a reasonable protection may be given to those whose interests it is their duty to protect, within the limits of their jurisdiction.

On enquiring recently about the chances of some modern conveniences being supplied to those who spend portions of their life at Osgoode Hall, we were told that it was hoped that arrangements would soon be made for the building of a Court House in rear of the Hall, when all would be "made pleasant," but that at present there was no place large enough even to hold a wash-hand basin. This may be so, but we doubt it. We venture to suggest that even that difficulty might be overcome by an effort on the part of some of our many excellent benchers. We could not, of course, expect a lunch room, but we should be happy during the summer to subscribe towards a pump with a trough to be "thereto attached;" the tail of a "stuff" would answer for a towel; and a tin cup might, without much additional expense, be hung on a chain and fastened to the pump with a staple, for fear it might suffer the fate of several valuable text books now missing from the library.

Both in England and the United States litigants are clamouring for more judges. Business is terribly in arrear in the Supreme Court of the latter country, there being some 900 cases now in arrear, and with the present staff the evil is rapidly on the increase. In England things are not quite so bad, but the arrears are assuming gigantic proportions notwithstanding the recent changes in the administration of justice. With us the Court of Common Pleas has heard all the cases on their paper. Their brethren in the Queen's Bench have had a vastly larger share of work to do and have been struggling manfully to master it. It may be necessary in some way to turn over to the judges of the former Court some of the rules in the latter. It always happens that a larger amount of miscellaneous business finds its way to the Bench than the Pleas.

We spoke last month of the Winslow Extradition case. We are glad to be able to refer to the following very sensible remarks on the subject in the *Albany Law Journal*, one of the best of the legal journals in America. Strange as the assertion may seem, there *really are* some people in the United States whose moral sense is not blighted, and who know what is right and are not afraid to own it. If a few more were so to assert themselves, they would soon raise the character of what might be, and in some respects is, a great nation:

"The course of our government and our courts in regard to the trial of extradited criminals is calculated to discourage future improvements in the law of extradition, if not to compel other governments to abandon treaties already in existence between them and us. The government of Great Britain refuses, it is said, to surrender Winslow until our government shall give some guaranty that he will be prosecuted only for the offence for which extradition is procured. This is, as we have frequently maintained, entirely just and reasonable; nevertheless, our Department of State, with characteristic blindness to the new and better views of international intercourse, refuses bluntly to comply with this condition of Great Britain. Now, the treaty of 1842, which contains the provisions relating to extradition between Great Britain and this country, has no limitation of the kind indicated. But, if there is any common-law of nations, we should suppose that it would supply the deficiency. If our government refuse to comply with the condition that an extradited person shall be tried only for the offence for which extradition is procured, we do not believe that we shall long be able to maintain extradition treaties with other governments at all. In this connection it may be well to notice that Judge Benedict has decided that Lawrence, whose extradition was procured from England, may be tried for any offence whatever, irrespective of the manner in which he was brought into the jurisdiction of the courts. We repeat, that, if such counsels are to prevail in