of King's Counsel refusing cases in which a junior is not also retained is very greatly to the advantage of the junior bar, and incidentally to the advantage of the public. The circuit bar perhaps is no longer possible here because the arrangement of the circuits on the old plan of dividing the Province into districts and including all places within a district in the same circuit has long since been abandoned.

The Courts, of course, might prevent cases being postponed for non-attendance of counsel by refusing adjournments on that ground and insisting on cases being proceeded with when called in due course.

It is well known at Osgoode Hall that counsel who make sacrifices in order to be present in Court when their cases are called do not meet with much encouragement. We have heard of a learned K.C. who received a brief for a trial in the country which he returned when he found that it interfered with a case in which he was retained in the Court of Appeal, which latter case when called on in its order was obligingly adjourned by the Court because counsel on the other side had unfortunately been unexpectedly obliged to leave town—as it afterwards turned out, to hold the brief which his opponent had returned!

JUDGES v. JURIES.

The case of *McGann* v. *Railroad Company*, 70 N.Y.S. 684, brings up an old but interesting question as to how far a Court should go in setting aside verdicts as being against the weight of evidence The case in question was an action for damages for personal injuries. At the first trial a verdict was rendered for the plaintiff with $6,000 damages. The Court set it aside as being against the weight of evidence and a new trial was had. On the second trial the verdict was the same, and was again set aside. The third jury, possibly feeling that an affront had been put upon their brethren, sought to revenge themselves by giving a verdict for double the amount, viz., $12,000. This was also promptly disposed of as before. On the fourth trial the jury gave the plaintiff $5,500. This slight reduction did not affect the Court which still held to the opinion that the damages were still excessive and again set the verdict aside. On appeal, however, from this trial Court to the Supreme Court of the State it was held that in