

JUDGMENT GIVEN IN THE WILL CASE

APPEAL DISMISSED BY THE FULL COURT Decision Upholds Mr. Justice Drake, Trial Judge, in Favor of James Dunsmuir.

In the Full court Tuesday afternoon judgment was given in the Hopper vs. Dunsmuir appeal. The court dismissed with costs the appeal taken by Edna Wallace Hopper and the Intervenor Joan Dunsmuir. The judgment of Chief Justice Hunter occupied from 2.30 to 4.10 in reading, and in it he went very fully into the evidence. His judgment was concurred in by Mr. Justice Irving, and Mr. Justice Martin supported the judgment in a shorter written one.

The appeal, it will be remembered, was taken from the judgment of Mr. Justice Drake, the trial judge. On the completion of the judgment Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, K. C., acting for Joan Dunsmuir, the intervenor, asked that a day be set for the hearing of argument as to costs. He and E. V. Bodwell, K. C., representing the plaintiff, appellant, also intimated that leave to appeal to the Privy Council would be asked. Monday was set as the day for hearing the argument on these points.

The Chief Justice in his argument says: In 1888, Robert Dunsmuir died, leaving B. C., leaving a widow, two sons, James and Alexander, and seven daughters. The estate consisted principally of the controlling interest in two joint stock companies, one the Union Colliery Company (original) and the Wellington Colliery Company, the other the Esquamit & Nanaimo Railway Company, which respectively own coal mines and a railway with a land grant attached on Vancouver Island, and a coal selling business carried on under the name of R. Dunsmuir & Sons Company in Victoria, B. C., and the R. Dunsmuir Sons Company in San Francisco, California.

Several years before his death he had made a will leaving everything to his wife, but shortly before his death, had a will drawn up by which the bulk of his estate was divided equally between the sons, while due provision was made for his wife and daughters. This will was, however, unexecuted for reasons which do not clearly appear, and about which it is unnecessary to speculate. The fact remains that although the sons had grown up with and helped to carry on the

Extensive Business of the father without any regular salary or substantial interest in it, the entire estate passed to the widow on the death of the father. It is unnecessary to appear largely to account for the family differences which have ensued. The business was carried on by the two sons in the same way as before, the elder, James, taking charge in Victoria, and the younger, Alexander, at San Francisco, where he had been sent by his father in 1877. Neither, however, had any salary or substantial interest, both taking out of the business what they wished with the acquiescence of their mother, who was the legal owner.

Things went on in this way until 1898, when owing no doubt to the desire of the sons that some proper provision be given to the intentions of the father as disclosed in the unexecuted will, the mother consented that the business in San Francisco should be converted into a joint stock company, in which the estate divided equally between the sons, except four shares necessary to be issued to others to legally constitute the company. She, however, imposed a condition to the effect that if either of the sons predeceased her, his share was to revert to herself. The reason for this was that Alexander was living with a woman named Mrs. Wallace to whom she entailed a great fortune, and she was afraid that in the event of his predeceasing Mrs. Wallace, the latter might acquire the whole if not the chief share of his estate to the exclusion of the other members of the Dunsmuir family. This was shortly followed by an assignment to the sons by the widow of the existing indebtedness of the Esquamit & Nanaimo Railway Company to \$68,654.40, and also of the indebtedness to her of the Union Colliery Company to \$376,221.59. Her interest in the stock of these two companies was transferred to the sons, equal shares being given to each.

In 1899 she sold the business and good will of R. Dunsmuir & Sons in Victoria including three coal mines, which shortly afterwards became worked out, two steam colliers and two tugs to the two sons for \$410,000 to be secured by a mortgage of the sons' interest in the business and in the railway and colliery companies.

