

The Toronto World

FOUNDED 1880.
A Morning Newspaper Published Every Day in the Year.
WORLD BUILDING, TORONTO, NO. 40 WEST RICHMOND STREET.
Telephone Calls:
MAIN 5308—Private Exchange connecting all departments.
\$2.00
will pay for The Daily World for one year, delivered in the City of Toronto, or by mail to any address in Canada, Great Britain or the United States.
\$2.00
will pay for The Sunday World for one year, by mail to any address in Canada or Great Britain. Delivered in Toronto or for sale by all newsdealers and newsboys at five cents per copy.
Postage extra to United States and all other foreign countries.
Subscribers are requested to advise us promptly of any irregularity or delay in delivery of The World.
THURSDAY MORNING, JAN. 16, 1913.

ORIGINAL ROAD RIGHTS.

Some ignorance seems to exist in the city hall and elsewhere over the powers of municipal, county and township councils with regard to the closing of or interference with original road allowances such as that of which Eglington avenue is a part. As will be seen from quotations from the Ontario Municipal Act, published elsewhere in this issue of The World, no council can in any way change the position or character of a road allowance except by bylaw passed under stringent conditions precedent, requiring publication of notices and advertisements and affording all proper opportunity for objectors to be heard. Still further, in the case of a township council, confirmation by the county council is necessary for its validity. Eglington avenue and the whole original road allowance is there and there remains unless and until it is stopped, altered, diverted, leased or sold by bylaw of York Township Council, confirmed by the York County Council. No such bylaw has been passed and the approval of plans for its diversion has no legal force or effect whatever. This does not mean that there may not be somewhere or other an ulterior intent to secure that diversion, and methods may possibly be attempted to get behind the provisions of the act, not directly, but indirectly. In this matter eternal vigilance is the price of safety. The World will go on guard at the Eglington bridge while The Telegram is down at Cherry street.

TORONTO ONE AND INDIVISIBLE.

It might be well to get general legislation to make it clear that Toronto, no matter how big the city may become, is Toronto one and indivisible. We do not know now whether we are bargaining for Toronto or when we make a city contract, or interpret a city agreement, or act upon a city statute, Toronto voted for Sunday street cars, but now that Toronto has grown whippersnappers must not be served on Sunday, although the face of the city can have all it wants.

A NEW YORK DELUSION.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. Commissioners of New York legislators may believe that hydro-electric power has saved the consumers of light and power in Toronto nothing at all, but the consumers, whether of the civic or the corporation power and light, know better. The first thing the electric corporations did when hydro-electric arrived was to cut their rates all round. In Toronto they were cut in two. Circulars were sent out in Toronto apprising Toronto consumers of the cut. Did the New York Commission never see one of these? Those New Yorkers must have got hold of the man who flooded the forces here with letters seven years ago, proving to their own satisfaction that the hydro-electric lines could not be built; and, if built, they would be built at double the estimated cost. They were built, and built under the estimates, in spite of Engineer Richmond et al. Then Mr. Beckett, the amiable partner of Mr. Kittson, of the Ontario Railway Board, got out his little pamphlet with its admirable arrangement of calculations, and he proved that the whole thing was going to the deuce, and would be bankrupt the middle of the next week. But Hon. Adam Beck failed to fulfil the "prognostication, and calmly announced a decided cut in rates.

It looks as if the corporations were mighty scared of hydro-electric methods, and are making a strong effort to hoodwink the people of New York State, and mislead them as to the true results of the hydro plans in Ontario. Tammany methods are all powerful in New York, and the corporations always being sympathetic, they can find sympathy of the sort of information they want, and our own City Auditor Sterling made a notable contribution to the corporation side of the story.

What New York needs is an Adam Beck to dig up the facts and tell the truth.

BRITISH EDUCATIONAL REFORM.

In an editorial in its Tuesday's issue on educational reform in Britain, The Globe, no doubt inadvertently, assumed that the new measure referred to by Lord Chancellor Haldane applied to the United Kingdom. Incidentally it credited Scotland with sharing in the "passive resistance" movement initiated after the passing of Mr. A. J. Balfour's Education Act of 1902, which, however, applied exclusively to England. Scotland has never participated in the long conflict between the church

and nonconformity over the English public and church schools, and already possesses a complete system of primary, intermediate, secondary and technical schools in close connection with her four universities.

Mr. Forster's act of 1870 applied only to England, but a year or two later the late Lord Young, then lord advocate, introduced and passed the act on which the present Scottish system is based. Altho, as The Globe says, English education bills were introduced by the present government in 1907 and 1908, but were both buried by the house of lords—again over the question of religious teaching—an important act for Scotland was passed in 1909 and came into force on New Year's Day of the following year. It established a central fund from which support is provided for secondary education and centres were selected according to a prearranged scheme for covering the whole country and where it was possible to place secondary schools in every area creating burials enabling schools from primary schools to proceed to secondary schools at a distance from their homes.

