contempt of Court in disobeying an injunction order. The defendant was not represented upon the argument. He filed an affidavit which, the learned Judge said, he should never have made. If prepared by a solicitor, his action was highly improper. A litigant should not be allowed to swear to legal propositions which he knows to be false, or which he could not be supposed to understand. The learned Judge was not able to accept the defendant's statement in one paragraph of the affidavit if what the defendant meant to say was, that he did not intend to disobey the order of the Court. The previous paragraphs of his affidavit led to a different conclusion. The defendant was not entitled to much consideration. In a sense he intended to disregard the Court and play the roll of a quasi-civilized outlaw. Technically, however, an immediate order committing him to the common gaol for contempt would not be justified. The defendant was not served with the injunction order made by KELLY, J., on the 28th November, 1912; and the solicitors who accepted service for the defendant advised him only that he was enjoined from cutting or selling sod upon the property. He should not be deprived of his liberty until the case should be made clear against him to all intents. Motion enlarged until Friday the 26th December; and, if the plaintiffs desire, it will then be further enlarged. In the meantime the plaintiffs, if so advised, can have the injunction order personally served, and evidence of any subsequent interference with the property can be given upon this application. If the plaintiffs prefer it, the motion will be dismissed without costs. W. M. Douglas, K.C., for the plaintiffs.

AVERY V. CAYUGA—LENNOX, J., IN CHAMBERS—DEC. 11.

Division Court—Prohibition—Attachment of Debts—Money Deposited in Bank by Unenfranchised Indian—Point Decided by Court of Appeal—Judgment Executed by Payment—Nothing Remaining to be Prohibited.]—Motion by the primary debtor for prohibition to the First Division Court in the County of Haldimand to prohibit proceedings upon the judgment of that Court which was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Ontario, Appellate Division, on the 21st April, 1913: Avery v. Cayuga, 28 O.L.R. 517. LENNOX, J., said that the fact that there had been a trial and lengthy argument, and that there had been an appeal to the Court of Appeal touching the questions now