

versity, and the statutes thereof, set out in the judgment, the Chancellor has no power to call a meeting of the Senate elsewhere than at Cobourg the present seat of the University. *Corporation of Cobourg v. Victoria University*, 165.

### VILLAGE.

See CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, 1.

### VOTERS LISTS.

*Mandamus — Compelling Court of Revision to hear voters' lists appeals — Specific remedy by appeal to County Judge*—51 Vic. ch. 4, sec. 13, sub-sec. (1) (O)—R. S. O. ch. 193, secs. 61, 68.—By sec. 13, sub-sec. (1), of "The Manhood Suffrage Act," 51 Vic. ch. 4 (O), it is provided that complaints of persons not having been entered on the roll as qualified to be voters who should have been so entered, may, by any person entitled to be a voter or to be entered on the voters' list, be made to the Court of Revision as in the case of assessments, or the complaints may be made to the County Judge under the Voters' Lists Act.

By sec. 61 of the Assessment Act, R. S. O. ch. 193, it is provided that the Court of Revision of each municipality shall meet and try all complaints in regard to persons wrongfully omitted from the roll; and by sec. 68, sub-sec. (1), that an appeal to the County Judge shall lie, not only against a decision of the Court of Revision on an appeal to that Court, but also against the omission, neglect, or refusal of said Court to hear or decide an appeal.

The Court of Revision of a municipality refused to hear or adjudicate

upon a complaint made by M. under sec. 13 of "The Manhood Suffrage Act," that the names of certain persons had been wrongfully omitted from the assessment roll:—

*Held*, that it was the duty of the Court of Revision under sec. 61, to try the complaint made by M.; and that if no other complete, appropriate and convenient remedy had existed, M. would have been entitled to a mandamus to compel the Court to perform its duty; but as the Legislature by sec. 68 had given a specific remedy for this very breach of duty, by appeal to the County Judge, M. was not entitled to a mandamus.

The right which M. was seeking to enforce was to have the names of certain persons placed on the assessment roll; not, as was contended, to have his complaint disposed of by the Court of Revision; the complaint to the Court of Revision was a means of enforcing his right, not the right itself.

Decision of MACMAHON, J., reversed.—*Re Marter and the Court of Revision of Gravenhurst*, 243.

### WAGES.

See GIFT—SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE.

### WARRANT.

See CONSTABLE.

### WAYS.

*Road along lake shore—User and dedication—Evidence of—Break in road.*—Uninterrupted user by the public, for seventy years, of a roadway along the edge of an un-