

plaintiff's recovery must be limited to 6 years prior to the 3rd September, 1915, that being the date of the commencement of this action. The time for which the plaintiff should be allowed was from the 3rd September, 1909, to the 3rd July, 1912—2 years and 10 months, say 34 months, at \$6 a month. This was not a case where remuneration should be assessed on the basis of wages paid to a girl in domestic service, nor to a stenographer, nor to a clerk in a store. It was the case of a person doing sisterly service, as the plaintiff herself said, in a place that the plaintiff was pleased with. The facts would not warrant a finding that the plaintiff was to be paid only by legacy; and so she was entitled to recover a small amount. See *Baxter v. Gray* (1842), 3 Man. & G. 771. Judgment for the plaintiff for \$204, with County Court costs; no set-off of costs. E. G. Porter, K.C., and W. C. Carnew, for the plaintiff. W. C. Mikel, K.C., for the defendant.

KENNEDY v. SUYDAM REALTY CO.—FALCONBRIDGE, C.J.K.B., IN CHAMBERS—JAN. 8.

Appeal—Leave—Order Postponing Trial—Order of Judge in Chambers—Rule 507.]—Motion by the defendants for leave to appeal from an order of MIDDLETON, J., putting off the trial until the 20th February, and ordering the defendants not to sell the lands in question in the meantime without reference to him. The order complained of was made after the trial of the action had been entered on. It was taken out as in Chambers by the plaintiff. The Chief Justice was of opinion that, whether the order was rightly issued as a Chambers order or not, the proposed appeal was not an appeal from an order of a Judge in Chambers within the purview of Rule 507. Application refused; costs to the plaintiff in any event. E. D. Armour, K.C., and W. H. Clipsham, for the defendants. J. H. Fraser, for the plaintiff.