their mistress rather than their servant. We have regarded them as noble, self-sacrificing spirits, who, almost alone among us, were above the use of catch penny devices.

We can congratulate ourselves in this country that we have not the United States method of electing judges for a term.

*

WE quote the following to show how far below Canadian is the United States training for lawyers:—

Unfortunately the American bar of to-day appreciates too little the vast importance of properly regulating admission to the bar.

Twenty-four of the States require a period of study previous to examination for admission, and in all the other States an applicant for admission can take his examination at any time, and the examinations are usually so informal that practically he can be admitted at any time. Therefore, generally speaking, in about twenty of the States in the country there are practically no requisites for admission, or they are so loosely observed that their object is frustrated. In a number of the twenty-four States where a period of study is required, the examinations themselves are formal matters, but although this should not be, yet we can in a measure condone it in view of the fact that the applicant is at least required to study a certain number of years before being allowed to take his examination. These States and the number of years' study required in each are as follows: North Carolina, one year; Washington, eighteen months; Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Nebraska, North Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, two years; Connecticut, Delaware, District of Columbia, Minnesota, New Hampshire, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Vermont, three years; New Jersey, three, if the applicant possesses an A. B. or a B. S. degree, and four years if he does not; New York and Oregon, two years if a college graduate, three years if not; and Rhode Island, two years if the applicant possesses a classical education, three if he does not.

The favorite method of examining applicants is in open court by a temporary committee appointed by the Court, or theoretically by the County and Supreme Judges themselves. Both of these methods, according to the testimony of the Attorney-Generals of the several States, are very unsatisfactory.

*

A NEW statute is not like a pebble dropped into water; it is like a salt or a stain, and becomes an undivided part of the mass of existing law into which it is thrust. Take the specific case of recently attempted legislation to forbid aliens to own land in the United States. The draftsman of the bill in Texas gave it this title: "An act to amend title 3, articles 9 and 10, and to add articles 10*a*, 10*b*, 10*c*, 10*d*, 10*e*, 10*f*, 10*h*, 10*j*, and to repeal all laws in conflict therewith." It is apparent instantly that no one can tell the object of the bill from its title, which would be equally applicable even to a similarly numbered statute of any other State than Texas. If the gentleman who drew that bill had had legal training, he would have recalled the famous, or rather infamous, Yazoo act of Georgia, which, under a title