

Mr. Justice Martin Accepts the  
Old-Time Version of the  
Transaction

Mr. Justice Martin yesterday gave judgment in favor of the plaintiff in the case of *W. J. Kootenay vs. J. H. Trill*, in which Col. Tootenay, known to old-timers of the Kootenays as the "Father of Trail," was sued for breach of contract. The note given in respect of some timber licenses. The defense was that fourteen licenses only were issued, and that only twelve were received, and that the defendant was consequently entitled to a refund of the balance of the purchase money. The plaintiff's attorney, however, said that the defendant did not accept the version of the transaction put forward by the defendant and gave judgment for the plaintiff.

The text of the decision follows:

"This is an action upon a promissory note made by the defendant for the purchase of certain timber licenses. The note is admitted, but in answer to the plea of non est, the defendant denies the existence thereof, and therefor denies the consideration due thereon, the defendant stating that the note was issued in pursuance of a new agreement between the parties, the defendant claiming that the note was written and partly verbal, and the effect of the same is alleged to be short of the amount of the note, and that the defendant paid the price of 12 only, subject to certain additional payment in the event of a specified sale of timber, and that the defendant, as before said, said the defendant was to pay to the government of the province of British Columbia the license fees for the said licenses."

In support of this contention a conflict of evidence arose between the defendant and the plaintiff in respect of their respective accounts of what was said at the time of the execution of the note, and the defendant called in support of his story, and in his evidence in chief Goss testified in a manner which was not only inconsistent, but in cross-examination he broke down and gave such an unsatisfactory account of the transaction that the court said that I cannot accept his story as a safe guide to my conclusions. I does not seem to have any other evidence in support of his story, and he said, apart from his lack of frankness about the payment of the commission. I

In my opinion the defendant has a meritorious defence legally or equitably, though he appears to have neglected to bring forward the evidence. The plaintiff was liable to repay him the amount he paid for the licenses under part of said contract. Though in the defendant's mind he was not to be held liable that point, yet in view of the subsequent disagreement between the parties, I think it is not out of the question that the defendant was to be held to said contract clearly no obligation on the plaintiff to recoup the defendant for the amount he advanced to pay the licenses. It seems unfortunate that the defendant did not apparently take legal advice upon this point before he proceeded to make the advance, but he was not lawfully called upon to thereby bringing about this litigation. The only objection to the plaintiff's contention is the contract was to sell much timber land for a specified price and to execute the necessary transfer therefor. I am inclined to believe that in putting forward this untenable contention I feel satisfied the defendant did not seek to take advantage of the plaintiff's anxiety to obtain a settlement, though it had that result. On the whole evidence I am of the opinion that the defendant's contention of the note has not been established, and therefore judgment must be entered in favor of the plaintiff.

ARCHER MARTIN,  
Victoria, March 19, 1909.

**NEWINGTON TURNED  
TO DEPARTMENT**

Mr. Sifton has sent a letter to the editor of the Vancouver News-Advertiser in which he says: "In issue of February 28th, a copy of your issue has been sent to me by a friend, and I have read it with much interest. I am glad to hear that you are being edited by Joseph Martin, of Vancouver. I report Mr. Martin is representative of the best making of the press of this province to a committee of gentlemen, whose names I can give you, if necessary. I am glad to hear that you are giving the candidates that were running on my behalf. I desire that the statement thus quoted in your issue be not the basis of any foundation for such a statement as that I am not a Canadian."

Miss Davie left town on leaving on a visit to Kamloops.

laid Manitoba's case before Earl C. and appealed to him for justice for province. The Manitoba minister while they would not deny these sales, refused to discuss their visit to governor-general.

out for further deliberation, and an- serve of the Do

Cooper and his son Robin, jointly charged with Sharp with slaying Carmack, Judge Hart sent the twelve men out for further deliberation, and another day.

while they talked over incidents played and discussed what was needed to improve their play and how to get at their opponents' weak points. In this both sides were in earnest. It was an important, if important, occasion. The championship hung in the balance. The locals were one ahead but they feel quite safe with such a small margin. The visitors' problem was a greater problem. They must overcome a handicap and win out. As was held. There was much discussion of schemes and ruling rejected. There was much frowning, much shaking of heads. The twinkling, countenances cleared, smiles reappeared and it was as