Honor. In future they will have to be men in the prime of life; and it will hardly be possible to get men of this class for less than $1,200. The saving which may be effected by dismissing about three hundred judges in a hundred courts of first instance will therefore be more than set off by the cost of increasing the salaries of *juges de paix*. Indeed, it is probable that some of the last named magistrates residing in districts where the work is very heavy—as in the Paris arrondissements, which rank with cantons—will get $2,000 to $3,000 a year; and as the old *juges de paix* will be superseded, the first effect of the reform in the judicature will be to place 1,620 decently paid posts at the disposal of the government for distribution among struggling *avocats* belonging to the *bourgeoisie*.

THE BAR OF MANITOBA.

Manitoba, after the fashion of rapidly developing territories, has had a large influx of lawyers from the older sections of the country, especially from Ontario. Those who had possession of the field naturally sought to impose some restrictions upon the new-comers, and an examination was made obligatory. This, it is said, brought about the curious anomaly in some cases of practitioners from Ontario being compelled to appear before their old pupils, for an examination into their fitness for practice. Legislation was asked to smooth the path to practice, but the Manitoba bar contrived that they should still hold the key to the position. A correspondent, who is a member of the Quebec bar, tells us the end of the controversy in the following words:—

"The final act in the legal farce was the most farcical of all. Those who had been loudest in their denunciations of the Law Society, when they found they had outwitted themselves by the working of the new bill, petitioned the benchers to admit them on a nominal examination. This request was favorably received, and the seventy and seven were admitted after an easy oral examination. The swearing in process then commenced. The Chief Justice, with a grim sense of humor, made the candidates stand in a row around the Court-room like school-boys in a class. There were Queen's Counsel learned in the law, jurisconsults of wide Canadian reputation, authors of profound legal treatises, and stern examiners of the Ontario Law Society, standing in line, toeing the mark, with humbler members of the Bar, briefless barristers anticipating a rush of practice, and youthful attorneys looking forward to a large *clientèle*. As soon as the line was formed and the roll called, Bibles were produced, and the candidates formed with military precision into groups of six, each group holding one Bible. The clerk of the Court then read the oath of allegiance, which was sworn to by each kissing the Bible in turn. The barrister's oath was then taken in the like fashion. The attorneys were next called up, and the oath of allegiance and the attorney's oath administered to them also. Those who were admitted both as attorneys and barristers took the oath of allegiance twice, the Chief Justice dryly remarking that it would do them no harm to take the oath every five minutes of the day. The legal corps were then dismissed to the ante-room to sign the barrister's roll, which terminated the proceedings."

NEW TRIAL.

An unusual ground for granting a new trial was lately sustained by the St. Louis Court of Appeals. A prisoner convicted of murder is to have the advantage of a new trial on account of the ignorance, stupidity, and gross blundering of his counsel, Mr. A. A. Bradley. The St. Louis requirements from aspirants to the legal profession must be extremely moderate, or it would not be possible for the Court to say of one who has satisfied them: "In looking over this record we find in the performance of the counsel for the defendant an exhibition of ignorance, stupidity and silliness, that could not be more absurd or fantastical if it came from an idiot or lunatic." This censure might be thought unduly severe, but unfortunately, Mr. Bradley having since rushed into print in the newspapers, all doubt as to his "ignorance, stupidity, and silliness" is at once dissipated, and the reader is fully disposed to concur with the Court in thinking that "the prisoner here in effect went to his trial and doom without counsel."

NOTES OF CASES.

SUPERIOR COURT.

MONTREAL, June 15, 1882.

Before MACKAY, J.

BEAUVAIS v. LANTHIER et al.

Louage d'ouvrage—Want of Terme.

PER CURIAM. The plaintiff complained of the non-delivery of a *manteau*. It was alleged that in September, 1880, this *manteau* was delivered to defendants, to be finished on or before the 24th of November; and that there was also a muff to be delivered for $17. The sum of $89 was to be payable by plaintiff on delivery. The sum of $100