

# Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXXIII.

JANUARY 16, 1897.

NO. 2.

Mr. Blanchard's letter on the subject of costs, which will be found in another place, invites discussion. Even in conservative England attention has been directed to this subject and suggestions in the line indicated in our correspondent's letter have been made by able writers. At least it may safely be said that the preparation of bills of costs is only a little less repulsive than the reception of them. We shall be glad to hear from those who may have thought over the subject and would be willing to formulate their ideas for the general benefit.

The publication of Mr. E. F. B. Johnston's article on Negligence and the Jury, in a recent number (ante vol. 32, p. 735), has created much interest amongst lawyers throughout the Dominion. A western barrister having fully digested it, submits the following question, which was tried before the County Judge of Huron. We refer this conundrum to some industrious student for an answer. Facts: A., a weak minded young man, is known to be so to B. By way of a lark B. loads a gun with a heavy charge of powder and gives it to A., requesting him to fire at some hens in the yard. A. being readily persuaded, takes the gun, fires as directed, and the recoil breaks his collar bone. Is B. liable in an action of negligence? State grounds for answer.

The holding of Divisional Courts weekly in Ontario has not been an unqualified success. It has undoubtedly facilitated the dispatch of business in some cases, but in others delays have arisen owing to the absence of counsel on circuit, and no advantage has been gained. Enough experience has been probably obtained to warrant the opinion that a weekly sitting of the Divisional Court is not really required. In