c. 221, s. 10, vested the absolute property in the deer in the plaintiffs.

Prohibition was granted to a Division Court where there were no facts in dispute, and the Judge in the inferior Court applied a wrong rule of law to the facts, and grounded his judgment upon a misconstruction of the facts above referred to.

W. M. Douglas for plaintiffs. C. E. Barker for defendant.

Div'l Ct.]

[June 27.

PECK v. AGRICULTURAL INS. CO.

Insurance—Fire—Unoccupied building--Special condition-Reasonableness--Information given to agent of Insurance Co., but not in application—Powers of agent—Evidence—Rejection of.

The defendants issued a policy of insurance against fire, dated 23rd April, 1889, upon a house of the plaintiff.

The application signed by the plaintiff stated that the house was occupied as a residence by the plaintiff's son. A fire took place on the 14th November, 1889, at which date, and for six months previously, the house had been unoccupied. One of the special conditions indorsed upon the policy was that if a building became vacant or unoccupied, and so remained for ten days, the entire policy should be void. The plaintiff and his wife swore that when the agent came to him and drew the application he asked the plaintiff if there was anyone in the house at the time, and the plaintiff told him that his son was living there at the time, but was going to leave in about two weeks, and asked if that would make any difference, and was informed by the agent that it would not. By a clause in the application the plaintiff agreed that no statement made or information given by him prior to issuing the policy to any agent of the defendants should be deemed to be made to or binding upon the defendants unless reduced to writing and incorporated in the application; and on the margin of the application there was a notice showing that the powers of agents were limited to receiving proposals. collecting premiums, and giving the consent of the defendants to assignments of policies.

Held, that the special condition referred to was not an unreasonable one. and that the agent had no power to vary it; and an action to recover the amount of the loss was dismissed.

The plaintiff at the trial sought to give et dence of certain transactions between the agent of the defendants and a brother of the plaintiff for the purpose of showing that the plaintiff, having become aware of them below the application was made by him, was justified in believing that the defendants did not regard the condition as to occupation as a material one.

Held, that this evidence was properly reiected.

Clute, Q.C., for plaintiff. I. W. Kerr for defendants.

Practice.

C. P. Div'l Ct.]

[June 2].

MCLEAN v. BRUCE.

Receiver-Residuary estate under will-Cross examination of executor and residuary legal -Account of debts and legacies unpaid.

In answer to the defendant's application receiver to receive the interest of the plainting residuary legatee under a will, of which he was also the suminity also the surviving executor, the plaintiff filed affidavit in which he stated that the estate insufficient to pay the debts and specificlegation and that there would be no sum coming ¹⁰ plaintiff as residuary legatee.

Held, that the plaintiff upon cross-examination upon his affidavit must swear as to whether there were approximation there were any and what debts and legacies up paid.

H. Cassels for plaintiff. Hoyles, Q.C., for defendant.

C.P. Div'l Ct.]

[June 27.

MACLEAN V. THE BARBER & ELLIS Co. Discovery-Inspection of document before delivery

ery of statement of claim-Merits.

In an action to recover an amount alleged to be due by the defendants upon an advertising contract after an and the defendants of the second to contract after crediting an amount admitted for be due by the be due by the plaintiff to the defendants illegation in the defendants in the defend rent, and also to recover damages for manual distress for rent. distress for rent, it appeared that the defendant had agreed to not had agreed to pay a certain sum to the plaint for advertising, and had also written a letter the plaintiff norm the plaintiff agreeing that a certain part of the rent should be rent should be taken out in advertising. letter letter purported to be in answer to a