Another section of that act, which came into force in 1911, permitted the combination of many of the then existing smaller school board districts into larger areas. School boards were also given larger responsibilities and powers for securing the health and well being of children of school age and imposed new and far-reaching duties in relation to young people who have left school and entered upon employment. The Edinburgh board has been notably successful in using its powers to aid parents in the choice of future employments for their children. Continuation classes were also greatly stimulated by the 1908 act. By 1914 all Scottish schools will be practically entirely staffed by fully-trained teachers, only 288 uncertificated assistant teachers—those employed before 1898—will then be entitled to serve. Scotland has always led England in the matter of education and, as now developed, its system is one of the most complete in the world.

Six transit glorio Avenue road.

BANK OF NOVA SCOTIA.

In anticipating the proposed legislation for an outside audit, the Bank of Nova Scotia set an excellent example six years ago. This sound old institution could well afford to court the fullest inquiry into its affairs at that time, and is now in a splendid condition to comply with the outside audit system which is proposed in the projected bank act at Ottawa. It will be noticed in reference to the annual statement of the Bank of Nova Scotia, published in The World today, that the profits for the past year totalled nearly a million dollars, the actual figures being \$970,544.88. This large aggregate of profits was equal to 23.28 per cent on the average paid-up capital of the year 1912. The paid-up capital quoted in the last annual statement amounted to \$3,984,790. Early last August, shortly after it had reached \$4,000,000, another allotment of \$1,000,000 was made. Of that amount nearly \$750,000 had been paid up by Dec. 31. No stronger evidence of the confidence in this important financial concern could be shown by its shareholders. Moreover, the reserve fund has been increased to \$8,728,146, the highest proportion of reserve to capital shown by a Canadian bank. In a year of unparalleled bank profits the Nova Scotia makes the remarkably fine showing of quickly available assets of 67.1-2 per cent of its liabilities. The total assets show an increase of \$3,008,108. The assets total \$71,279,298, against liabilities to the public of \$67,410,805.

AGREES WITH THE WORLD.

Toronto Telegram: Toronto should make no further attempts at a police censorship of theatrical performances.

LET IT BE SOON.

Toronto Star: It may be found one of these days that when a political leader comes along who has the courage to do things, the people will quickly develop an interest in him and his works.

EPWORTH LEAGUE CONFERENCE.

GALT, Jan. 15.—(Special.)—The board of management of the Hamilton conference of the Epworth League met here today to complete arrangements for the annual summer school study of the Bible and missions, usually held in July. For the past two years the school met at Elora, but the board received an invitation from the Methodist people of Berlin and decided to go there.

Modern Science.

President King of Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, will address a political men's club on Saturday evening, at the Williams Restaurant, 179 Yonge street, on "The Contribution of Modern Science to the Ideal Interests."

WARD ONE LIBERALS.

A mass meeting of all the Liberals living in Ward One will be held in Poulton's Hall, corner of East Queen street and Colton avenue, on Thursday evening next, January 16, at 8 o'clock. At this meeting the annual nomination and election of officers for the current year will take place, as provided in the new constitution of "The Liberal Association of Toronto," and the meeting will be conducted by the officers of that body. The different offices will be open to all Liberals who may wish to contest the same, and a full discussion will be permitted.

DEAN ELLIS IS HONORED.

KINGSTON, Jan. 15.—(Special.)—Dean Ellis, of the faculty of education, Queen's, was elected president of the Kingston Canadian Club to succeed Lieut.-Col. A. B. Cunningham.

THE STAMP OF PUBLIC APPROVAL



PUBLIC approval of the light beer is most emphatic.

A Prominent Physician, speaking before the Ontario Medical Council, said:

"Lager and Mild Ale are forms of liquid beefsteak, which impart power and strength to the system."

O'Keefe's Pilsener Lager

"The Light Beer in The Light Bottle"

ORDER A CASE FROM YOUR DEALER.



Philosopher of Folly

A WINTER PLAIN

We hate the foolish mortal who loves to see it snow, who tells us with a chuckle that it is ten below; who when the wind is freezing our marrow to the core would have us think it pleasing to hear the blizzard roar. The mercury he watches, and when he sees it drop from zero twenty notches he closes up his shop, and while we tear home snorting in froeze, trembling pain, on snowshoes he's cowering across the winter plain. We interview our lawyer to see what can be done to stop this peace-decay from thinking this is fun; we put the case before him, and then as man to man we earnestly implore him to do the best he can to have this mad man arrested, where he cold outside, nailed safely in the attic above where we reside. And in this case of course the lawyer will use his well balanced mind; this rift within the ointment, this rift within the rift, means certain disappointment for us, but we close the talk by stating the time and out of joint when folks can take pleasure. In the winter where we freeze; we think the state should measure their heads for this disease. Sherwood Hart.

