these precincts; or else you hear, every now and again, greetings exchanged by those who parted last week in Norway, or in the Highlands, or on the banks of Lake Lucerne.

But those of us who were in the old haunts at the close of last month had an opportunity of witnessing a most remarkable and indeed unprecedented trial at the Old Bailey. Upon an indictment for bigamy, the most conflicting and yet positive evidence was offered as to the identity of the prisoner, it being maintained, for the Queen, by the prosecutrix, her mother and the parson, that the man in the dock was he who had married himself to the prosecutrix, while the prisoner, on the other hand, by a cloud of witnesses, differentiated himself and established an *alibi*. The suspicious element, however, of the defence is that the man charged, who is a Londoner, was unquestionably in Brighton where the crime was committed, at the same house, and at nearly the same time. The jury, amid these bewildering facts, were unable to agree, and the case must be tried again. The offender, whoever he was, had only remained a few days with his inamorata, and then had disappeared, so that the poor woman is in the position of knowing that she is tied for life to somebody who is little better than a myth.

A vast deal of discussion and passion, and sentiment has been expended upon what is known as the scandal of the *Pall Mall Gazette;* and Stead, the editor of that paper, together with some other such philanthropists, stand to take their trial for abduction and assault at the Old Bailey.

At the Old Bailey, last month, the first instance occurred, under the new act, of a prisoner tendering himself as a witness on his own behalf.

A recent decision of the Reviser of Votes in Chelsea must cause great surprise in the colonies and particularly in India. The suffrage of a man born in Calcutta was disallowed, on the ground that he was not a subject of the Queen of England, but merely of the Empress of India, and therefore an alien in this country. But the proposition has been combated by Mr. Louis de Souza in a letter to the *Times*, showing on the authority of *Calvin's* case, in the time of King James the first, that an "alien" is one who is not only *extra ligentiam nostri regis*, but also *infra ligentiam alterius;* and that allegiance "cannot be confined to one kingdom," and that all subjects of the Queen, in any title, are equally within her allegiance in every part of her dominions. Otherwise it might happen, that if a native of Calcutta, or of Jersey (which is an appendage of the ancient dukedom of Normandy) should league with rebels here to dispossess the Queen of Her English throne, he would not be within the Statute of Treasons as levying war "in the realm" nor as a "subject" abroad aiding traitors here.

The mention of this matter reminds me to say that public interest is now almost wholly concentrated on the impending elections, which are the nearer, because the date of dissolving the present parliament has just been made known.

Lincoln's Inn, 10th Oct., 1885.

*SUPERIOR COURT—MONTREAL.**

Capias—Forme de la déposition—Il peut reposer pour partie sur un jugement.

JUGÉ:—1o. Que l'allégation dans la déposition pour *capias*, "que le défendeur a caché, soustrait et recélé ses biens, et est sur le point de cacher *ou* soustraire et recéler ses biens avec l'intention de frauder ses créanciers en général *ou* le demandeur en particulier," est suffisante.

2o. Qu'il n'y a pas non plus d'incertitude dans l'allégation, "que le défendeur est sur le point de quitter immédiatement la Province du Canada, comprenant les Provinces de Québec et d'Ontario, avec l'intention de frauder ses créanciers en général *ou* le demandeur en particulier," et que cette allégation est aussi suffisante.

3o. Qu'en faisant émaner le *capias* en cette cause, tant pour le montant d'un jugement déjà rendu en faveur du demandeur, que pour une autre créance dont il était porteur, le dit demandeur n'a en rien violé la loi, le *capias* ayant été valablement émis comme procédure distincte et séparée du jugement en question.—*Senécal* v. *Hart*, Jetté, J., 25 fév. 1885.

* To appear in full in Montreal Law Reports, 1 S.C.