

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXXIX.

DECEMBER 1, 1903.

NO. 23.

One of the Toronto newspapers has published a daily reminder of the number of days during which North Renfrew has been without a representative in the Provincial Legislature. The profession in the County of York, Ontario, might in a similar way be reminded that its County Court has been without a Clerk for upwards of three years. Meantime the locum tenens is, under the law, the Clerk of the Peace, who, if he be really allowed to enjoy the fees, has a very good thing. We presume from the position not being filled there is no need for the services of any one but a junior clerk. This is probably correct, but if so, why not be economical and appoint the present warming pan without extra salary. If, however, another appointment is to be made, as was intimated last Session by the Attorney General, we trust the position will be given to some member of the profession. There are many such to whom such a sinecure would be a God-send, and this is the class that are entitled to positions of this kind, and not some political hanger on of the lay species, e. g. a baker or farmer, or such like.

It has been recently decided by a Divisional Court, (Street and Britton, JJ.), on appeal from the County Court of Wentworth, in the case of *Dunn v. Malone*, that it is not possible for parties by any form of words to contract themselves out of the provisions of the Interest Act, (60 & 61 Vict. c. 8, D.), and the Act amending it (63 & 64 Vict. c. 29, D.) The principal Act requires that any written or printed contract for the loan of money on any security other than real estate, where the interest is payable at a rate per day, week, or month must also explicitly state what is the equivalent yearly rate, on pain that no more than six, (or in cases where the amended Act applies, five) per cent. per annum shall be recoverable. In the case in question the rate was five per cent. per month, but no statement of the equivalent yearly rate was mentioned, but the parties expressly agreed that the contract was a sufficient compliance with the Act, and the borrower expressly waived the benefit of the Act, but all to no purpose, as the Court held. On