

the recognized rules affecting investment of trust funds, I cannot advise or regard this as a prudent or proper investment of trust money.

As to the proposed lien upon the remainder of the trust money, whether principal or interest, this of course is out of the question, as Mrs. Hill is to be restrained by the settlement from anticipation or encroachment and for the trustee to concur in a charge upon the fund would be in itself a breach of trust.

It would not be right to make the beneficiaries, generally, contribute to the costs of this application. The costs of all parties will be paid by the executor and charged against the share of Mrs. Hill.

---

HOLMESTED, SENIOR REGISTRAR.      NOVEMBER 4TH, 1913.

MCVEITY v. OTTAWA CITIZEN CO.

5 O. W. N. 237.

*Pleading—Statement of Claim—Motion for Particulars—Paragraph Irrelevant—Particulars Refused—Costs.*

HOLMESTED, K.C., held, that particulars should be refused of an irrelevant allegation in a pleading.

*Cave v. Torre*, 54 L. T. 515, followed.

Stanley Mills, for defendants.

J. T. White, for plaintiff.

Motion for particulars of paragraph 3 of the statement of claim in a libel action.

GEO. S. HOLMESTED, K.C.:—This is an action to recover damages for libel which occasioned, as is alleged, the dismissal of the plaintiff from an office held by him.

Paragraph 3 of the statement of claim is as follows: "3. With the intent to procure the dismissal of the plaintiff from his said office . . . the defendants for several years carried on against the plaintiff, through the columns of their said newspaper, a campaign of falsehood and slander."

The statement then sets out in a subsequent paragraph the alleged libel which occasioned the plaintiff's dismissal. Nothing is claimed in the way of damages in respect of the