

gas to their customers in the city of Hamilton. The defendants were three companies, also operating in Hamilton, and, the plaintiffs alleged, supplying or using electricity. The plaintiffs complained that the defendants, by allowing electricity to escape, had set up electrolytic action and damaged the plaintiffs' gas pipes, etc., and claimed damages and an injunction. The plaintiffs examined for discovery one Hawkins, as an officer of all three defendant companies, and upon the examination Hawkins refused to answer a number of questions, and the plaintiffs moved for an order compelling him to answer, or, in default, for the usual alternative. RIDDELL, J., held: (1) that Hawkins should disclose who his employees are and the terms of his employment; (2) that he should give information as to the kind, conductivity, etc., of the defendants' wires, the number of cars run, their average mileage, and generally all information that will enable an expert to compute or determine the amount, tension, etc., of the electrical current; (3) that he should disclose the means adopted to prevent the escape of the electricity; the plaintiffs are entitled to all the information the defendants have, and the officer examined must inform himself: *Harris v. Toronto Electric Light Co.*, 18 P. R. 285; *Clarkson v. Bank of Hamilton*, 9 O. L. R. 317; and, if he does not know, he should say who does, that that person may be examined; (4) that he should tell what instructions he gave to his subordinates at the sub-station, and who those subordinates were; (5) that information should also be given as to whether a measurement had been made of the current, as to the sectional area and conductivity of the wires of the defendant street railway company, as to the tracks and bonding, &c.; (6) and that information should be given as to what are the necessary and proper precautions taken by the defendants to confine the electric current to their own wires and apparatus. Order accordingly, if an order is desired. Costs to the plaintiffs in any event. J. G. Gauld, K.C., and A. M. Stewart, for the plaintiffs. W. W. Osborne, for the defendants.

---

CORRECTION.

Page 752, ante, 10th line from top: for "D. O'Connor" read "D. O'Connell."