

are involved. Apart from legislation, law and equity seems to have considered it safer to go the whole length of preventing persons from dealing with their land during minority. There must be difficulty either way. It is hard that because one may be a day, a week, a month, a year, or more, under age, favourable opportunities should be lost; whilst to allow an infant to deal with lands as if of full age, even with the approval of a Court, would have its risks and disadvantages.

This, however, is evident; that by virtue of different enactments very considerable power to deal with infants' lands has been conferred, and that that power is being from time to time increased, not curtailed; the legislature of this province in this year adding another word upon the subject.

Therefore neither of the applications now before me will be granted; no order will be made in either of them; but both, or either, may be renewed at any time if there be anything new to be shown upon the subject in any of its features.

---

MASTER-IN-CHAMBERS.

JUNE 18TH, 1913.

ST. CLAIR v. STAIR.

4 O. W. N. 1486.

*Pleading—Statement of Claim — Motion to Amend—Variation in Amendment—Costs.*

MASTER-IN-CHAMBERS refused plaintiff leave to amend his statement of claim in the manner desired, but ordered that he be permitted to amend in accordance with a form suggested by the learned master.

Costs to defendant in cause.

Motion by plaintiff for leave to amend his statement of claim by adding certain clauses fully set out in the notice of motion. These were very fully discussed on the argument by all the counsel.

W. E. Raney, K.C., for plaintiff.

A. R. Hassard, for three defendants.

E. E. Wallace, for defendant Stair.

D. O. Cameron, for defendant Rutherford.

R. McKay, K.C., for the other defendants.

CARTWRIGHT, K.C., MASTER:—The facts of this case are sufficiently set out in previous reports. See 23 O. W. R.