

after another upon the devoted shoulders of County Judges: broad indeed must they be to bear them. Such a course is unfair to the Judges; and it is both unfair and unjust to the public, whose servants they are. It is contrary to public policy, and tends to the injury of public business. It never seems to strike our law-makers that, in the ordinary business of life, increased remuneration goes hand-in-hand with increased labours and responsibilities; but, according to the practice now in vogue, whenever anything in the shape of local administration has to be done, County Judges are to be the doers of it, and—get nothing for it. Their duties under the Insolvent Act of 1864, is a sufficient example of this, without going further.

We have long been expecting a change for the better in this respect; and though it is long in coming, come it must; and we shall continue, as heretofore, to condemn a practice which we consider most pernicious.

DISPUTES BETWEEN PARTNERS—DIVISION COURT JURISDICTION.

We notice in a recent English Law Periodical, that the Lord Chancellor has introduced a bill to confer a jurisdiction in Equity on the English County Courts. Precisely the same thing was done by Chief Justice Richards, when Attorney General, who, in 1843, succeeded in passing it into law. It is somewhat remarkable that the Lord Chancellor's measure goes just as far and no farther than Chief Justice Richard's act, and that the subjects embraced are the same; and it is something to boast of that in this, as in many other matters of law reform, we colonists are in advance of the mother country.

Our present object, however, is to direct attention to one branch of equity jurisdiction, which we think demands a further extension, namely, small partnership transactions, in respect of which we think the Division Courts should have jurisdiction. There are a vast number of petty partnerships formed in the country; the capital invested is in most cases small, and the term of partnership is commonly limited to a year, during which the partners work together in their common business. Two persons, say a blacksmith and a wheelwright, engage in the manufacture of some implement of husbandry; or two or more persons purchase a threshing, mowing, reap-

ing, stumping or other machine, and form a partnership to work it together, travelling from farm to farm in doing the work. A dispute takes place between them; they want to wind up their affairs, have an account taken, pay the partnership debts, and divide the profits; but, as the law stands, although the amount between them might not exceed \$100, the Division Court cannot entertain the question; the parties must go into a court of Equity for relief.

Now this, in respect to the small partnerships we speak of, is practically a denial of justice, for the expenses would swallow up the whole subject matter. 'Tis true Mr. Richards regulated the costs in his act *on homœopathic principles*; but still, any one can see the absurdity of a contention in a Superior Court about a little partnership business for \$80 or \$100. The law should be amended, so as to enable this class of cases to be speedily and cheaply settled. One single clause would do all that is required to remedy the evil pointed out; let it enact, in substance, that the Division Courts should have the like authority as the Court of Chancery, in respect to the dissolution of a partnership, or where a partner seeks an account of the dealings of a partnership dissolved or expired, the capital not having been over say \$200. We trust that this and other amendments necessary for Division Courts, may be brought under the notice of the Attorney General before the next meeting of Parliament.

PUBLIC TASTE IN HUMBUGS.

It has been said that the world is made up of knaves and fools—those that impose upon others, and those that are imposed upon. Mankind loves to be humbugged, and is humbugged accordingly. Every age has had its own peculiar species of vanity in this respect. In the good old times, the credulous public had wizards, witches, magicians, astrologers and such like; in these enlightened days we indulge in spiritualists, table-turners, electrobiologists, prestidigitators, clairvoyants, &c., according as fashion, fancy, or a clever humbug may lead the public taste.

The law does not trouble itself much about harmless nonsense of this kind, but leaves every one to please himself or herself as to the manner in which he or she will be cheated or humbugged. Occasionally, however, these