In this transaction, the sons, particularly Alexander, considered that she drove a bargain with them and did not intend to carry out the intention of the father. It would also appear that at the time of the making of the first will in question in this action, she had received altogether \$3,000,000 worth of property out of the estate. It says appear, because it is difficult to extract the facts regarding the ultimate distribution of the evidence has accumulated during the progress of the litigation.

excessive drinking. The total value of the San Leandro property was over \$300,000. On October 5th, 1898, Alexander made a will by which he left his whole estate to James, who was married and had a large family, and immediately after

His Marriage he re-executed this will in California. Alexander, according to the admission of James, imposed a trust on his brother that he should pay his widow \$1,000 a month during his life, and after some negotiations, on December 1st, 1900, partly no doubt in order to avoid litigation, James entered into an agreement with his widow by which he agreed to pay her for life \$25,000 per annum, and one-half of what may be shortly described as the net profits of the San Francisco business, what are Alexander's estate. She died shortly afterwards in June, 1901, and her daughter, who is the principal beneficiary under her will, brings this action for the recovery of her share of the agreement between her mother and James was produced by the undue influence of James, and that neither document was the act of a free and capable person.

Shortly after the trial commenced, an order was made allowing the defendant's mother to intervene for the purpose of enabling her to contest the validity of the will, thereby bringing all parties in interest before the court. Towards the end of the trial, the plaintiff and the intervenor applied to be allowed to amend their pleadings, which was granted by the court. It became domiciled in California, and that therefore in any event his will was invalid by California law. The application was refused by the learned trial judge, but it was allowed by this court, and the appeal was stood over to allow the parties to adduce evidence on this point.

In considering the appeal it will be convenient first to deal with the case of the intervenor, as it is obvious if the will was that of a free and capable testator there is no necessity to consider the question as to whether Mrs. Alexander Dunsmuir's agreement with James was the result of undue influence, or if so whether the plaintiff has any right to have it set aside. The case set up by the intervenor is two-fold. She alleges first that the will should be declared void as being that of a person of unsound mind, and in any event as being the result of the undue influence of James, and that it is at any rate void as not being executed in accordance with the laws of California. The second contention is that it was set aside by the California court of first instance, and we are informed that an appeal is now pending.

Some facts surrounding the execution of the will are not in dispute. The testator admitted copy of the former will which was made in September, 1898, by the testator when he was in Victoria, and was prepared by their common solicitor. It is in the handwriting of the solicitor, and was prepared by him on the verbal instructions of James, who took it with him to California at Alexander's request in order that Alexander should execute it. At the time of the execution James and Alexander had each, as already stated, acquired a half interest in the railway and colliery business, while the sisters were dependent on the bounty of their mother, who had, as already stated, retained a large portion of the original estate and had received large sums of money out of the business from the sons. Before his marriage Alexander was of loose and imprudent habits, and it is not doubted that, as already stated, intemperance was the cause of death.

Inasmuch as large interests are at stake, and the case is entirely one of fact, it is desirable to review the evidence at length, and I will consider the evidence adduced for the plaintiff as having been also adduced by the intervenor, and will bring it together as far as possible in the order in which it was given. Following this the Chief Justice in his judgment reviewed the evidence of all the witnesses in the case relative to the execution of the will, and his were all summarized, and following that he gives his judgment with the reasons assigned for it. This was as follows:

The above is in brief the evidence of the eye-witnesses (about 80 in number) adduced by all parties to this controversy, and it is at once to be observed that, with the exception of the plaintiff herself, all the witnesses brought forward to impeach the will speak only from a short acquaintance with the deceased, or only as to isolated occasions when he was intoxicated, and none of them testify to having any dealings with him during the last two years of his life. I refer to the evidence of Mighell, Taylor, Wharton, Gillespie, E. J. Palmer, Howard, Chandler, Young, Burns, Frazer, George, Fritch, J. H. Fritch, The Bulls and the Freemans, and especially to the first two. Nor do I consider that because some of these witnesses in the hands of a skilled cross-examiner failed to detail more than one or two specific interviews the probative force of their testimony is seriously weakened, as it is evident that was their settled conviction that the deceased was quite competent to manage his own affairs when not intoxicated, that he had.

Good Business Capacity. was of obstinate and dictatorial nature, and less likely than the average man to be influenced by others. This being so, it is unnecessary to consider the speculations of the alienists who were called in to dispute and support the sanity of the deceased. The evidence which was adduced when he was not intoxicated was incoherent in his speech, or dragged his feet, or had to be amused as a child, then it would have been necessary to consider the evidence of these experts. Even then I should say that the opinions of a learned person would come with far greater weight to the ears of the court if given by a man of business sitting with the court than when given under retainer for the parties, and I take this opportunity to express the hope that in future when the occasion calls for it their opinions will be obtainable in that way.

