

It appears from the Term Book, Hilary Term, 7 George IV., Jan. 2nd, 1827, that this judgment was given by the full court, Campbell, C.J., Boulton and Sherwood, JJ., and that the defendant lost six weeks' allowance by his caution.

The Statute of 1822, 2 George IV., C. 8, allowed interrogatories to be exhibited to a defendant in execution, which he must answer on oath shewing his property and his disposition of it, etc. This put a stop to a certain amount of fraudulent concealment of property.

WILLIAM RENWICK RIDDELL.

POOR SUITORS.

No provision is made by the Ontario Rules of Practice for the case of poor Suitors. Possibly the former Chancery practice as to suing in formâ pauperis prevails, under the combined effect of the Jud. Act, s. 128, and s. 58 (13). But this is not absolutely certain, and there is no case, that we are aware of, in which the question has been raised.

It seems desirable that explicit provision should be made by the Rules on the subject. In England, recently, a very hard case was carried up to the House of Lords by the plaintiff in formâ pauperis and the judgment of the court below reversed: *Lloyd v. Grace*, 1912, A.C. 716. In that case the plaintiff, a poor woman, had gone to a solicitor's office to consult about her property, and under the fraudulent advice of the managing clerk of the firm, she transferred to him all her property and he then made away with it, and the poor woman was reduced to poverty. —She brought an action against the firm of solicitors, which was dismissed by the lower courts on the ground that the clerk in taking the conveyance to himself was not acting within the scope of his authority; but the House of Lords held that he was, and that the defendant was liable to make good the loss occasioned by his clerk's fraud. But for the provisions of the English practice enabling proceedings to be taken formâ pauperis this gross wrong would have been unredressed.