

# The Toronto World

FOUNDED 1880.  
A morning newspaper published every day in the year by The World Newspaper Company of Toronto, Limited: H. J. Maclean, Managing Director.  
40 WEST RICHMOND STREET.  
Telephone Calls:  
Main 5308—Private Exchange connecting all departments.  
\$3.00  
will pay for The Daily World for one year, delivered in the City of Toronto or by mail to any address in Canada, Great Britain or United States.  
\$2.00  
will pay for The Sunday World for one year by mail to any address in Canada or Great Britain. Delivered in Toronto or for sale by all newsdealers and newsboys at five cents per copy. Postage extra to United States and all other foreign countries.  
Subscribers are requested to advise us promptly of any irregularity or delay in delivery of The World.

TUESDAY MORNING, NOV. 25.

## WITCH FINDING.

The Telegram maintains its impudent assumption that it can flim-flam the people over its attitude on the Humber valley's survey, or persuade anybody that The World has not proved its case on The Telegram by the suggestion that The World, which has supported every movement for a greater and better Toronto, must explain why The Telegram is against every movement for a greater and better Toronto, save one. "Evasion is obsolete, silence is superseded," declares the witch-finder of Bay Street. The humor of the situation is rich to those who are aware of the circumstances. In Africa, when the witch-doctor has a private grudge against anyone, he announces that all the evils that befall the community are attributable to a witch or witches, and it is necessary for him to smother them out. Citizens with bad consciences or with other aims immediately endeavor to appease the witch-doctor with gifts. He smells in other directions, after these conciliatory measures.

The Telegram poses as the great and only witch-doctor of the place. It starts off constantly smelling witches. The city council is quite a hunting ground for it. Some aldermen are afraid they may be smelled and denounced. They fear the magic of the awful voice and the weeks of yelling and shrieking of which a genuine witch-doctor is capable. They are smelling around Controller O'Neill's quarters last night. If he votes for the people he will be denounced as a witch, and the clamor will be frightful. Mayor Hocken was smelled out years ago, and should have been destroyed long since, but somehow the witch-doctor's power is not what it used to be. Timid young creatures like Ald. McBrien have been smelled, and some victims are afraid of the tom-tom and the four-column yell. It is certainly very grievous, but not mortal, as many attach aldermen who have been smelled can attest. The witch-doctor is constantly smelling The World, but the charms are not sufficiently potent to injure us, and the people know they can rely on what we say, but that they can't rely on the Bay Street oracle. We advised public ownership of the street railway in 1901, and we advise it now. The Telegram is against it now and it was against it then. It was smelling witches then as it is today. It smelled E. F. Clarke as the worst witch then. It has Mayor Hocken in his pocket. It then smelled Ald. McDougall, and all the other aldermen who voted for public ownership as enemies of the community and supported the aldermen who were against public ownership, and those who were bought up and had to leave Toronto. It preferred that class of aldermen to E. F. Clarke or Mayor Hocken. Its policy has cost the city millions in money and uncountable wealth in time and comfort and convenience. Does it regret that? It says it regrets it was associated with anyone else in its victory, and we believe that about represents the truth. It would sell out the people again and glory in doing it single-handed. It would defame and destroy Mayor Hocken, Controller McCarthy and every other decent and honorable member of the city council who refused to yield to its big stick and its witch-smelling, and it would care absolutely nothing for the mass of the people as long as it got its pound of flesh out of the downtown real estate men and the Humber valley. It deceived the people in 1884, in 1889, and in year after year since. It postponed the Bloor street viaduct when it could have been built for a third of the present estimate, and it delayed the development of the city accordingly. It refused to widen Yonge street twenty years ago when it would have cost a trifle. It would have sold out Ashbridge's marsh for forty years for a nominal sum and made the harbor improvement impossible. The only thing it ever got right upon was the hydro-electric project, and it adopted that not to benefit the people, but to embarrass a political party. Today it would wreck the hydro system and ruin everyone belonging to it in order to destroy Mayor Hocken. It is now smelling out Engineer Couzens as a witch, and Attorney John MacKay as another. It alone is the true witch-doctor and none others are genuine. Fortunately we live in Toronto and not in the Congo.

