of business for the profession, the judges in this country have much the best of it. All the same we shall be glad to see some government strong enough to take up and deal with the question of judicial salaries in some adequate manner.

We learn from the *Albany Law Journal* that the Supreme Court of Tennessee had recently to pass upon the novel question of the right of counsel to shed tears before a jury. The Court confessed itself unable to find any direct authority on the point, and concluded that no cast-iron rule should be laid down. "Tears have always been considered legitimate arguments before the jury, and we know of no power or jurisdiction in the trial judge to check them. It would appear to be one of the natural rights of counsel which no statute or constitution could take away. Indeed, if counsel have tears at command, it may be seriously questioned whether it is not his professional duty to shed them whenever proper occasion arises, and the trial judge would not feel constrained to interfere unless they are indulged in to such excess as to impede, embarrass, or delay the business before the Court. In this case the trial judge was not asked to check the tears, and it was, we think, a proper occasion for their use, and we cannot reverse for this reason." Our brethren to the south of us are, we apprehend, more emotional, and possibly more conversant with "ways that are dark and tricks that are vain," than the more stolid Canadian; and for this, probably, both judges and juries in the Dominion are devoutly thankful. Even the advent of lady barristers will not, we venture to say, work any change in this respect.

A correspondent in our last issue (p. 193) called attention to some proposed legislation in the Province of Nova Scotia on the subject of probate jurisdiction, and which incidentally affects the salaries of the county judges.

Whilst we must admit that it is rather hard on the county judges to give them extra work to do without remuneration, and probably take money out of their pockets,