making of the will. The jury found for the will.—Probate Division, April 25th, &c., 1898 (Mr. Justice Barnes).—*Times*, April 28th.

Another illustration of the tenacity with which juries will cling to a will. Hostility to his wife was a prominent element in the testator's delusions. The effect of the will was to prejudice the wife's interests. Yet the jury upheld the will.

Donald Ross v. William Ross's Trustees and Others.

A probate case. The pursuer, D. Ross, sought reduction of the will of his brother, W. Ross, on the grounds that the testator was of unsound mind and incapable of managing his affairs, and that the will was impetrated from him when he was weak and facile by the defenders. The evidence was of the usual contradictory character, and the judge summed up strongly for the will; but the jury, notwithstanding, found a verdict upsetting the will, but exonerating the defenders.—Court of Session (the Lord President), March 14th and 15th, 1898.—*Scotsman*, March 15th and 16th.

This case shows that it is very much easier to upset a will in Scotland than in England. In England the "pursuer" would have been very ill advised to bring an action, and would certainly have lost it.

Spence v. Spence.

This was a probate action, the will being disputed on the usual grounds. It was proved that the testator was an habitual drunkard, that he was "always soaking," "almost always delirious," and had been repeatedly under treatment for delirium tremens. By his will he left the whole of his property to his wife, to whom he had been married a few months, and whom, it was said, he had known only for a month before marriage. The jury found for the will.—Manchester Assizes, March 1st, 1898.—*Manchester Guardian*, March 2nd.

Browning v. Green.

Plaintiff was a nurse, and in that capacity had the care of defendant, a dangerous lunatic. Defendant, in an outbreak of violence, struck the plaintiff a blow in the eye, whereby the sight was permanently destroyed. For the defence the facts were admitted, but it was pleaded that defendant, a lunatic, was not liable for an assault. The jury found for the plaintiff, with £78 damages; and upon an intimation from the judge that he hoped nothing more would be heard of the point of law, the defence was abandoned.—Birmingham Assizes (the Lord Chief Justice), March 24th, 1898.—*Times*, March 25th.

Re Charles Clarke.

This was an important appeal, involving the rights of a judgment creditor as against a receiver subsequently appointed under Section 116 of the Lunacy Act, 1890. The case, however, is of no medical interest.—*Times*, March 8th, 1898.

In re the Earl of Sefton.

This case in the Court of Appeal decided an important point with respect to dealing with the property of a lunatic, but is of no medical interest.—*Times*, June 15th, 1898.

In re Lamond.

An inquiry into the state of mind of Miss Cordelia Warde Lamond. It was proved that the lady had employed eleven detectives and thirteen solicitors in connection with her affairs. She had brought two actions against the Hôtel Métropole, two against Sir George Lewis, one against the Hôtel Cecil, five against officers of the Irish Rifles, and one against a naval officer. Most of these actions were for slander, and all had failed. In her bankruptcy there were thirty claims against her estate—seventeen by solicitors and five by detectives. The jury found that she was incapable of managing her affairs, but capable of managing herself, and was not dangerous to herself or others.—Before Mr. J. Fischer, Q.C.—*Times*, June 22nd, 1898.