in question had been "lopped," and the question was whether that was within the statute; and it was held that it was not, that "lopping" means cutting off branches laterally.

CRIMINAL LAW—EXTRADITION—EMBEZZLEMENT OR MISAPPROPRIATION—FRAUD BY BAILEE OR AGENT—SUFFICIENCY OF WARRANTS.

In re Bellencontre (1891), 2 Q.B. 122, was an application by a prisoner, committed for extradition to France, to be discharged from arrest. Two points were raised: the first as to the sufficiency of the French and English warrants for his arrest; and, secondly, whether the offence charged was an offence for which he was extraditable. The French warrant was issued on a charge of embezzling or misappropriating money as a notary; and the English warrant under which he was arrested described him as accused of the crime of fraud by a bailee, and fraud as an agent. The French warrant specified nineteen separate charges, and the Court came to the conclusion that fifteen of them disclosed no crime, such as if committed in England would be punishable by English law. With regard to the other four charges, there was evidence that in each case money was entrusted to the prisoner as a notary, without any direction in writing, with a view to reinvestment as soon as he or his customer should have found a suitable investment, and that he had misappropriated such money. As to the first point, the Court (Cave and Wills, JJ.) were of opinion that the offences were sufficiently described in both the French and English warrants, and that the warrants were consistent with each other, and that as to the four charges above-mentioned there was evidence that the offences charged were offences within both the French and also, if committed in England, within English law (24 & 25 Vict., c. 96, s. 76), and, therefore, that the prisoner was properly committed for extradition. Wills, J., shortly sums up the effect of the Extradition Act (33 & 34 Vict., c. 52) as follows, viz.: It requires "that the person whose extradition is sought should have been accused in a foreign country of something which is a crime by English law, and that there should be a *prima facie* case made out that he is guilty of a crime under the foreign law and also of a crime under English law"—of course what he means is, that the crime charged must be one which is actually a crime under the foreign law, and would be a crime under English law if it had been committed in England. When these conditions are satisfied, then the extradition ought to be granted.

CRIMINAL LAW—CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT ACT, 1885 (48 & 49 VICT., C. 69), S. 4—CARNAL KNOWLEDGE OF GIRL UNDER 13 YEARS—(R.S.C., C. 162, S. 39).

In *The Queen* v. *Marsden* (1891), 2 Q.B. 149, a case was reserved for the opinion of the Court whether on an indictment for having carnal knowledge of a girl under thirteen years (under R.S.C., c. 162, s. 39—the age is ten years) it was necessary to prove emission. The Court (Lord Coleridge, C.J., Denman, Mathew, Cave, and Charles, JJ.) were unanimously of opinion that it was not.

APPOINTMENT OF PROXY—ATTESTATION BY PROXY HIMSELF, SUFFICIENCY OF.

In re Parrott (1891), 2 Q.B. 151, a question arose under the bankruptcy law, which, however, is of general interest, and deserves to be noticed here. A person