

without the usual preliminary enacting clause; this strange omission is now supplied by c. 29 of the recent session.

C. 29, by naming certain new schedules "A" and "B," seems to create an opportunity for confusion, as in the principal Act there are already schedules with the like designations.

We have, on former occasions, pointed out the desirability of arranging all amending statutes in orderly sequence. This method as a rule has been generally observed in the present volume; there are, however, a few instances where it has been departed from, *e.g.*, in c. 34, s. 4 amends s. 12, and s. 5 amends s. 6, of the same Act. In c. 42, s. 12 (1) should have been numbered s. 14,—cc. 56, 57 are both out of order and might, we think, have more appropriately followed c. 48.

NOTES FROM THE ENGLISH INNS OF COURT.

THE INNS THEMSELVES.

Many Canadian lawyers are now in England—not, indeed, on legal business, but on their way to, or on furlough from the front. If they have a few hours to spare in London they may seek out the wells of English law. To them a few notes about the Inns of Court may be of interest. Baedeker, it may be supposed, will tell them something; but perhaps he has little knowledge *le plus intimé*.

The only Inns that retain the right to call men to the Bar are the Inner Temple, the Middle Temple, Lincoln's Inn and Grays Inn. Other Inns there are such as Clements Inn and Furnivals Inn; but as corporate bodies they have long since passed away although their names and in some cases the original buildings still survive. Of the Inns of Court a wag once wrote:

The Inner for a rich man,
The Middle for a poor,
Lincolns for a parchmenter
And Grays Inn for a bore.

It is possible that some kindly commentator has changed the word 'boor' into 'bore' in the last line, but the line is no longer true in any sense. Your Grays Inn man is one of the best.