Though his star was in the ascendant, both as a writer, an advocate, and as a outspoken, fearless statesman, the celeberity he acquired by his defence of Queen Caroline, brought him most prominently before the public, and made him for years one of the idols of the English nation. This masterly effort, and his speech on the Reform bill, were the oratorial efforts by which he was best known to fame, professionally and politically. He is, however, best known to those of the present day, as the greatest reformer, and particularly law reformer, of his day.

Mr. Brougham was appointed Lord Chancellor during Lord Grey's administration, and though not attaining to the eminence on the bench that he did at the bar, his energy was the same, and his zeal as untiring as before.

His powers of work were almost superhuman. Such an intellect, combined with such physical endurance, and such a determined, dauntless spirit knew nothing of failure, until he had risen from an obscure position to the highest honours which his country could restore. He has left a name without which many pages of English history would be a blank, and his memory will ever remain as a beacon of encouragement to the industrious student, ambitious of success. Their motto should be what his proved to be, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might."

LAW SOCIETY, EASTER TERM, 1868.

The following statement shows the result of the examinations for call to the Bar and for admission as Attorneys during this Term, in the order in which they passed.

For Call:

Maximum number of Marks, 350.

1. Mr. Mulock, ...307 marks;
2. " Moore, ...305 "
3. " Lash, ...304 "

who were admitted without oral examination.

4. Mr. Harman,
5. " Sparks,
6. " Fraleck,
7. " Dingwall,
8. " W. Bell,
9. Mr. Hall,
10. " Goforth,
11. " McMurrich,
12. " Barrett,

Nine gentlemen were rejected.

For Admission:

Maximum number of Marks, 300.

1. Mr. Garrow, ...271 marks;
2. " Lash, ...259 "
3. " A. Bell, ...254 "

who were admitted without oral examination.

4. Mr. Douglas,
5. " McMartin,
6. " Scott,
7. " White,
8. " Chamberlain,
9. " Boggs,
10. " French,
11. " Donaldson,
12. " Gibson,
13. " Berford,
14. " McDowell,
15. " Harman,
16. " Robinson,
17. " Elliott,
18. Mr. Dingwall,
19. " Duggan,
20. " Lillie,
21. " Capreol,
22. " Green,
23. " Greig,
24. " Beatty,
25. " Sewell,
26. " O'Leary,
27. " Bethune,
28. " Smith,
29. " Leet,
30. " Gray.

Four gentlemen were rejected.

SELECTIONS.

WHAT SHOULD BE A QUORUM OF JUDGES.

The recent change in the constitution of the Court of Appeal in Chancery, and the various plans which have been lately put forward, and are now under consideration, for reforming the law courts, suggest the consideration of the question.—What number of judges sitting together forms the best tribunal?

An independent observer of our judicial system must at first sight be greatly struck with the curious difference between the accustomed number at common law and in chancery. He would also, at all events until within the last few years, if he consulted members of both branches of the bar, have been struck with the uniformity with which they each preferred their own system. Members of the chancery bar have seldom been found to recognize the advantage of four judges sitting *in banco*, and common law barristers, for the most part, wonder how it is that suitors and the profession are satisfied with the decisions of a single judge in equity. These opinions are, doubtless, in a great degree, the result of the force of habit and of the conservation which has habitually pervade the profession. We cannot, however, think that such opinions are entirely without foundation in reason; still less that they were so formerly, when they were more universally entertained than they are now. The tendency of all recent legislation has been largely to increase what we may call the concurrent jurisdiction of the common law and equity courts. With this increase has grown up a feeling that the composition of the tribunals might, with advantage, be more nearly assimilated. Notwithstanding this, we think there may still be recognized a difference in the general nature of the questions which come before a common law court *in banco*, and before the Vice-Chancellors, and that this difference is of a character which makes it desirable that the decisions of the one tribunal should be based on collective opinion, while those of the other may be may be satisfactory, though only the expressions of invi-