case was mentioned which seemed to cause a gleam of intelligence to pass between Lord Selborne and Sir Horace Davey. It was a decision of Vice-Chancellor Malins in a case in which, when it came before him, he at once took a strong line against the plaintiff. Something was said of an opinion of counsel advising the action, whereupon the vice-chancellor looked up with a smile and said: "I am curious to know who that counsel could be." The plaintiff's counsel proffered the opinion, and the Vice-Chancellor took it, protesting that he "should not like to injure the reputation of the young man who wrote it, and he would carefully cover the signature with a piece of paper, so as not to see his name." Said the counsel: "There is no objection to your honor reading or giving the counsel's name." The Vice-Chancellor proceeded to read the opinion, exposing its fallacies one by one in his humorous conversational way, and at the end of it he found the name of "Roundell Palmer," then lord chancellor. It was the last opinion he wrote before he accepted the Great Seal.—*London Law Journal.*

PRISONERS AS WITNESSES.—Writing on the subject of "Prisoners as Witnesses" a few years ago, Mr. Justice Stephen remarked that "it may seem paradoxical to say so, but it is nevertheless true that the class of accused persons who will get least advantage from having their mouths opened are those who are entirely innocent of and unconnected with the crime of which they are charged—persons who have nothing to conceal and nothing to explain." It is rather remarkable that the learned judge should this week have presided at the trial of a case in which, not only did the prisoner get no advantage from, but it seems probable that conviction was due to, her mouth being opened. Down to the time of Mrs. Maybrick's statement, a verdict of "not guilty" did not seem improbable. It was not established beyond doubt that the deceased died of arsenical poisoning; the facts did not show beyond doubt that, even if he died from arsenic, Mrs. Maybrick administered it. There was no proof that she purchased arsenic, except in the fly-papers; there was the clearest evidence that the deceased had been in the habit of taking arsenic. There were doubtless many circumstances of the gravest suspicion, and there was the statement of the prisoner to her paramour that her husband was "sick unto death," made at a time when the doctors had not suggested that he was dangerously ill. But there was probably doubt enough to prevent a jury from convicting. When, however, the prisoner admitted in her statement that she had placed a white powder in the meat juice, the die was cast. All Sir Charles Russell could do was to urge that, while "at first sight," the statement was "a self-incriminating one," it was "a remarkable one, and made under remarkable circumstances, and the jury must make such allowances as they thought fit." It may be surmised that the effect on the jury of the observations made by the learned judge on this statement, toward the close of his summing-up, turned the scale and insured the conviction.—*Solicitors' Journal.*

THE PRESS AND ACTIONS OF LIBEL.—The *Law Journal* (London), says:—"In these days, when actions of libel are so frequently brought against newspapers, a proof-reader for libel would be a more useful member of the staff than the American fighting editor."

CONFUSED RELATIONSHIP.—Mr. Uttley in "Law and Professional Notes" writes:—"It is announced that a son has been born to Ex-King Amadeus and Princess Letitia, from which ensues a curious result in the matter of relationship. The parents are uncle and niece, and, therefore, the new-born babe is grand-nephew to its own father and first cousin to its own mother. What future complications may be expected from this strange pedigree?"

IGNORANCE OF LAW.—The same writer says:—"In connection with ignorance of law, a story is told of Servius Sulpicius (when he consulted the famous Mucius Scævola on a point of law) which may be worth reciting. 'Servius, cum in causis orandis primum locum, aut pro certo post M. Tullium obtineret, traditur ad consulendum Quintum Mucium de re amici sui pervenisse; cumque eum sibi respondisse de jure Servius parum intellexisset, iterum Quintum interrogasse; et a Quinto Mucio responsum esse, nec tamen percepisse; et ita objurgatum esse a Quinto Mucio: namque eum dixisse, Turpe esse patricio, et nobili, et causas oranti, jus, in quo versaretur, ignorare. Eâ velut contumeliâ Servius tractatus, operam dedit juri civili; et hujus volumina complura extant; reliquit autem prope centum et octoginta libros.'"

AN UNSULLIED RECORD.—During a recent trial of a case relating to a patent, the Attorney-General wished his junior to hand up to the judge a copy of some correspondence, when the junior said that his copy was marked. Another barrister declined to part with his transcript for the same reason, adding that it was marked in red. Then turning round to a well-known Q.C. engaged on the other side, the great man of law requested the loan of his copy, saying he knew it was neither marked nor read.—*City Press.*

TALES OF BYLES.—The assumed or real modesty of judges concerning their own merits has often given rise to amusing little episodes, one of the best remembered of which relates to 'Byles upon Bills.' A learned counsel was pleading before Sir John Byles, the author of the work, from which a quotation was made, and the book was held up. 'Does the learned author give any authority for that statement?' inquired the judge. Counsel (referring to the volume): 'No, my lord; I cannot find that he does.' 'Ah!' replied Sir John, 'then do not trust him. I know him well.' Sir John always rode a very sorry horse, which legal wags nicknamed 'Bills,' in order that they might say, 'There goes Byles on Bills;' concerning which we are told, in 'A Generation of Judges,' that in an argument upon a certain section of the Statute of Frauds, he put a case by way of illustration to the counsel arguing: 'Suppose, Mr. So-and-so, that I were to agree to sell you my horse; do you mean to say that I could not recover the price unless,' and so on. The illustration was so pointed that there was no way out of it but for the counsel to say that that section applied only to things of the value of ten pounds. The retort was well appreciated by those who had ever seen the horse.—*City Press.*