

The *Law Gazette* declares: 'It is notorious that he is now absolutely, both mentally and physically, incapable of his duties. Justice is daily travestied at his court, and suitors disgusted to such an extent that the scandal demands the immediate attention of the Lord Chancellor. It is an outrage on the public that Judge Bayley should be permitted to remain even a day longer on the bench, and we would earnestly urge on the lay press the pressing necessity for joining us in our demand for the removal of this senile and incompetent judge.' It is said, too, that Judge Abdy is not unfit through age, but ill-health has so impaired his intellectual qualifications that he is no longer fitted to be entrusted with the arduous duties of a County Court judge." The same journal delights at a fling at Chief Justice Coleridge: "Those members of the Bar who are everlastingly raising the question of Lord Coleridge's retirement are disquieting themselves in vain. If they will take the trouble to think, they will remember that Cockburn died in 1880, and that consequently his successor will not have earned his full pension as the Lord Chief Justice of England until 1895. Is it reasonable to expect his lordship to resign before he has earned his full pension? I think not. But, reasonable or unreasonable, the expectation is certainly doomed to disappointment. Whatever other changes may take place before 1895—and I think that all the present occupants of the bench are animated by a determination to die rather than retire—it is morally certain that Lord Coleridge will continue to preside over the Queen's Bench Division and (occasionally) over the Appeal Court until the latter end of 1895, when his lordship will have attained the respectable age of 75. He will then be a year younger than the Master of the Rolls is at the present moment." Another writer takes his lordship to task for being absent from court without leave, so to speak. If the learned judge occupied a somewhat less exalted position, it would probably be said of him, with some show of reason, that he was "above his business."

CRIMINAL TRIAL—EVIDENCE—LETTERS OBTAINED BY DETECTIVE.—One point in the case of *Siebert v. People*, 32 N.E. Rep., decided by the Supreme Court of Illinois, is of special interest. It is held that the fact that letters were taken from defendant's room by a detective without authority of law and without