of an interpreter. A curious example of the embarrassments which may arise from the inability of the jury to converse with one another occurred two years ago to the learned judge who presided at the Demers trial. His honor was trying a case at Ste. Scholastique, and the evidence was so clear that he expected the jury would find a verdict without leaving their seats—a result which would have enabled him to take the train of that afternoon. But the jury expressed a wish to retire, and some time later when an officer was sent to ascertain whether they were ready to come into court, he returned with a negative reply. Another long wait ensued without any intimation from the jury. Meantime it was evident from the noise proceeding from the jury room that a discussion of the liveliest description was in progress. The clamour increased, until finally the judge sent an officer for the purpose of finding out the cause of the excessive vociferation. The messenger returned in a few minutes with the explanation. It appeared that six of the jury spoke English and did not understand a word of French, and the other six spoke French and did not understand a word of English. The two sections had raised their voices in a vain attempt to make themselves mutually understood. An interpreter was then sworn in and dispatched to the jury room. He quickly discovered that the jurors were all agreed, that they had been all agreed from the first, but they had been unable to discover the fact!

A meeting of the bar of Montreal was held on the 28th September on the subject of the examinations, and at this meeting, which was attended by over one hundred and fifty members, it appeared that the practically unanimous feeling was against the proposition of the majority report noticed in our last issue, to the effect that a degree in law from a university should be accepted as sufficient evidence of legal attainments for admission to