to the clemency of the junior, which is somewhat difficult to reach when the fine, in the shape of champagne, has disappeared down the throats of the mess.

The controversy concerning the Lord Chancellor's delay in appointing Queen's Counsel still continues, and is waxing impatient. He has now announced that no promotions will be made before Easter, at the earliest, and he is likely enough, when Easter comes, again to defer the evil day. Why a man should want to be promoted one hardly knows. Little work as there is for juniors, there is still less for silks, and it is all concentrated in a very few hands. Still the silk gown is the sign of an honourable dignity, and the desire to protect the Inner Bar is no reason for refusing a prized privilege to capable men. Besides, if the Inner Bar requires protection, the Outer Bar is entitled to equal consideration, and what would be the storm of popular indignation if the Benchers of the Inns of Court declined to call more men to the Bar until the numbers of their seniors were sensibly diminished. In brief, the logical consequence of limiting the numbers of Queen's Counsel must also be to limit the numbers of juniors.

Crowded courts have been the rule during the past term, and one doubts whether the crowd was densest over *Adams* v. *Coleridge*, *Finney* v. *Garmoyle*, or the *Mignonette* case. On the whole, however, the fair Mrs. Weldon has, from time to time, collected as many hearers as any other litigant. Her general appearance has been described on a former occasion, and it only remains to be said that she has registered a couple more victories of late. The *Lotinga* insurance case has recently been the subject of a lengthened and, it may be added, a remarkably disgusting trial. The practical point at issue was whether a deceased money-lender and bankrupt had been, at the time when he effected a life insurance, a person of strictly sober habits. An array of witnesses on the one side swore that he was always drunk; an equal array declared that his sobriety was exemplary and remarkable. This conflict of testimony went on for something like a week, the witnesses being carefully kept out of court in the meantime. But, as the judge remarked, the precaution was futile, because the witnesses naturally read in the daily papers the account of the evidence which had been given on the preceding day. In fact, having regard to the abnormal and unnecessary length of our modern trials, there can be no question that this good old custom of the criminal courts has become a mere matter of form. By the way, the conclusion of the *Lotinga* case was not otherwise than instructive. Clearly the jury had nothing to do except to decide which of two armies of witnesses was committing perjury, and to give a verdict in harmony with the decision. But the jury entirely failed to agree, thereby passing a significant comment upon the character of the evidence submitted to them. In fact, it is not too much to say that there has been a phenomenal increase of perjury of recent years, and that, whatever Mr. Homersham Cox may say, the failing is not peculiar to Wales.

If one may be permitted to take a general survey of the talk among lawyers now-a-days, I should be inclined to say that it was strangely dull and monotonous. Bad times do not conduce to lively discussion, and such reforms as the Franchise Act and the Redistribution Bill are exciting enough to distract men from professional topics. A good many barristers will lose their seats, amongst them Mr. Warton, who has been known to appear in the courts. Mr. Charles Russell, Q.C., intends, so it is said, to stand for Holborn, though rumour originally assigned him to the Irish dock labourers in Liverpool. Mr. Edward Clarke, Q.C., will probably reappear as the representative of one of the minor