## POPULATION ESTIMATES.

The Globe's estimate of the population of Toronto for the next eight years does not agree with that of any of the experts. Prof. Mackenzie figures 800,000 for 1921. Mr. Arnold figures 850,000. Our own estimate, made a number of years ago, tallies with the latter. The Globe does not expect that Toronto will progress in the future even half as fast as in the last ten years. The Telegram during last summer estimated 1,000,000 of a population in 1923. Nothing has occurred to change the situation. Mr. Arnold's figures are conservative and can easily be substantiated. The question does not depend upon the census returns, however, but on the number of people using the cars between now and 1921. The more cars the more people, both inside and outside the city.

## TRIPPING UP THE PROGRESSIVES.

Saskatchewan prides itself upon being progressive and the people of that province were unanimous a year ago in demanding the initiative and referendum. At the general elections of 1912 both parties were pledged to bring in the necessary legislation. It returned to power. Premier Scott won, but shirked the issue to some extent, because the bill passed by the legislature to implement his pledge was not to become effective unless ratified by a plebiscite in which at least thirty per cent of the electors on the voters' list should participate.

That plebiscite is to be taken next Thursday, but the vote may be light or may fail altogether, in view of an opinion handed out by Hon. Mr. Doherty, minister of justice, which is being given wide publicity by the Scott government. That opinion is to the effect that the legislature of a province cannot establish the initiative and referendum. Or, if the opinion does not go quite that far, it does hold, in effect, that the provision for direct legislation would not survive the legislative council which granted it. The provincial act is not disallowed, indeed, it could not be disallowed, not having yet been ratified, but the suggestion is thrown out that the matter should be taken to the courts, and the intimation is plain that in Mr. Doherty's opinion the act is unconstitutional.

The minister's opinion will come as a surprise to many who flatter themselves that the rule of the people in this country is not impeded, as in the United States, by rigid constitutional restraints. Section 92 of the B. N. A. Act confers exclusive jurisdiction upon the provincial legislature respecting:

The amendment from time to time, notwithstanding anything in this act, of the constitution of the province, except as regards the office of lieutenant-governor.

One would therefore assume that a Canadian province could have any kind of a constitution it wanted, so long as it preserved the monarchical form of government, just as the states of the American Union are free to govern themselves in any manner they please, so long as they preserve a republican form of government. It is true, no doubt, that the legislature, having complete power to amend the constitution of the province, might hereafter repeal the initiative and referendum, but the same power would exist in respect to other legislation.

It will surprise the people of Saskatchewan to learn that they cannot establish direct legislation for their own government, even though they may be unanimous in desiring it, unless until remedial legislation is obtained at Westminster. They have been deprived of their natural resources; they have had a school system imposed upon them by the Laurier government, and now when they propose for their own local affairs to establish the initiative and referendum, they are told it is unconstitutional.

Those who favor direct legislation, direct primaries, the recall of members, and other progressive policies will find the party politicians on both sides against them. Sir R. P. Roblin, Conservative prime minister of Manitoba, has already denounced those who favor such policies as anarchists. Hon. Walter Scott, the Liberal prime minister of Saskatchewan, is too polite to say that, but he, no doubt, heartily agrees with Sir Roblin. In the people once get a taste of real power, they will insist upon ruling themselves, and the politicians will become, in fact as well as in name, public servants. Hence the politicians feel the need of the constitution. Hon. Mr. Doherty's opinion, which may be good law, for all we know to the contrary, will greatly encourage them.

## TO SAVE THE MAPLE INDUSTRY.

The department of inland revenue, thru its inspectors, recently took up 128 samples of maple syrup. Of these 37 were found to be adulterated according to the standard of the department. Very few samples probably were pure maple syrup; some of those condemned by the department were only five per cent genuine. The record is no worse this year than usual. The adulteration of certain foods has for so many years been practised in Canada that the public take it as a matter of course. It is the maple growers rather than the consumers who are now protesting against the impudent frauds of the maple sugar adulterators.

The characteristic reaction by which the chemist determines the purity of maple syrup is the lead precipitate not obtained in the case of any refined sugar. But it is possible to adulterate high-grade maple syrup with thirty per cent cane sugar and yet reach the standard established by the chemist. The maple sugar men say that this is all wrong and

# THREE MORE EXPERT OPINIONS FAVORABLE TO MAYOR'S PLAN

Prof. M. A. Mackenzie of Toronto University Says Population in 1921 Will Be 800,000—George E. Bell and W. M. Douglas, K.C., Report Litigation Imminent if T. E. L. is Not Bought Now.

