GENERAL NOTES.

BENCH AND BAR.—In an article dealing with encounters between Bench and Bar, suggested by the recent passage of arms between Mr. Justice Hawkins and Mr. Kemp, Q.C., the *Pall Mall Gazette* says: "Most dramatic scene of all, but not before an English tribunal, was that which gave a Lord Chancellor to England. In 1757 Wedderburn, under great provocation from Lockhart, another Scotch barrister, used language to him in Court at Edinburgh which certainly cannot be justified. It was undoubtedly, as the Lord President said, when at last he did interfere, "unbecoming an advocate, and unbecoming a gentleman." Wedderburn, beyond himself with passion, retorted, "His lordship had said as a judge what he could not justify as a gentleman," (an admirable formula, by the way, when the judge is wrong). The Bench promptly and properly resolved that he must at once apologise, under pain of deprivation. Without another word he pulled off his gown, laid it in front of him, and said, "My lords, I neither retract nor apologise, but I will save you the trouble of deprivation; there is my gown, and I will never wear it more; *virtute me involvo*,' and with a bow he left the Court. That very night the future Lord Loughborough set out for London."

INTERESTING LIFE INSURANCE CASE.—Aaron Goldsmith and his wife were burned to death in New York City on December 20, 1896, and now there is going to be some litigation about a life insurance policy, taken out on the husband's life for the benefit of his wife. The question being which of the two died first, relatives and heirs of both sides will lay claim to the money, and the life insurance company will pay the amount into Court and compel the parties to fight. It is not known exactly in which way the New York Courts will decide, but under the Roman law the presumption is in favour of the husband having survived the wife, as being the stronger; wherefore his relatives will be entitled to the money. But that law no longer applies here. Professor Meilziner, of the Hebrew Union College, has discussed the matter in the newspapers from the Rabbinical side, calling attention to a like question discussed by Hillel and Shamai. In the Mishna the case is stated of a man and wife having no children, who perished together under the ruins of a house that tumbled over them. Her relatives claiming that he died first, demanded not only her dotal and paraphernal property, but also the dower due to her by Jewish law. His brothers, claiming that he survived her, hence held themselves out as sole heirs. The Shammaites held that since there is no possible way of determining who died first, the money in dispute is to be divided among the two contestants. Hillel, to the contrary, held that the property in dispute remains with the actual possessor, thus giving the wife's relatives only her paraphernal property. The Code of Maimonides and the Shulchan Aruch adopt this opinion. But in the present case the insurance money is in the hands of neither party.—*Jewish Chronicle.*