


| SLIPS 0F N0VELISTS LEGAL mistakes that have been MADE BY GREAT AUTHORS. Dickenn and the Famons Case of |  |  |
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| gondoliers, "are solemn things." Yet it is curious how seldom a novelist rentures into a law court without driv- |  |  |
| ing his quill through acts of parliament and rules of law alike |  |  |
| That Dickens' knowledge of law, like Mr. Weller's of London, was "exten. |  |  |
| sive and peculiar" is amply demon- strated by the famous case of Bardell |  |  |
| rersus Pickwick. Students of that re-port may have been struck by the fact |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| that neither plaintiff nor box. The ex- peared in the witness box. planation is that at that time parties |  |  |
| "upon the record" were not competentwitnesses, their interest in the case be-ing regarded as too strong a tempta- |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| who calls a witness is not permitted to cross examine him at all, but, on the | stom |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| would have known better than to do) <br> their rersion of the words heard |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| forces counsel never to call a hostile witness. Who could bear to be depriy ed ofler? |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| decimus Scott, is called, much against his will, as a witness for the defense. |  |  |
| cross examined by the celebrated Chaf- fanbrass, forced to confess his mis- deeds and dismissed covered with |  | ma |
| $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { ignominy, to be subsequently expelled } \\ & \text { from his club-poetic justice which } \\ & \text { would have been defeated even by a } \\ & \text { chairman of quarter sessions. } \end{aligned}\right.$ |  | and meical atenasarce |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| from many others. Yet the famoustrial scene in "Hard. Cash" would havebeen ruthlessly deprived of its mostdramatic moment by any judge of the |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| high court. When the hapless Alfred Hardy, who has been wrongfully im- prisoned in an asylum by his wicked |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { father, comes at last to establish his } \\ & \text { sanity before a jury, his case is closed } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| dead sister. Writing at the point of |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| goes far to secure her brother a trium |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| received in evidence. Knowing that, under ordinary circumstances, such |  |  |
| testimony would Reade is careful to establish that the writer knew herself to be dying; buthe was unaware that a "dying declara |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| tion" is only admissible in evidence |  |  |
| slaughter of the person who has made it, and cannot be laid before the jury |  |  |
| Numerous and entertaining are thetrial scenes which adorn the works of trial scenes which adorn the works of |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | well |
| the part of that most careful of nor-elists, David Christie Murray, whoshares to some extent the popular con-fusion on the subject of the law of |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| libel and slander. His powerful story, |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | M |
|  |  |  |
| No fault can be found in this case with the way in which the villain is |  |  |
| culty is that no such prosecution couldhave been instituted at all. You may |  |  |
|  |  | RST-CLASS BICE |
| but to libel him you must "write, print or otherwise permanently record" your |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| an action for damages, it is libel alone |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| cause it tends to pre areach of the peace, but one would think as much might be said of slander. Still |  |  |
| the distinction exists, and the ag gressor who confines his attack to |  | Dr. O. D. Faust |
| person.Such are a few of the slips to which |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| the novelist is liable who nnwarily trespasses upo |  |  |