Further expert opinions have been submitted, which to no small extent strengthen the feeling that the City of Toronto should purchase the Toronto Electric Light Company and the Toronto Street Railway and the Toronto Electric Light Co. John MacKay's complete interim report was presented to Mayor Hocken yesterday, and it contained appendices by B. J. Arnold, Prof. M. A. Mackenzie of Toronto University, by George E. Bell, and by W. M. Douglas, K.C. The two last named men reported on the right of the electric light company to be compensated for its franchise, while that of Prof. Mackenzie was on the probable growth of Toronto by the year 1921. Mr. Arnold estimated the population at that time to be 850,000, but Prof. Mackenzie's opinion was that the population would be 800,000.

Basing his figures on Toronto's growth since 1854, by decades, Prof. Mackenzie stated that the growth during 1912 was 9.45 per cent. Although American cities which are around the half million mark are showing a drop in their rate of increase, the Toronto rate is not. The fact that an increase is being shown by Canadian cities, at the rates of increase set forth, Toronto's population in 1921 will amount to the following figures:

Increase	Population.
5-4 per cent.	695,500
6-1 per cent.	735,300
7-1 per cent.	783,800
8-1 per cent.	834,800
8-2 per cent.	883,200
9-2 per cent.	944,900

A 9 1/2 per cent. increase would not seem to be unreasonable, but nevertheless the professor placed his estimations at a safe and conservative figure, taking 850,000 as his estimate. The above calculations, as made, taking the assessor's returns and the police figures for 1912 as a starting point, Prof. Mackenzie is a

will ask for legislation this session making it a crime to sell as maple syrup anything except the boiled down sap of the maple tree. Replying to the arguments that many people cannot afford to buy pure maple syrup but desire a syrup with the delicious flavor of the maple, the producers say that such syrups or compounds should not be sold as maple syrup or under any brand name or label which includes the name "maple."

They also complain of a divided jurisdiction. The department of agriculture is naturally charged with looking after the interests of the department of inland revenue which administers the Pure Food Act. The department of agriculture now administers the Pure Food and Canned Goods Act, and there seems no good reason why it should not administer all other pure food statutes. But here we strike another snag of divided jurisdiction. There is no federal enforcement of federal law. The statutes are clear, but the adulterators pay no attention to them. One is reminded of Doherty's charge to the watch by the way our pure food laws are administered.

The maple sugar producers are demanding and we think not without reason: First, that the only sap of the maple tree should be sold as maple sugar or maple syrup. Second, other syrups flavored with maple should not be sold under any name, brand or label which includes the word maple. Third, people who persistently and as a business sell adulterated sugar or syrup as pure maple should be sent to the workhouse.

## GERMAN IMPORTS OF WHEAT AND LINSEED.

In a recent report, Mr. C. F. Just, Dominion trade commissioner for Germany, called attention to the remarkable growth in German imports of Canadian wheat. Non-existent in 1909 these imports increased from 16,973 metric tons in the calendar year 1910 to 88,017 tons in 1911 and to 269,028 tons in 1912. During the period from January to June of the current year, upwards of 150,000 metric tons had been imported, of which the port of Hamburg received 139,715 tons. This notable development was due chiefly to the opportunity offered last year when the German crop proved to be low in flour yield and of poor quality, while the Russian crop also failed. Although the cause was thus in a measure accidental the continuous growth indicates that Canadian grain has established itself in favor on its merits.

This Should Interest You  
English Overcoats, Ulsters and Gabardine Raincoats  
At 25% Off Regular Prices  
Ladies' Ulsters and Raincoats  
Half Price  
20 per cent. off "Woolsey" Underwear, Union Suits and Separate Garments, English Flannel Shirts, \$1.50 to \$4.00, Half Price.  
The Reason: Mildness of weather and shortness of season.  
CHRISTMAS SPECIALTIES  
Wreyford's, 85 King West  
Open Evenings. Phone Adol. 1739.

# AT OSGOOD HALL

Nov. 24, 1913.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Judge's chambers will be held on Tuesday, 25th inst., at 11 a.m.  
1. Sanderson v. Gillespie.  
2. Niagara Navigation Co. v. Niagara.  
3. Kowalewski v. Hamilton Radial.  
4. Dvill v. Toronto Railway Co.  
5. Brown v. Thompson.  
6. Derach v. Faugulier.