Documents were also put in which give silent but cogent testimony as to the business capacity of the deceased. His correspondence, sitting with the court on November 18th, 15th, 1899, (date of the deceased for a special price for coal

months and a half before his death), which were sent to James under Alexander's instructions urging the purchase of the property in San Francisco which was held on lease, and stating that there was \$186,000 in the bank, also the sharp businesslike letters of June 8th and September 8th of the same year. Then there is the will of the plaintiff's mother of August 16th, 1899, in which she commits the future of her daughter to the deceased, and gives him the great bulk of her property. She also

Commits Her Own Future into his hands by marrying him on the day before her death. Having regard to the fact that she had obtained a very large property, which, so far as we know, could not have been taken from her, it is not the natural inference that she did not think he was a demerit? And who is there better able to judge than the woman who had lived with him for twenty years? And what is retained by Alexander's wife, and was not liable to the undue influence of anyone, the circumstances surrounding the making of this will and the destruction of her former one really attest.

Then it was urged that the disposition of his property was not natural or reasonable. No doubt different temperaments would view the disposition in different lights. The mother, thereby well off, the sisters all married, and provision made for them, and none required assistance. The only brother had a large family, and while no doubt also well off, nor had he devoted his energy to the business, yet a man in the position of the deceased might have thought it was right to give more to his sisters, another that it was best to keep the bulk of the fortune together, another that all had enough, and that his wife should have all that came to him. Can anyone say, in view of the provision which he had made for his wife, that any one of these dispositions would have been unnatural? A man of just as determined a nature as Alexander Dunsmuir might easily have vacillated between these various dispositions, and changed his will a number of times without being in danger of being adjudged a demerit, or subject to the undue influence of any of the parties concerned.

In going through the evidence at length, I have assumed that the will of the defendant to show that the will was not that of a demerit man, or the result of undue influence. I am, however, not clear that the case comes within that class which requires affirmative proof by a person who alleges that the making of the will. There is no satisfactory evidence to show that the will of 1898 was suggested by James, but rather that it was the carrying out of Alexander's fixed intention, and I do not think the mere fact that James brought a copy of it for re-execution in San Francisco at Alexander's request is sufficient without more to bring it within that class, as he seems to have been not the author, but the messenger. However, even if the onus is on the defendant. I think it

Has Been Fully Discharged, and that we must hold on the evidence before us that the will was that of a free and capable testator. In cases like this, it is unnecessary to consider the questions specially affecting the plaintiff's case, i. e., whether the agreement between her mother and James was the result of undue influence, or whether she has any status to maintain the action. There remains to be considered the contention that the deceased had acquired a California domicile and that his will was not executed in accordance with the California law.

The deceased, as already remarked, was born in British Columbia, and resided in British Columbia until he was about 24 years of age when he was sent by his father to his agent in San Francisco. Evidence as to whether or not he changed his domicile was, in my opinion, taken by a commissioner in San Francisco. W. G. Harrison, a witness already mentioned, being examined on this point says that in 1892 or 1893 the deceased, upon being asked by him to take an interest in an exhibition which was being promoted, told him that "he did not care to take part in it, but here as he did not consider himself a Californian; he did not consider he should take any part in local matters; that his home was in British Columbia; and all his interests were in British Columbia; that he always spoke of Victoria as his home." Witness says that he often had conversations with him to the same effect, but could not place the time or occasion. Cross-examined, he says that the deceased frequently told him he was going home, meaning Victoria; that although he had lived in San Francisco for 32 years he was still British and regarded Ireland as his domicile; that he did not mean to say that the deceased said were in British Columbia, but he indicated that all his personal interests were there.

