> "In the corrupted currents of this world,
> Offence's gilded hand may thrive by justice;
> And oft 'tis seen the wicked prize itself
> Buys out the law. But 'tis not so above—
> There is no shuffling there."

In the case before us is there no way of obtaining the recission of the grant by which $200,000 worth of property are said to have been obtained for $500? Is there no mistake as to the property, no concealment of knowledge of its value by the grantee, no *fraud* which vitiates everything? The Roman law held taxation to the extent of half the value to be sufficient, and though our modern law, founded more on trading principles, does not go so far, I think it still says that very gross inadequacy may afford evidence of the existence of fraud. Is $200,000 obtained in the manner reported by the committee for $500 sufficiently gross inadequacy? If English law affords no remedy in such a case, or it exists and our lawyers cannot find it, so much the worse for the law and lawyers, and Mr. Blake's purifying Bill is the more urgently necessary. I think if a like case had been referred by Hamlet's father to his Lord Chancellor, or whoever might there be the proper authority, and he had reported no remedy, King Hamlet would have thought and said there was "something rotten in the State of Denmark," which must and should be cured. W.

Notes on Exchanges and Legal Scrap Book.

A valued correspondent has called our attention to an error in the last paragraph of the article on the "English Ceremonial on Taking Silk." It should read: "The Oaths Commissioners recommended that in altering the form of this oath the words '*unless* with license of Her Majesty' should be inserted where marked *."

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY.—The state of judicial opinion on the question when a workman precludes himself from recovering against his employer under the Employers' Liability Act is becoming as embarrassing as that upon the Bills of Sale Acts. It will be remembered that the famous decision in *Thomas* v. *Quartermaine*, which, unfortunately, did not go to the House of Lords, left the law in this position, as put by Lord Justice Bowen: "It is no doubt true that the knowledge on the part of the injured person which will prevent him from alleging negligence must be a knowledge under such circumstances as leads necessarily to the conclusion that the whole risk was voluntarily incurred. The maxim, be it observed, is not *scienti non fit injuria*, but *volenti*." Then, after referring to certain conditions, the Lord Justice concludes: "Knowledge is not a conclusive defence in itself, but when it is a knowledge under circumstances that leave no inference but one, viz., that the risk has been voluntarily encountered, the defence seems to me complete." That was the view adopted by Lord Esher and Lord Justice Fry, the other members of the Court. The decision has been very much can-