argued, would it be reasonable, that by taking a step for such a purpose a creditor should obtain a priority over another creditor who commenced proceedings before him, such proceedings being finally carried to judgment and execution."

Again, after referring to the argument against this view on account of the apparent hardships arising therefrom, he continues:

"It is also objected that there is a much stronger reason than the supposed equities of the case for thinking that attaching creditors have priority, and that the principle to be applied is that the goods when once attached and handed over to the Clerk are in the custody of the law and are not therefore liable to seizure under execution. It is contended that there is nothing in the act to interfere with this principle, in fact that sections 199, 204 & 211 all uphold it. Sec. 199 only authorizes the bailiff to seize sufficient goods to cover the debt and costs mentioned in the warrant delivered to him in a particular suit, and not all the goods of the debtor, as in the Superior Courts, expressly for the security of all his creditors. If the principle referred to does not govern where is the sense of enacting, as an apparent exception to the general rule, that property seized under an attachment may be seized or sold under an execution to be issued in such attachment suit. But this section says nothing about *any other* execution. The rights of a judgment creditor who has commenced his suit and served his summons personally upon the defendant before the seizure of any of his property under an attachment are referred to sec. 211, and it is provided that his suit shall proceed as if no attachment had issued, and that he shall have execution forthwith on his judgment. If it was intended that other creditors should be able to acquire an advantage by obtaining judgment on a personal service after the seizure of property under an attachment, it would have been provided for."

Our opinion inclines to the former view; but whilst agreeing with Mr. O'Brien that "the matter is one of considerable difficulty," upon which "the Legislature has carefully abstained from throwing any unnecessary light," we think that the manner which the bailiff in the case brought before us made or attempted to make the seizure is deserving of rebuke. Committing a breach of the peace in the execution of even a rightful act is most improper.

THE BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEWS.

As will be seen from an advertisment of Messrs. Leonard, Scott & Co., the enterprising publishers of the above on this continent, a change (rendered necessary to save themselves from loss) has been made in the list of prices of the Reviews and *Blackwood's Magazine*. But they still remain (if we except the mass of trash that floods the country) the cheapest, as they certainly are the best reading matter in the shape of general literature that we can obtain, possessing the attractions of ephemeral reading as well as the more solid benefits to be obtained from mature thought and close reasoning; and their value is enhanced by the fact that each Review represents one of the leading, distinct and antagonistic parties either in politics, philosophy or religion, into which the English nation may, as a mass, be divided.

We heartily recommend those of our readers who desire to keep themselves "posted" in the premises" to subscribe for these Reviews and *Blackwood*, and when three or four or five persons club together, the expense to each individual is reduced to a mere nothing.

SELECTIONS.

THE OFFICE OF CORONER.

Of the many institutions which may be termed the inheritance of an Englishman, there are few which, for antiquity or usefulness, can be compared to the office of coroner.

Elected, for the most part, by the people, he becomes the guardian of the poor, the unprotected, and the friendless, and is free from that influence which is inseparable from a Court nominee. And yet, strange as it may seem, the real value and importance of the office of coroner is not sufficiently estimated by the public, for want of measuring its advantages not only by what it does, but what it *prevents*.

Until the twenty-fifth year of King George II., the coroner did not receive any remuneration beyond a sum of 12s. 4d., taken, upon view of the body slain, of the goods and chattels of him that was the slayer or murderer (if he had any); but by statute passed in that year, cap. 29, a fee of 20s. was the remuneration fixed for each inquest, in addition to 9d. a mile for his travelling expenses. Looking at the difference of the value of money at that time to what it is at the present, the remuneration to the coroner was much greater than it is now. It was by this same statute that the duty was imposed on coroners of holding an inquest in every case of a death happening in a prison, in order that the public may, through