

Now, my idea in writing this is to suggest the establishment of a solicitors' benevolent association in Ontario. We have many members of rank and affluence who might possibly join the society as life members on paying, say, \$50 therefor, and the other members of the profession to pay an annual sum to be fixed. Persons getting relief from the funds would not consider it a charity, but a right, having contributed thereto. What say you and your readers?

J. A.

Kincardine, Oct. 29, 1895.

Notes and Selections.

NEGLIGENCE—DANGEROUS PREMISES—LIABILITY OF OWNER.—In *Richards v. Connell*, 63 N.W. Rep. 915, it was held by the Supreme Court of Nebraska that the owner of a vacant lot, upon which is situated a pond of water or dangerous excavation, is not required to fence it or otherwise insure the safety of strangers, old or young, who may resort to said premises, not by invitation, express or implied, but for the purpose of amusement or from motives of curiosity. The court said in part:

The single question presented by the record is whether the owner of a vacant lot, upon which is situated a pond of water or a dangerous excavation, is required to fence it, or otherwise insure the safety of strangers, old or young, who may go upon said premises, not by his invitation, express or implied, but for the purpose of amusement, or from motives of curiosity. The authorities we find to be in substantial accord, and sustain the proposition that, independent of statute, no such liability exists. In *Hargreaves v. Deacon*, 25 Mich. 1, which was an action for the death of the plaintiff's son, a child of tender years, by drowning in a cistern left unguarded, it is said: "Cases are quite numerous in which the same questions have arisen, but we have found none which hold that an accident from negligence on private premises can be made the ground of damages, unless the party injured has been induced to come there by personal invitation or by employment which brings him there, or by resorting there as to a place of business or of general resort, held out as open to customers or others whose lawful occasions may lead them to visit there. We find no support for any rule which would protect those who go