

application. While they cannot be ignored, their utility cannot be stretched beyond its proper boundary. They are first principles only, and not abridgments of the law. The practitioner who discovers a 'wise saw' pertinent to his case has only found a good anchor whereby his brief may be moored. Unless he can fill its sails with the prospering gale of 'modern instances' he can hardly hope to reach the desired haven of success."

---

The trial of Gerald Sifton at the London Assizes for the murder of his father is fresh in the memory of our readers. There are some matters connected with this prosecution which we think should not be allowed to pass without comment. As our readers are aware one Edgar Morden was supposed to be an important witness for the Crown. His name is on the indictment and he was a witness before the Grand Jury. It is also on record that some nine months ago the jury found that an alleged will of the deceased was a forgery. This will was witnessed by Edgar Morden, and he had sworn before the magistrate that the signature was that of Joseph H. Sifton. If the finding of the jury was correct, and it may be assumed that it was as there was no appeal, the man who thus testified that the will was genuine was guilty of perjury and presumably of forgery. It will be remembered also that the reason given for the execution of this will by Sifton the day before his death was that Morden had stated to him that his life was in danger from his son, as Morden had been asked by his son to aid in killing him. The County Crown Attorney of Middlesex, whilst engaged in the prosecution of Gerald Sifton and Walter Herbert for the murder of the elder Sifton, was retained as the legal adviser of Edgar Morden, and his firm acted as solicitors in the attempt to uphold the alleged will in which Edgar Morden was very much interested. This latter individual was also actively engaged in assisting the prosecution against Gerald Sifton. Morden was naturally under the circumstances an important witness for the Crown, and presumably would have been called but for the fact that the verdict in the will case discredited him, and it would not have been policy on the part of the Crown to put him in the box. This man Morden is, we understand, still at large, no charge having been preferred against him. A recital of these facts brings into prominence the difficulties and complication likely to arise when a