

CORRESPONDENCE.

LAW SOCIETY—REWARDS TO STUDENTS.

To the Editor of the LAW JOURNAL:

SIR,—I learn from the *resumé* of the proceedings of the Benchers during Hilary Term, published in your issue of March 15th, that it is proposed, upon economical grounds, to drop the Supreme Court Reports, which cost some \$1,800. I also observe in the estimate of current year's expenditures by the Society the following items:—

Scholarships	\$1,600
Medals.....	120
Law School prizes	50
	—————

In all \$1,770

Now, I suppose the funds of the Society are the common property of its members, of whom the Benchers are trustees, and that they (the Benchers), as in duty bound, are desirous of so administering the funds of the Society as to confer the greatest good upon the greatest number.

If so, I venture to believe, and trust I will be excused for saying, that a very large majority of the members of the profession could much better sustain the loss which will result from the withholding of the sum of \$1,770, now devoted to scholarships, medals, and prizes, than the loss of the Supreme Court Reports.

It is not necessary to aver, as everyone knows, that these awards, as a rule, go neither to the most needy or meritorious, but rather to those whose advantages in other respects give them a long start in the race for these distinctions, and render them, when gained, of small pecuniary moment.

While it is usually well known that practitioners struggling in the comparatively outer darkness of the outer counties can ill dispense with light from any quarter, but especially from the highest Court of the Dominion, may I also be permitted to ask, is there any good reason for the rule which withholds from solicitors any report published after they receive their certificates? The fees paid at admission are supposed to cover all reports published for the current year. Why not supply all back numbers of current volumes at cost, and continue them to all upon the rolls alike?

Respectfully yours,

A JUNIOR.

THE WILL PROBLEM.

To the Editor of the LAW JOURNAL:—

SIR,—If guesses as to solution of the will problem published on page 176 are in order, I submit the inclosed as nearer the intentions of the testator than any yet given.

Let A., B. and C., represent the respective shares of mother, son and daughter, and let C=6 (nearest practical figure); then, as son gets one-third more than daughter (two-thirds as against one-half),

$$B = C + \frac{C}{3} = 8.$$

The mother gets half as much as the son, or as much as the daughter. To average this, and give the share as against two instead of one, we have

$$A = \frac{\frac{B}{2} + C}{2} = 5.$$

making mother's share $\frac{1}{3}$; son's, $\frac{2}{9}$; and daughter's, $\frac{1}{9}$.

Yours, etc.,

S.

ALTERATIONS IN TARIFF.

The following amendments in the tariff were issued on March 29th, 1884. The first item is a little ambiguous, and it seems doubtful whether it is intended to supersede the appeal to the Judge in Chambers under Rule 449, or whether it is to be concurrent therewith, or what the precise intention is. Then the charge made by item 11, which amends item 115 previously existing, is curious, inasmuch as it apparently takes away from the taxing officer all discretion in allowance of counsel fees for the attendances referred to. We especially, however, call attention to item 16, which introduces a decided novelty in numbering. What the precise effect of calling an item "165½" may be, is hard to anticipate. The following are the new regulations:—

Saturday, 29th March, 1884.

It is ordered that the tariff of fees made by the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Ontario on the 10th day of September, 1881, be amended as follows:

1. There may be an appeal by appointment without other notice from the taxing officer in Toronto to the Master in Chambers, or to the Master in Ordinary, pending the taxation in all cases.
2. Item 12 in the said tariff is struck out.
3. Item 23 in the said tariff is struck out, and the following is substituted therefor:
 - "23. To amend any pleading when the amendment is proper, \$2.00."