

C.P., and a party is generally required to do so before appealing to the House of Lords.

5. In the cases of persons suing *in forma pauperis* the court has power to dispauper a party who conducts vexatious proceedings, and he may then be put upon terms as to costs, or compelled to give security, just as other persons may be: *Hawes v. Johnson*, 1 Y. & J. 10.

6. A defendant, against whom proceedings are taken maliciously, and without probable cause, has also remedy by action if he can show special damage: *Quartz Hill Company v. Eyre*, 49 L. T. Rep. N. S. 249; 50 Ib. 274; 11 Q.B. Div. 674. But, as may well be supposed, this remedy is not often resorted to.—*Eng. Law Times*.

DEFECTIVE STREETS.—By the statutes of the State of Michigan it is provided that "Any person or persons sustaining bodily injury upon any of the public highways or streets in this State, by reason of neglect to keep such public highways or streets . . . in good repair, and in a condition reasonably safe and fit for travel by the township, village, city, or corporation, such township shall pay to the person or persons so injured just damages." The Supreme Court of Michigan in *Joslyn v. City of Detroit* reversed the decision of the Circuit Court, which refused damages to the fair plaintiff for injuries received while driving along Clifford Street, Detroit, in the dark. Persons building a house had a pile of sand on the street, from one and a half to four feet high, and extending half way across the street. The sand had been there for upwards of a month. There being no lights or other warning of the obstruction, the plaintiff's carriage came in contact with it, in the dark, overturning the carriage and injuring her seriously. It was contended for the city that it was not liable for damage resulting from obstructions placed there by private persons; but the court held that the city had been guilty of negligence in allowing the obstruction to remain in the street for so long a time.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.—The Minnesota Legislature have been imitating ours in respect to providing for capital executions. They have enacted that after sentence the condemned shall be allowed to see no one but his family, his spiritual adviser and his lawyer; that none but the officers and three persons whom he may select shall witness the execution; that it shall be a misdemeanour to print any details of it; and that the taking off shall be by hanging or electricity, as the governor may direct. Here is another blow at the free-and-easy-dom of the press. No reporter allowed to interview the condemned, nor to describe his dying actions! Now hark for a howl of execration from the Minnesota newspapers. For once those of St. Paul and Minneapolis will howl in harmony. But the Legislature have unconsciously bestowed a valuable franchise on the condemned. What a strife and struggle there will be for those three places! The newspaper men will bid high for them, and take their chances of the misdemeanour penalty. We are glad however to see this endeavour to invest capital executions with some dignity and solemnity.—*Albany Law Journal*.