

defendants had not pleaded, and said that they were unable to do so, except by way of general denial, unless particulars of the negligence alleged should be given. The Master finds that the charges of negligence against the defendants in the statement of claim are not sufficiently explicit to enable the defendants to plead. The allegations contained in the statement of claim on which the charges of negligence are based are too general. All the information demanded by the defendants to enable them to plead is in possession of the liquidator of the plaintiffs, and should be furnished. Order made for particulars of the allegations on which the charges of negligence contained in paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 of the statement of claim are based. Costs of the application to be costs in the cause. R. McKay, K.C., for the defendants. M. L. Gordon, for the plaintiffs.

---

RE BUSTARD AND DUNLOP—FALCONBRIDGE, C.J.K.B.—OCT. 17.

*Title to Land—Intestacy—Stepchildren of Intestate—Vendors and Purchasers Act—Question between Owner and Mortgagee.*]—Motion by the owner of land, under the Vendors and Purchasers Act, for an order declaring that an objection made to the title by the respondent, a person proposing to advance money upon mortgage, was invalid. The objection was in respect of the descent of the land upon an intestacy. The learned Chief Justice said that the case did not seem to admit of a doubt. The descent was to be traced from the widow of Philip Armstrong. The children of her husband's first wife were not of her blood and did not inherit any part of her estate. The objection had been fully answered. No costs. D. C. Ross, for the owner. H. H. Shaver, for the mortgagee.

---