Ridley, a former witness, says that in 1896 he had a conversation with the deceased about some electric installation, when deceased told him that he was going home to Victoria when he would consult his brother on the subject. Cross-examined, he did not speak about this subject to him after his marriage. J. E. Freeman, a former witness, says that between June and December, 1899, he had a conversation with the deceased about British subjects becoming citizens of the United States, when deceased stated that he was a British subject and that his home and residence were in Victoria; a statement which was not shaken by the cross-examination. R. Van Schalk, United States assistant weigher in the Dunsmuir office at San Francisco, says that he knew deceased for 27 or 28 years, and he often used to say to the deceased: "Why don't you come and be one among us, be an American citizen and live with us here?" "Oh," he would say, "What would be the use of that? I refer to you, I will take me five years to be a citizen here. Then when I go back to Victoria again I will have to put up my hand and swear over again there," and that he had never heard of any other persons who had taken this course. J. H. Frith, a former witness, says that on one occasion when asking the deceased for a special price for coal

that he replied: "My people at home won't stand for it"; that he often used the expression "my people at home," and that he had been to Victoria on a vacation, fishing and hunting, meaning Victoria. Cross-examined, he says that the deceased gave him to understand that his home was his mother's house in Victoria. Thomas Whitehead, a witness already referred to, testified that the deceased considered Victoria as his home; that he always retained his rooms in the leased hotel there; that he would frequently speak of "going up home to Victoria" or "going up home," or "going back home"; that when in Victoria he would say: "I am going down to San Francisco," and in cross-examination that he knew the deceased was away a great deal from San Francisco. J. P. Taylor, the witness already referred to, testified before the commissioner in San Francisco that the deceased with his wife, and his children, resided at that time in Victoria, and that the San Leandro place was Mrs. Wallace's place. And in cross-examination, that he understood that deceased intended "going up home," and that her home was in San Leandro.

Positive evidence is thus before us that the deceased never had any intention, until at any rate when he bought the San Leandro estate, of changing his domicile or origin, his fixed and intended domicile or origin, his fixed and intended domicile or origin. He had never changed his allegiance, nor intended to do so; had never taken any part in political or municipal affairs in Victoria, nor had he devoted his energy to the business, yet a man in the position of the deceased might have thought it was right to give more to his sisters, another that it was best to keep the bulk of the fortune together, another that all had enough, and that his wife should have all that came to him. Can anyone say, in view of the provision which he had made for his wife, that any one of these dispositions would have been unnatural? A man of just as determined a nature as Alexander Dunsmuir might easily have vacillated between these various dispositions, and changed his will a number of times without being in danger of being adjudged a demerit, or subject to the undue influence of any of the parties concerned.

In going through the evidence at length, I have assumed that the will of the defendant to show that the will was not that of a demerit man, or the result of undue influence. I am, however, not clear that the case comes within that class which requires affirmative proof by a person who alleges that the making of the will. There is no satisfactory evidence to show that the will of 1898 was suggested by James, but rather that it was the carrying out of Alexander's fixed intention, and I do not think the mere fact that James brought a copy of it for re-execution in San Francisco at Alexander's request is sufficient without more to bring it within that class, as he seems to have been not the author, but the messenger. However, even if the onus is on the defendant. I think it

Has Been Fully Discharged, and that we must hold on the evidence before us that the will was that of a free and capable testator. In cases like this, it is unnecessary to consider the questions specially affecting the plaintiff's case, i. e., whether the agreement between her mother and James was the result of undue influence, or whether she has any status to maintain the action. There remains to be considered the contention that the deceased had acquired a California domicile and that his will was not executed in accordance with the California law.

The deceased, as already remarked, was born in British Columbia, and resided in British Columbia until he was about 24 years of age when he was sent by his father to his agent in San Francisco. Evidence as to whether or not he changed his domicile was, in my opinion, taken by a commissioner in San Francisco. W. G. Harrison, a witness already mentioned, being examined on this point says that in 1892 or 1893 the deceased, upon being asked by him to take an interest in an exhibition which was being promoted, told him that "he did not care to take part in it, but here as he did not consider himself a Californian; he did not consider he should take any part in local matters; that his home was in British Columbia; and all his interests were in British Columbia; that he always spoke of Victoria as his home." Witness says that he often had conversations with him to the same effect, but could not place the time or occasion. Cross-examined, he says that the deceased frequently told him he was going home, meaning Victoria; that although he had lived in San Francisco for 32 years he was still British and regarded Ireland as his domicile; that he did not mean to say that the deceased said were in British Columbia, but he indicated that all his personal interests were there.

