

93, for the determination of questions arising upon habeas corpus under the Extradition Act, of a rule nisi calling upon the Secretary of the Department of State of the United States of America, the Attorney-General for Ontario, and the senior Judge of the County Court of York, to shew cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not issue, and I direct that such a rule nisi be granted, returnable before a Divisional Court.

---

MEREDITH, C.J.

JANUARY 30TH, 1906.

CHAMBERS.

CAMPBELL v. CROIL.

*Appeal—Master's Report—Extension of Time—Delay—Explanation—Grounds of Appeal.*

Appeal by defendant Croil from order of Master in Chambers, ante 86, dismissing appellant's motion for leave to appeal and to extend the time for appealing from the Master's report of 19th June, 1905, which was confirmed by consent on 27th June.

G. A. Stiles, Cornwall, for defendant Croil.

D. W. Saunders, for defendant McCullough.

W. E. Middleton, for plaintiff.

MEREDITH, C.J., dismissed the appeal with costs.

---

MEREDITH, C.J.

JANUARY 30TH, 1906.

WEEKLY COURT.

WILE v. BRUCE MINES AND ALGOMA R. W. CO.

*Railway—Appointment of Receiver—Jurisdiction of Provincial Courts—Railway wholly within Province—Absence of Federal Legislation.*

Motion by plaintiff, a creditor of defendants, whose railway was situate wholly within the province of Ontario, for the appointment of a receiver.

M. C. Cameron, for plaintiff.

Britton Osler, for defendants.

MEREDITH, C.J.:—It is clear that if the railway is under provincial legislative jurisdiction, a receiver may be appointed