

timate child, was acquitted, but Mr. Mathews was not content to let the matter rest with the verdict of the jury, and proceeded to give an utterly irrelevant account of the dark incidents of the woman's career. He expressed his conviction that 'it should be known' that the prisoner had given birth to three illegitimate children, that she had been charged with causing the death of her second child as well as of her third, and that, being acquitted of the charge of murder, she had been sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for concealment of birth. With perfect accuracy Mr. Justice Grantham described Mr. Mathews' observations as 'unusual,' but he made it clear that he thoroughly concurred in them, and that he was in some measure responsible for them, for he stated that he 'was anxious that the statement should be made, so that the prisoner might learn that these facts were known, and that if anything of the kind happened again the verdict of the jury would probably be very different.' These remarks are perilously near the famous verdict, 'Not guilty, but don't do it again.' But they may be strongly objected to on several more important grounds. If trial by jury is to retain its value, neither prosecuting counsel nor judge ought to qualify a verdict of acquittal by any irrelevant references to the prisoner's past. When the jury found the prisoner innocent the trial was at an end, and the counsel for the prosecution was not entitled to address the Court. The circumstances of any particular case may be very suspicious, but in nowise do they justify a serious departure from the elementary principles of our criminal procedure.—*Law Journal (London.)*

SPORT ON THE THAMES.—A curious case of shooting arose on the August Bank Holiday. Thomas Wyborn, paperhanger, of Fulham, went to Craven Steps, Hammersmith, with a shot-gun to seek sport on the river. There, he says, he saw a snipe flying across the river and he fired, and shot four men in a passing boat, one so badly that he lost an eye. They maintain that no bird was flying by, and that he aimed at them. To find a snipe off Hammersmith Bridge on an August Bank Holiday is an event calling for much proof, and to shoot at it when found a deed worthy of a mad ornithologist, and it is not surprising that the sportsman is charged with shooting with intent to murder, and runs great risk, whatever his real intent, of falling within *Regina v. Salmon*, 50 Law J. Rep. M. C. 25; L. R. 6 Q. B. Div. 79.—*Ib.*