Ridley, a former witness, says that in 1896 he had a conversation with the deceased about some electric installation, when deceased told him that he was going home to Victoria when he would consult his brother on the subject. Cross-examined, he did not speak about this subject to him after his marriage. J. E. Freeman, a former witness, says that between June and December, 1899, he had a conversation with the deceased about British subjects becoming citizens of the United States, when deceased stated that he was a British subject and that his home and residence were in Victoria; a statement which was not shaken by the cross-examination. R. Van Schalk, United States assistant weigher in the Dunsmuir office at San Francisco, says that he knew deceased for 27 or 28 years, and he often used to say to the deceased: "Why don't you come and be one among us, be an American citizen and live with us here?" "Oh," he would say, "What would be the use of that? I refer to you, I will take me five years to be a citizen here. Then when I go back to Victoria again I will have to put up my hand and swear over again there," and that he had never heard of any other persons who had taken this course. J. H. Frith, a former witness, says that on one occasion when asking the deceased for a special price for coal

rooms are absolutely diagnostic of senile dementia, and there could have been no testamentary capacity then it is, at the time of making the will or later." Third, as to the domicile of the deceased. At first I was disposed to think that the facts this must be held to be where his Residence Was. but on further consideration of the circumstances and the special nature of the business carried on, which required the residence of one of the proprietors to be at San Francisco, I have come to the conclusion that it was not the intention of the deceased to abandon his domicile of origin. It is not at all unlikely, indeed, that the deceased, who was a native of the longer he was practically compelled to live in that foreign country the less he liked and refused to identify himself with its institutions, and looked forward to the time when he could return to the home of his birth and of his family, his "home," as he often referred to it. Since the recent judgment of the House of Lords in the important case of Winans vs. Attorney-General, 1904, A. C. 237, it would be presumptuous in me to endeavor to do the subject, for, as the Lord Chancellor says, "The law is that where a domicile of origin is proved it lies upon the person who asserts a change of domicile to establish it, and it is necessary to prove that the person who is alleged to have changed his domicile had a fixed and determined purpose to make the place of his new domicile his permanent home." And Lord Macnaughton says at p. 291 that said burden is a "heavy" one, and quotes the language of Lord Westbury that it must be shown "with perfect clearness and satisfaction." And Lord Macnaughton goes on to say that "a change of domicile is a serious matter, serious enough when the competition is between the domiciles both within the ambit of one and the same kingdom or country—more serious still when one of the two is altogether foreign" as is the case here.

Applying the above principle to the facts before us the onus has not been discharged to my satisfaction, at least. Many other cases were cited, but I only refer to that of Capdeville v. Capdeville (1889), 25 W. R. 307, which is strongly in favor of the respondent; see also Attorney-General v. Countess de Walsdale (1884), 3 H. & C. 373.

Fourth, as to the execution of the will according to the law of California. This raises a difficult and perplexing question, and one on which a judge of another court has a natural difference in expressing his opinion. There is much conflict in the evidence of the two experts, and it is difficult to satisfactorily reconcile the numerous authorities that have been cited. The best conclusion that I have been able to reach is that there was a substantial compliance with the essential requirements of the law of that state.

Fifth, as to undue influence alleged to have been exerted by the defendant in procuring the will, and also of the subsequent agreement with Mrs. Alexander Dunsmuir. I am of the opinion that on the evidence we should not be warranted in disturbing the findings of the learned trial judge in these points. The defendant clearly is not in the position as a beneficiary as was the plaintiff in McHugh v. Dooley supra, who propounded a will which he had caused to be prepared without the intervention of any faithful witness or anyone capable of giving independent evidence as to the testator's intentions and instructions."

At the conclusion of the argument our attention was called to the change in section 6 of the Wills Act made by the amendment of 1902, cap. 73, sec. 2, whereby said sec. 6 is made in its fifth line to conform to the English Wills Act, and read "made or acknowledged," instead of "made or acknowledged," as therebefore. It was argued that the effect of this amendment as applied to the evidence before us, was that if the will were not valid in California it would not be valid here, because if a declaration cannot be made under the California law an acknowledgment cannot be made under ours. But it is unnecessary to consider this contention nor Mr. Davis' rejoinder, as it was duly executed according to California law. But in accordance to California law, the attention clause states that the will was "signed by the testator as and for his last will and testament," and which in respect follows the form given in Hayes & Jarman Concise Forms of Wills (1898) as being in compliance with all the requirements of the statute; pp. 25 (n. 1), 28, 44, 47.

