practice might easily degenerate into a serious abuse. The W. C. T. U. of Chicago has made a formal protest against the innovation, and it will be generally conceded that the objection is a reasonable one. The time spent in deliberation is not usually so protracted that much inconvenience can be suffered from the temporary deprivation in any case, and jurors should not be encouraged in any practice which may have the effect of lessening their sense of the serious nature of the duty imposed on them.

---

Lord Chief Justice Russell seems to have rather astonished the legal mind in London, by voluntarily assuming duty which he had a plausible reason for ignoring. When holding the assizes at Newcastle his Lordship finished the civil work in three days, though five were allowed. Then the county of Durham provided enough work to keep both the judges occupied for the full time; but at York there were only two causes and seven criminal cases. Lord Russell disposed of the latter in one day, and at once returned to London, where he unexpectedly appeared in court on the Monday, and tried cases from the lists of the other judges of the Queen's Bench Division.

---

In referring to the case of *Plummer v. Gillespie*, *ante*, p. 66, the statement should have read that the judgment was affirmed by the Court of Review, instead of by the Court of Appeal.