## Master's Chambers.

Before George S. Holmstedt, K.C., Registrar.  
Morrison v. Toronto Furnace—J. F. Boland, for defendant, moved for particulars of injury complained of in statement of claim. Coffey for plaintiff. Order made that particulars be given of injury and suffering, date of loss of time and particulars also of how much claimed for board and how much for clothing. Costs in cause to defendant. On defendant's motion to strike out amended statement of claim, order made giving plaintiff leave to amend pleadings in accordance with order of Oct. 24 by substituting Piper as next friend and striking out claim of Mary Morrison. It being admitted that she has failed to give security. Costs in cause.

## Love v. Love—J. L. Grover, for plaintiff, moved for interim alimony. G. R. Roach, for defendant, objects that parol evidence has not been delivered as ordered and asks enlargement. Enlarged until particulars delivered.

Stavert v. Holdcroft—J. F. Boland, for plaintiff, moved for order of examination of Holdcroft as a judgment debtor. J. G. Smith, for defendant, asked enlargement to file affidavit in answer. Enlarged for one week.

## Smith v. Canada Foundry Co.—G. F. McFarland, for defendant, moved for order for plaintiff to produce statement of claim. S. C. Wood for plaintiff. Defendant undertakes to produce statement of claim for examination for discovery in Toronto on 48 hours' notice, and order made that particulars be delivered within 10 days after such examination. Costs of motion in the cause.

Kates v. Rattleman—L. Davis, on behalf of plaintiff, moved for order of defendant. Elenson, by serving an adult person at her residence, McCaul street, Toronto.

## Before George M. Lee, Registrar.

Vivian v. Singer—McLean (Clarke & S.) for plaintiff, obtained order to registrar of deeds for County of Lincoln to produce deed and mortgage at the trial here on Tuesday, Dec. 2.

## Single Court.

Before Kelly, J.  
Mr. Rudolph Phillips and Mr. H. R. Moses presented their certificates of fitness and were, on the flat of the court, ordered to be enrolled as solicitors of the supreme court of Ontario.

## Nairn v. City of Toronto—W. A. Lamport, for plaintiff, moved for injunction. G. R. Roach, K.C., for defendant. As proceedings have now been moved to quash bylaw in question, motion stands sine die at request of parties.

National Advertiser Co. v. Welch—G. A. Plaxton, for plaintiff, on motion for injunction, asked enlargement for defendant. Defendant undertakes to produce statement of claim for examination for discovery in Toronto on 48 hours' notice, and order made that particulars be delivered within 10 days after such examination. Costs of motion in the cause.

## Re Mallouche Estate (Gouin); re Mallouche Estate—J. B. Cuddey, for two petitioners, daughters of Hypolite Mallouche, asked court to sanction sale of lands settled upon them by will of J. B. Cuddey, for infants. Sales authorized if terms satisfactory to official guardian are obtained on or before purchase money to be paid into court.

Heron v. Wiggins—T. P. Galt, K.C., for plaintiff, moved for judgment for specific performance of agreement whereby defendant agreed to sell to plaintiff 200 shares of Trust and Guaranty stock for \$1000. Judgment for plaintiff for specific performance and defendant ordered to deliver the stock within one month on payment of costs. In default of payment, master in ordinary to ascertain damages sustained by plaintiff by reason of non-delivery. Defendant to pay plaintiff's costs down to judgment. Costs of defence reserved.

## Re Powell and Reynolds—H. M. Mowat, K.C., for vendor, moved under Vendors' and Purchasers' Act for order declaring that vendor has shown good title and that purchaser's objections are not valid. J. P. White for purchaser. Reserved.

## Appellate Division.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Maclean, J.A.; Riddell, J.; Lelch, J.  
Byrton v. Sherwood—L. F. Heyd, K.C., for plaintiff, and Hamilton, E. F. Singer for defendants. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

Whitehead v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

## Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.

Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.

## Whitely v. Livingston—J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant; F. M. Reid, K.C., for plaintiff. Appeal by defendant from the judgment of Roger, J. of Northumberland and Durham, of Sept. 15, 1913. Action to recover \$154.15 and balance alleged to be due plaintiff for goods supplied to defendant. At trial judgment was given for plaintiff for \$127.65 and two years' interest, with costs. Appeal allowed and dismissed with costs.

Before Mulock, C.J.; Riddell, J.; Sutherland, J.; Lelch, J.  
Cotton v. Stinson—F. M. Field, K.C., for plaintiff; J. B. McColl (Cobourg) for defendant. Appeal by plaintiff and by defendant Hamilton, from the judgment of Meadhill, C.J., of May 28, 1913. Pending negotiations for settlement case adjourned until Dec. 2.