

ATTEMPT TO STEAL.—The recent case of *Regina v. Ring*, 61 Law J. Rep. M. C. 116, established the important point that, if a man tries to pick a pocket, he may be convicted of an attempt to steal without proof that there was anything in the pocket. The contrary had been held in *Regina v. Collins*, 33 Law J. Rep. M. C. 177, decided as long ago as 1864, but that decision was virtually overruled in *Regina v. Brown*, 59 Law J. Rep. M. C. 47. There seems, however, to have been a misapprehension in some quarters, as to the effect of the last named case, and accordingly in *Regina v. Ring* a case raising the point was stated for the consideration of the Court for Crown Cases Reserved. There can be little doubt that the decision of that Court is in accordance with the true principles of justice. Where a person tries to pick the pocket of another, it is obvious that the felonious intention exists whether there is anything in the pocket or not; and it is certainly a startling proposition that a man's guilt or innocence should depend upon whether the pocket is empty or not—a purely accidental circumstance. Under the law as laid down in *Regina v. Collins* it was necessarily impossible to establish the guilt of a prisoner charged with attempting to pick a pocket unless the person whose pocket was attempted could be secured as a witness, which frequently could not be done, owing to the circumstances under which this class of offence usually takes place, and many guilty persons consequently escaped punishment.—*Law Journal (London)*.

JUDICIAL QUALIFICATIONS.—It is said that the Lord Chancellor does not intend in future to appoint men over seventy years of age to the office of County Court judge. This is satisfactory as far as it goes, but we could wish that the limit had been fixed at sixty, as that appears to us to be quite a maximum age for a man to commence a judicial career.—*Law Journal (London)*.