

GENERAL NOTES.

NERVOUS SHOCK.—The interesting question of the liability for a negligent act producing a mere nervous shock or mental injury—the subject of decision by the Privy Council in *The Victorian Railways Commissioners v. Coultas*, L. R. 13 App. Cas. 222; 8 Eng. Rul. Cases, 405—has been decided in the New York Court of Appeals (to be reported in 151 New York Reports), and it was there held, in harmony with the English case, and reversing the decisions below, that there is no liability where a negligent act produces mere fright in a woman, although it results in a miscarriage. The Court held that the damages were immediate and proximate, but based its decision mainly on the ground that there is no right of recovery for injuries produced merely by fright, no matter how serious, or however directly the result of the mental shock. There is a little authority to the contrary in the States and in Canada, and the authorities are arranged in the American notes in 8 Eng. Rul. Cases, 414.

VENERABLE PRECEDENTS.—The Selden Society will issue in the course of next week volume x. of its publications, "Select Cases in Chancery, A.D. 1364-1471," edited by Mr. W. Paley Baildon, F.S.A., with an introduction on the growth, early history, and procedure of the Court of Chancery. This volume represents the publication for the year 1896. Volume xi for 1897 is expected to follow very shortly, and will be a second volume of "Select Pleas in the Court of Admiralty," edited by Mr. R. G. Marsden.

A SHARP CRITICISM.—The *London Law Journal* says:—"It is with great regret that we have again to comment on a recurrence of those disputes between judge and counsel of which the Court in which Mr. Justice Hawkins presides has of late been too often the scene. On the present occasion there seems no doubt that he was solely to blame. Not only was his manner unnecessarily provocative, but he had no justification for the accusation of misconduct which he made against the eminent counsel who were appearing before him. In no quarter does a judge receive more support than from the legal profession, yet we entertain no doubt as to how the Bar and solicitors alike will regard this unpleasant case. It is to be hoped that Sir Henry Hawkins will follow the example of other judges, and will not again be led into conduct which is alike injurious to the administration of justice and derogatory to the dignity of the Bench and Bar."