It follows from all the foregoing that the appeal should be dismissed with costs.

SOME AWARDS. As mentioned in another column the judging in connection with the annual show of the Victoria Poultry Association commenced this morning. Appended were the results available at noon: White Plymouth Rocks—Cock, 1st, J. S. Jones, Nanaimo; 2nd, Brandy Dyer, Saturday Island; 3rd, Mrs. G. A. Shade, Yates street, Cokerels, 2nd, H. S. Rolston, Vancouver. Hens, 2nd, Mrs. G. A. Shade, Victoria. Pullets, 1st, J. S. Jones, Pen. 1st, J. S. Jones, 2nd, J. S. Jones, 3rd, J. S. Jones. Buff Plymouth Rocks—Cock, 1st, W. A. Blackstock, Cokerels, 1st, W. Reid, Victoria; 2nd, Edwards & Son, Salt Spring Island; 3rd, J. Wood, Victoria. Hens, 1st, W. A. Blackstock, 2nd, J. L. Lang, Victoria; 3rd, J. Lang.

WEEK OF PRAYER. In the Y. M. C. A. rooms Monday afternoon commencing at 8 o'clock opening meeting took place in the week of prayer and conference being held in the week in common with a movement among the evangelical churches throughout the world. Rev. T. W. Gladstone presided, and Right Rev. Bishop Grigg gave an address, dealing largely with the subject of thanksgiving. He spoke with vigor, and held the attention of his audience throughout. In the evening a meeting was held in the First Presbyterian church, at which Rev. Dr. Campbell presided. Rev. P. Tapscott was the speaker. He dealt principally with the theme of humiliation, and went on to show how every one fell short of the Glory of God. His remarks were listened to with the utmost interest. During the evening J. G. Brown sang a very appropriate hymn entitled "A Little Talk With Jesus." Altogether the meetings yesterday were acknowledged very successful.

THE Tye Copper Co., Ltd. Purchasers and Smelters of Copper, Gold and Silver Ores. Smelting Works at LADYSMITH, VANCOUVER ISLAND, B. C. Head Office—Duncan's Station, Vancouver Island, B. C. Clermont Livingstone, General Manager

A GREAT OFFER THE London TIMES Weekly Edition The Semi Weekly Victoria TIMES and Pearson's Magazine Regular Price \$3.15 POST FREE for ONE YEAR Regular Price \$1.00 Regular Price \$5.15

OR The London Times Weekly and either one of the others For \$3.30 A great chance to obtain England's greatest weekly, British Columbia's greatest paper and a world-renowned magazine at a bargain. Annual subscriptions only, payable in advance, to F. S. Wright, Canadian Agent, the Times, Ottawa, Ontario.

THE JUDGE STARTS WORK THIS MORNING All Preparations for Opening of Poultry Show are Complete—Tombola Arranged. (From Wednesday's Daily.) To-morrow the annual show of the Victoria Pet Stock Association will open at the market building. It will continue on Friday and Saturday, closing on the evening of the latter day. Members of the management committee announce that the arrangements are complete. About 800 of the finest birds to be found in the north-west are on exhibition. They have been placed in comfortable coops ranged in long rows from one end of the capacious galleries of that building to the other. Judging by the noise created by the crowing of the self-sufficient cocks and the complacent chucking of the hens, they feel quite at home and would be perfectly willing to remain in charge of the officials of the local organization for an indefinite period.

Province of British Columbia, Canada. LICENSE TO AN EXTRA-PROVINCIAL COMPANY. "COMPANIES ACT, 1897." This is to certify that "The Traveler Insurance Company" is authorized to be licensed to carry on business within the Province of British Columbia, and carry out or effect all or any of the objects of the Company to which the legislative authority of the Legislature of British Columbia extends.

LAND REGISTRY ACT. In the Matter of an Application for a Duplicate Certificate of Title to Lots 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891