FIRST INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.

D. M. Christie.	F. W. Gearing.
R. W. Keefer.	J. A. M. Aikins.
J. V. Teetzel	J. Fullerton.
Chester Glass	E. W. Scatherd.
H. T. Beck.	W. L. Walsh,

(The above without oral.)

W. Malloy.	J. K. Dowsley
G. T. Shipley.	R. Shaw.
J. A. Wright.	P. C. MacNee.

J. Woodman.

SECOND INTERMEDIATE EXAMINATION.

A. W. Kinsman.	H. Cassels.
A. H. Marsh.	E. D. McMillan.
	E. Campion.

(The above without oral.)

A. C. Galt.	H. J. O'Neil.
T. G. Meredith.	W. M. Sutherland.
J. M. Carthew.	G. P. Hallen.
R. J. Duggan.	J. J. Manning.
L. T. Barclay.	W. J. Hales.

Reference was made, in the *Mercer will case*, to the doctrine of the feudal law, that a child born in wedlock was legitimate, though conceived before marriage. A case was lately decided by Vice-Chancellor Malins (*Re Corlass Estate*, 24 W. R., 204), involving a piece of refinement, wonderfully subtle, modifying this well-established rule. A testator directed the income of one-half of his residuary estate to be paid to his son during his life, and afterwards to his lawful issue. One of the issue was *en ventre sa mère* at the time of the death of the life-tenant, but his parents were not married till after that time, though they did intermarry before the birth of the child. The judge held that the class entitled to the benefit under the will had to be ascertained at the death of the tenant for life; that at that time, though the child was *en ventre sa mère*, yet because of her mother, being then unmarried, the issue could not be called lawful at the period of distribution; and the subsequent marriage before the birth would not so legitimate by retroaction as to entitle the child, after its birth, to share in the residue. This decision strikes us as an unnecessary piece of casuistry. Marriage should be held to legalize the issue born thereafter for all purposes. The decision, carried out to its logical consequences, would involve an inquiry as to the period of conception. It was said in *Doe* v. *Clarke*, 2 H.Bl., 401, that a child *en ventre sa mère* was to be considered as born, for all purposes for his own benefit.

OUR LAW REPORTS.

A report was presented last Term to the Benchers in Convocation, suggesting some important alterations in the arrangement with the Law Reporters. The scheme proposed was only partially adopted. It was decided to increase the salaries of the Reporters of the Queen's Bench and Common Pleas, the former to $1,200 and the latter to $1,000, and to add $400 to that of the Editor-in-Chief, making his salary $2,000. It was also decided (the arrangement with Mr. O'Brien as to the Practice Reports having expired by effluxion of time) to appoint a fourth or supernumerary Reporter, who should report all Practice cases both at Common Law and in Chancery, all Election Cases and County Court appeals, which latter are hereafter to be heard by the Court of Appeal, and probably insolvency appeals, if they are to be brought before that Court. In addition, this gentleman is to be subject to be called on by the Editor-in-Chief to assist the other Reporters when necessary. It is proposed to give him a salary of $800 per annum. In view of the fact that the reports (with the exception of the Practice reports which are up to time) are nearly a year in arrear, owing to the great increase in the work, it was also advised that an ar-