

LEGAL NOTES.

DIARY FOR MAY.

1. Wed.. *Philip & James*. County Treasurer to make up books, enter arrears, and make yearly settlement.
4. Sat... Articles, &c., to be left with Secretary of Law Society.
5. SUN. *Rogation*.
9. Thur. *Ascension*.
12. SUN. *1st Sunday after Ascension*.
16. Thur. Exam. of Law Stud. for call to Bar with Honors.
17. Fri.. Exam. of Law Students for call to the Bar.
18. Sat.. Exam. of Art. Clerks for certificates of fitness.
19. SUN. *Whit Sunday*.
20. Mon. Easter Term begins. Articled Clerks going up for inter-exam. to file certificates.
23. Thur. Inter-exam. of Law Students and Articled Clerks.
24. Fri.. Paper Day, Q.B. New Trial Day, C.P.
25. Sat.. Paper Day, C.P. New Trial Day, Q.B.
26. SUN. *Trinity Sunday*.
27. Mon. Paper Day, Q.B. New Trial Day, C.P.
28. Tues. Paper Day, C.P. New Trial Day, Q.B.
29. Wed. Paper Day, Q.B. New Trial Day, C.P.
30. Thur. Paper Day, C.P. Open Day, Q.B.
31. Fri.. New Trial Day, Q.B. Open Day, C.P.

THE

Canada Law Journal.

MAY, 1872.

Mrs. Bradwell, the Editor of the *Chicago Legal News*, is one of the most indefatigable of her sex. She applied for admission to the Bar of Illinois; and on being refused, moved all the Courts of the State, from the lowest even unto the highest. But the law was against her, and, cherishing the motto of her paper, "*Lex vincit*," she submitted with serene grace. But it was only to gather up her energies for a new and now successful effort. The Senate of the State of Illinois has been moved, and the result is announced in her paper in jubilant capitals: "LIBERTY OF PURSUIT TRIUMPHANT IN ILLINOIS!" Her importunity has secured the passage of an Act, which takes effect next July, and reads as follows:

"Sec. 1.—No person shall be precluded or debarred from any occupation, profession or employment (except military), on account of sex. Provided, that this Act shall not be construed to affect the eligibility of any person to an elective office.

"Sec. 2.—All laws inconsistent with this Act are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 3.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as requiring any female to work on streets or roads, or serve on juries."

We think this indomitable woman, or "female," as the Act has put it, is now entitled

to change the motto of her journal into "*Sex vincit*." If we may judge from the character of her paper (one of the most spirited of our weekly exchanges), she will, as a barrister, surpass many of her bearded brethren; and in time, we doubt not, should the gown movement obtain among the United States bar, she will arrive at the forensic honour of being "clad in silk attire." We notice that in the Washington District Courts a "female lawyer, coloured," has already been admitted to practice.

These are the halcyon hours of legal authors. Times are changed from the days when counsel were sternly reprimanded if they ventured to cite text-writers. Treatises even so weighty as Viner's Abridgement were once lightly esteemed by the court. In *Farr v. Dean* (1 Burr. 364), Mr. Justice Foster interrupted Sergeant Martin, when he was clenching an argument, thus: "Brother, Viner is not an authority. Cite the cases that Viner quotes; that you may do."

Notwithstanding the complacency with which the Judges now take a note of the text-writers cited, it remained for a Western Supreme Court (as duly chronicled in the *Chicago Legal News*) to render the finest compliment ever yet conceived by judicial intellect to legal authorship. That Court, it appears, suspended giving judgment in an important testamentary case, until Mr. Ker's recent treatise on "Fraud and Mistake" could be imported from England, and placed in the hands of the Judges.

Since the four-and-twenty-day deliverance of the Attorney-General against the historical "claimant," minute statisticians have been overhauling the records of legal speeches famous for their "long, majestic march," if not for their "energy divine." The closest upon Sir John's heels was Miss Shedden, who, in the great Legitimacy case which so nearly concerned her, spoke for twenty-four days before the astonished and despairing law lords. Sir Charles Wetherell is said to have occupied eighteen days in discussing a cause in Chancery. In *Small v. Attwood*, the House of Lords listened for twelve days to the compact eloquence of Sergeant Wilde (afterwards Lord Chancellor Truro), whose fee, by the way, was £6,000—about the same sum as that