Our client was now the legal owner of the property. Had it become necessary to transmute that legal ownership into actual possession we should have been compelled to go to chancery, and the papers actually went up to counsel to draw the petition, but in the meantime the defendant appeared on the scene, and the mystery was solved. The notices sent by us to the tenants to pay their rents into our hands broke the spell, and it appeared that this was the first intimation the poor fellow had ever received of the action. Old, bedridden and illiterate, he had, months before the account was given us for collection, sent his wife and daughter with the cash to pay our client. It was the only debt left outstanding from his former business, and he felt happy in the thought that he owed no man. His wife and daughter shamefully deceived him. They kept the money for their own purposes, and when our legal missiles rained upon them they artfully contrived to keep the old man in ignorance of every thing. It never crossed their stupid minds that the real property could be attacked. The original debt was £120; our costs amounted to nearly as much more, and in the end our client paid our bill, and took a mortgage on the property (which was of ample value) to cover the whole amount. Thus ended the struggle between the women and the law: our first and last experience with a writ of *elegit*.—A. B. M. in *Albany Law Journal*.

GENERAL NOTES.

A lawyer was prosecuting a horse case in a justice's court. Being desirous to have the horse exhibited in court, he issued *subpœna duces tecum* to the defendant to produce the horse. A new use to put this writ to, but we are advised in this case it secured the result desired.—*Kansas Law Journal*.

At the Sheriff's Court, Preston, on Wednesday, June 24, before a jury, the case of *McAlden* v. *Schnedeerhe* was tried. On April 24 last the plaintiff and the defendant were at an hotel in Barrow-in-Furness. The defendant asked the plaintiff to stir the fire, and while he was doing so poured a box of red dye over McAlden's head, observing that he was phrenologically feeling his bumps. The defendant then exclaimed, jocularly, "You will be a red devil for three months." The plaintiff tried to wash off the dye, but the more he rubbed the deeper the color became. His face and hair were stained, his collars, clothes and bedclothes spoilt, and when he went into the street the boys and girls shouted, "Red Indian!" He appeared in court with a finely polished scarlet countenance and a head of bright chestnut hair. The defendant, who was manager of the Flax and Jute Works, Barrow, had been in the habit of carrying a box filled with red powder, which he distributed as snuff, the effect being to dye his friends' nostrils a deep carnation. The damages were assessed at £20.

The Master of the Rolls, whose elevation to the House of Lords receives the hearty approbation of the legal profession, is to take the title of Lord Esher, from the well-known village in Surrey, in which he formerly lived, and where his brother, Major Sir Wilford Brett, K. C. M. G., lives. His predecessors in office who have been made peers are not numerous. They are Lords Romilly, Langdale, Gifford, Colepeper, and Kinloss. The last-named, who lies in the Rolls Chapel under his effigy in his robes of office, was Edward Bruce, a Scotch lawyer, who came to England with King James. Lord Colepeper was Master of the Rolls in days when law gave way to arms, and earned his title by his services in the field to King Charles I. The rest of the peers named were, like the new peer, distinguished lawyers. The eldest son of the Master of the Rolls is Mr. Reginald Brett, M.P. for Penryn and Falmouth, and private secretary to the Marquis of Hartington. The creation not only bestows a well-earned distinction, but secures to the public in the future the services in the highest Court in the country of one of its ablest lawyers.—*Law Journal*.

Mixed Marriages.—There is a probability that the distressed heroine whose woes arise out of the fact that, being an Englishwoman, she marries a Frenchman, without any knowledge of the French marriage laws, will soon become out of date. Lord Granville recently replied to a letter on the subject from the Bishop of Manchester, to the effect that the Foreign Offices of London and Paris had agreed upon a form of certificate which should be issued by the French Consuls, throughout the United Kingdom, before the celebration of marriages between French and English subjects. There can be no question about the value of such a document, setting forth that the requirements of the French code have been complied with to the satisfaction of the Consul issuing it. But it would be still better if it were known that such a certificate would be received in any French court of law as in itself constituting indisputable proof that an English marriage had been performed in strict accordance with French law. Having addressed an enquiry to the French Consulate on this point, we are politely informed by M. Cochelet, the Vice-Consul, that "the instructions received from the Foreign Office in Paris are silent on the subject." It should be added, indeed, that in a letter from M. Napoleon Argles, the solicitor to the Consulate, which was published a few weeks ago, that gentleman declares that when the Consular certificate has been obtained, the marriage "can be proceeded with, without risk of being annulled." This, of course, would be the natural assumption, from the formal nature of the document; but it would be more satisfactory if the inference of M. Argles were corroborated by an express declaration from the French Foreign Office.—*Pump Court*.