vocate as given gratuitously. It hardly needs, however, the example which he cites from Roman history of the speedy relaxation of the decrees of Augustus prohibiting advocates from taking fees, to show how rapidly the custom becomes more honoured in the breach than in the observance. In England, except in the ecclesiastical courts, says the same journal, the rule has always been that a barrister has no legal right to a fee. The reward, says Sir John Davys, "is a gift of such a nature, and given and taken upon such terms as albeit the able client may not neglect to give it without note of ingratitude. . . . . yet the worthy counsellor may not demand it without doing wrong to his reputation." As far as we remember, although refreshers have often been very liberal in proportion to the retainers, no retainer since the fee of 4,000 guineas marked on the brief of Serjeant Wilde in *Small* v. *Attwood* has at all approached in amount that given to Serjeant Ballantine.

A member of the firm whose advertisement in an English paper was referred to last month, has spoken to us on the subject, deprecating any intention of offending against good taste in matters professional, and repudiating most strongly the objectionable interpretation which some had placed upon the language used in the latter part of it. We need not say that it was with no unkindly feelings that we made the very temperate observations we felt called upon to make, and which were made only from a sense of duty to the profession in this country and to prevent any false impression arising as to us in legal circles in England.

The *Law Times* thus heartily welcomes the arrival of a new legal journal in England: "What possible object is to be served by issuing in pamphlet form, half-a-dozen milk-and-water articles on worn-out topics? * * * we confess ourselves unable to determine. The only other legal monthly publication is a conspicuous failure, and we cannot suppose that any one will, by purchase, encourage *The Law* to prolong a vain struggle for existence." The laws against infanticide do not seem to be well enforced in English legal circles.

The judgment in *Ray* v. *Corporation of Petrolia*, 24 C. P. 73, will tend to discourage actions, which have become rather frequent, against Municipal Corporations by persons who have met with an accident which they attribute to the negligence of the corporation in the care of the streets. The plaintiff complained that between a hinge, which projected slightly above a trap-door to which it belonged, in the sidewalk, and a depression of said trap-door about an inch and a quarter below the sidewalk, he fell and broke his leg. Plaintiff admitted that the state of the hinge did not evidence negligence against the defendants, but was of opinion that the depression was the result of wrongful neglect on their part. The Court said: "I cannot but think that when his (plaintiff's) counsel gave up the hinge he gave up the case. There would then be nothing left but an inch and a quarter depression in a wooden trap-door on or adjoining a wooden sideway, which depression but for the stumble over the hinge would have done no harm. . . Unless we declare it to be the duty of a village corporation, when they try to improve the streets, in a place not many years taken from the forest, by laying down wooden sidewalks —to insure every passer-by against every unevenness or inequality in the levels, we can hardly hold the defendants liable."

The Lord Chief Justice of England is one of those who think that general culture should not be sacrificed to special professional training. He lately presided