GOES TO VICTORIA.

A. P. Boulton to be Manager of Bank of Toronto Branch.

The Bank of Toronto has opened a branch at Victoria, B. C., under the management of Mr. A. P. Boulton. Mr. Boulton has given the bank good service as manager at Coldwater, Wallaceburg and Port Hope branches in Ontario, and for the past year has held the position of assistant inspector at head office.

WARD ONE LIBERALS.

A mass meeting of all the Liberals living in Ward One will be held in Poulton's Hall, corner of East Queen street and Colton avenue, on Thursday evening next, January 16, at 8 o'clock. At this meeting the annual nomination and election of officers for the current year will take place, as provided in the new constitution of "The Liberal Association of Toronto," and the meeting will be conducted by the officers of that body. The different offices will be open to all Liberals who may wish to contest the same, and a full discussion will be permitted.

DEAN ELLIS IS HONORED.

KINGSTON, Jan. 15.—(Special.)—Dean Ellis, of the faculty of education, Queen's, was elected president of the Kingston Canadian Club to succeed Lieut.-Col. A. B. Cunningham.

ANNUAL STOCK TAKING SALE

Shirts, Cost Sweaters, Neckwear, Hosiery, Gloves, Caps, etc., will be sold at 20% to 50% off Regular Prices.
English Neglige Shirts, large range to choose from. All good patterns. Regular values 12 and 15.00, for \$10.00.
8 Dozen English Flannel Shirts, regular values 12 and 15.00, for \$10.00.
Imported Linen Underwear, in brown and natural wool, medium and heavy weights. Regular up to \$1.50 and \$1.75, clearing \$1.00.
8 Dozen English and Canadian Made Sweater Shirts, regular values 12 and 15.00, clearing \$10.00.
Clearing English Ulster Coats \$5.00

Wreyford & Co.
85 King St. W.

At Osgoode Hall

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

15th January, 1913.
Motions set down for single court for Thursday, 16th inst., at 11 a.m.:

1. Re Corbett v. McNeil.
2. Loveland v. McNeil.
3. Myerscough v. Lake Erie.
4. Re Quay Estate.

Peremptory list for appellate division for Thursday, 16th inst., at 11 a.m.:

1. Weir v. Weir (to be continued.)
2. Rymal v. Foran.
3. Maketa v. Slater.
4. Coffey v. Sturgeon Lake.
5. Houston v. Sturgeon Lake.

Master's Chambers.
Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master. Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

ANNUAL STOCK TAKING SALE

Shirts, Cost Sweaters, Neckwear, Hosiery, Gloves, Caps, etc., will be sold at 20% to 50% off Regular Prices.
English Neglige Shirts, large range to choose from. All good patterns. Regular values 12 and 15.00, for \$10.00.
8 Dozen English Flannel Shirts, regular values 12 and 15.00, for \$10.00.
Imported Linen Underwear, in brown and natural wool, medium and heavy weights. Regular up to \$1.50 and \$1.75, clearing \$1.00.
8 Dozen English and Canadian Made Sweater Shirts, regular values 12 and 15.00, clearing \$10.00.
Clearing English Ulster Coats \$5.00

Wreyford & Co.
85 King St. W.

At Osgoode Hall

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

15th January, 1913.
Motions set down for single court for Thursday, 16th inst., at 11 a.m.:

1. Re Corbett v. McNeil.
2. Loveland v. McNeil.
3. Myerscough v. Lake Erie.
4. Re Quay Estate.

Peremptory list for appellate division for Thursday, 16th inst., at 11 a.m.:

1. Weir v. Weir (to be continued.)
2. Rymal v. Foran.
3. Maketa v. Slater.
4. Coffey v. Sturgeon Lake.
5. Houston v. Sturgeon Lake.

Master's Chambers.
Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master. Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his examination for discovery. Judgment: The position taken by defendant's solicitor in my view of the law is too unqualified. I think Steele should have acknowledged his signature or denied it, and then there might be light thrown thereby on the present question which is to be tried.

Before J. S. Cartwright, K.C., Master.
Playfair v. Cormack and Steele.—H. Ferguson for plaintiff, W. D. McPherson, K.C., for defendant. Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to answer certain questions which he declined to answer on his