

The *Law Journal* (London) has this to say in opposing Lord Russell's praiseworthy effort to induce those in authority to elevate the system of legal education in England to the level of the standards prevailing in France, Germany and the United States at the present day:—

"The fashion of our day is, as it was the fashion of that of Dr. Johnson, to believe that everything can be taught in lectures; and it is as true now as then, that a clever man will learn all, or nearly all, that can be so taught from a book in half the time the lectures occupy, and will prefer to do so (!)"

The immanent assininity of this deliverance is its own undoing; a serious reply to it could only emanate from Bedlam.

Ottawa.

CHARLES MORSE.

ENGLISH CASES.

EDITORIAL REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

(Registered in accordance with the Copyright Act.)

The Reports for February comprise (1896) 1 Q. B., pp. 97-139; (1896) P. pp. 33-64; and (1896) 1 Ch., pp. 105-198.

CRIMINAL LAW—EXTRADITION—JURISDICTION—BONA FIDES OF DEMAND FOR EXTRADITION.—POLITICAL OFFENCE—EXTRADITION ACT, 1870 (33 & 34 VICT., C. 52) S. 3, S-S. 1—(R. S. C. C. 143, AND DOM. STATUTES, 1890, PP. XXX., ET SEQ.)

In re Arton (1896), 1 Q. B. 108, was an application in an extradition proceeding on the part of the prisoner for a *habeas corpus* to the keeper of the gaol in which the prisoner was confined, to bring him before the Court to abide the judgment of the Court. The application was based on several grounds. Those relied on, however, resolved themselves practically into two, viz.: (1) That some of the offences charged were not within the Extradition Act. (2) That the demand for extradition was not made in good faith, but for the purpose of punishing the prisoner for a political offence. As to the first ground the Court (Lord Russell, C.J., and Wills and Wright, JJ.) thought that sufficient was shown to warrant