

public, and so far as we know there has been no such leave granted to the learned judge we refer to. Whatever question there may be as to the law there is none as to the inconvenience resulting from a High Court judge permanently residing outside of Toronto. It is a continual source of annoyance not only to practitioners but also to the other members of the bench. It operates in this way. It is often the cause at the beginning of the week of keeping the bar, solicitors, litigants and witnesses waiting for hours the arrival of the judge, because, to suit his convenience, the Court at which he is to preside cannot be opened at the usual hour. At the other end of the week it has the opposite effect, and the sittings are held at an unusual hour and business is rushed through to enable the judge to catch a midday train for his distant home on Friday, and any business which turns up on Saturday is either neglected or thrown upon one of the judges who live in Toronto. This being so it would seem to be time that some steps were taken to "abate the nuisance." We do not venture to suggest what the remedy should be, but feel in duty bound to call attention to the grievance.

---

## ENGLISH CASES.

---

### *EDITORIAL REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.*

(Registered in accordance with the Copyright Act.)

#### **MASTER AND SERVANT—CONTRACT—DISMISSAL—MISCONDUCT OF SERVANT— WORKMAN—FORGETFULNESS.**

*Baster v. London & County Printing Works* (1899) 1 Q.B. 901, was a case stated by a magistrate between a servant and his master, who had been summarily dismissed from his employment for a single act of carelessness, which had caused £30 injury to a valuable printing press. The servant claimed two weeks' wages for having been dismissed without notice. The magistrate had held the dismissal was justifiable, and dismissed the claim, and a Divisional Court—Darling and Channell, JJ.—upheld his decision.