

LAW STUDENTS' DEPARTMENT.—CORRESPONDENCE.

terfere to examine and adjust the accounts of partners between themselves? Answer fully.

3. What method is provided by statute whereby a person interested in the profits of a partnership concern can limit his liability for the partnership debts? Answer fully.

4. Define what is meant by a Joint Stock Company, and indicate the various ways which they may be formed.

5. In how far is a principal liable for the *negligence* of his agent? Answer fully, giving illustrations.

6. Give a short sketch of the respective rights of mortgagor and mortgagee of a British ship.

7. A payee of a promissory note for \$500 given by the maker in consideration of \$250 lent and a further illegal consideration, gives you the note with instructions to collect from the maker. How would you advise him to act in the matter, and why?

8. Point out, as fully as you can, the duties imposed upon a merchant who has taken a ship to freight.

9. Give the chief judicial decisions upon that portion of the 4th section of the Statute of Frauds which relates to answering for the debt, default, or miscarriage of another.

10. Define a *lien* and point out the various ways in which a lien may be lost. Answer fully.

CORRESPONDENCE.

"Finals."

To the Editor of the CANADA LAW JOURNAL:—

SIR,—Will you kindly permit me, through the medium of your columns, to suggest to the Benchers the expediency of speedily informing those students who intend to present themselves for their final examination in August next, whether "by pleading and practice of the Courts" will be understood the present practice, or the practice under the Judicature Act?

For my own part, and I dare say other students would support my view, I would (provided timely notice were given) far rather prepare myself to pass an examination in the provisions of the Judicature Act, than spend somewhat futile labor in reviewing and adding to my knowledge of the C. L. Proc. Act, and the ex-

piring practice. With the help of the annotated editions of the Judicature Act already in print, and reviewed in your last number, we should be enabled to gain a fair acquaintance with the new practice before August.

At all events, I would respectfully suggest to the Benchers to issue some order on the subject.

Your obedient servant,

IGNOTUS.

Alleged Errors in the Judicature Act.

To the Editor of the LAW JOURNAL.

SIR,—I observe in your issue of May 1st, some "points" noted from the advanced sheets of Messrs. Taylor & Ewart's forthcoming book on this subject. If you assumed these "points" to be reliable it is no wonder you expressed a fear that "other" mistakes and difficulties would be discovered in the Statute, and when the learned critic, cheered by your assurance, set to work to find some more "points," I was not surprised to see in your June number another crop of them.

I won't trouble you this time with more than a few of the absurd blunders which any one who reads the Statute and Rules will find the critic's "points" to be.

They say "A Divisional Court is one of the Common Law Courts, or the Court of Chancery, with their present quota of three Judges, yet in Sec. 29, s. 3, a Divisional Court shall be constituted by 'two or three and no more' of the Judges thereof."

I beg leave to say this is wrong. The Divisions of the High Court of Justice, the Q. B. Division, the C. P. Division, the Chancery Division are not what either the English or Ontario Statute means at all by "Divisional Courts," and he misquotes the language of the Section, when he says, "A Divisional Court shall be constituted by two or three and no more of the Judges thereof," i. e. of the Divisional Court. The Act does not say "two or three and no more" of the Judges of the Divisional Court, but "two or three and no more" of the Judges of the High Court. It provides that any number of such Divisional Courts may sit at the same time; and the Divisional Court need not have a single Judge who is attached to the particular Division of the High Court in which the suit brought before the Divisional Court was brought. It is only where "found practicable and convenient," that a Divisional Court is to include one or more Judges so attached to the Division. See Sec.