and that the consent of the Lieutenant-Governor, provided for by sec. 8, was not required as this was not an additional high school:—

Held, also, that the appointment of the board must be by by-law; but a by-law therefor passed after the motion was made, but before the hearing thereof, was sufficient.

The Court refused to entertain an objection that the board were about to build the school on land not acquired by them, for it could not be assumed that the money would be spent until the title to the land had been acquired; and also it was not necessary to shew that specific portions of the $15,000 had been appropriated to the purchase of the land and to erection of the building. *Dawson* v. *Corporation of Sault Ste. Marie et al*, 556.

3. *Separate schools—R. S. O. (1887) ch. 225, sec. 120, sub-sec. 2—ib., ch. 227, sec. 40.*]—*Held*, that if the assessor is satisfied with the *primâ facie* evidence of the statements made by or on behalf of any ratepayer, that he is a Roman Catholic pursuant to R. S. O. (1887) ch. 225, sec. 120, sub-sec. 2, and thereupon (asking and having no other information) places such person upon the assessment roll as a separate school supporter, this ratepayer, though he may not, by himself or his agent, give notice in writing pursuant to R. S. O. (1887) ch. 227, sec. 40, may be entitled to exemption from the payment of rates for public school purposes, he being in the case supposed assessed as a supporter to Roman Catholic separate schools.

Held, also, that the Court of Revision has jurisdiction, under R. S. O. (1887), ch. 225, sub-sec. 3, on application of the person assessed, or of any municipal elector (or ratepayer, as under R. S. O. (1887), ch. 227, sec. 48, sub-sec. 3), to hear and determine complaints, (*a*) in regard to the religion of the person placed on the roll as Protestant or Roman Catholic; and (*b*) as to whether such person is or is not a supporter of public or separate schools within the meaning of the provisions of law in that behalf; and (*c*), which appears to be involved in (*b*), where such person has been placed in the wrong column of the assessment roll for the purposes of the school tax.

It is also competent for the Court of Revision to determine whether the claim of any person wrongfully omitted from the proper column of the assessment roll, should be inserted therein upon the complaint of the person himself, or of any elector (or ratepayer).

Held, also, that the assessor is not bound to accept the statements of, or made on behalf of, any ratepayer under R. S. O. (1887), ch. 225, sec. 120, sub-sec. 2, in case he is made aware, or ascertains before completing his roll, that such ratepayer is not a Roman Catholic, or has not given the notice required by sec. 40 of R. S. O. (1887), ch. 227, or is for any reason not entitled to exemption from public school rates.

Held, also, that a ratepayer, not a Roman Catholic, being wrongfully assessed as a Roman Catholic and supporter of separate schools, who through inadvertence or other cause does not appeal therefrom, is not estopped (nor are other ratepayers) from claiming with reference to the assessment of the following or future years, that he is not a Roman Catholic.

Held, lastly, that a ratepayer, being a Roman Catholic, and appearing in the assessment roll as such and as a supporter of separate schools, who