

TRADE UNIONS.—One who procures the discharge of an employee not engaged for any definite time, by threatening to terminate a contract between himself and the employer which he had a right to terminate at any time, is held, in *Raycroft v. Tayntor* (Vt.), 33 L.R.A. 225, to be not liable to an action by the employee for damages, whatever motive may have prompted him to procure the discharge.

AN INTERESTING QUESTION.—At a meeting of the Leeds Law Students' Society, held on February 8, the following subject was debated: "A., a bachelor, in 1893 promised to marry B., a spinster. A. failed to keep his promise, and in 1896 B. brought an action for breach of promise of marriage against him and obtained 500*l.* damages. The damages were never paid, and in the same year the parties were married. In the beginning of 1897, C., an antenuptial creditor of B. for 100*l.*, applied to A. for payment of that sum. A.'s solicitor replies that A. received no assets with B., and is therefore not liable. C.'s solicitor answers that A. received assets to the extent of 500*l.* Can C. successfully maintain an action against A. for the 100*l.*?" Mr. G. E. Foster opened in the affirmative, and Mr. E. N. Whitley replied in the negative. After a brief discussion, the chairman, Mr. W. H. Clarke, summed up, and there was a majority for the affirmative.

ASPIRATION AND PRACTICE.—At the farewell dinner to Sir Alfred Milner, the newly appointed Governor of Cape Colony and High Commissioner for South Africa, Mr. Asquith, Q.C., M.P., referring to the days in which Sir Alfred Milner sought to practise at the Bar, said: "We both joined, and we both aspired to practise the profession of the law. I am afraid that, in those days, at any rate, there was a good deal more aspiration than practice. But I can recall occasions on which he and I have in a gloomy mood discussed the baffling problem which constantly presents itself to ambitious youth in this country—the unaccountable want of discrimination of that which is ironically called the lower branch of the legal profession. Well, after a time, much to my regret and to that of many others, Sir Alfred Milner turned his back upon the Temple. The Northamptonshire Sessions, in which I believe upon one occasion his voice had been raised for a trifling honorarium in the interests or supposed interests of justice, knew him no more. He deviated, as so many good men have been tempted to do, into the seductive by-paths of journalism."