writer in making letters and figures, there is no basis for an opinion, because no characteristics exist.

In the case of a person accustomed to write, but who makes his mark because of being temporarily too nervous or too feeble to write, it is clear that the making of a mark is not habitual but exceptional, and hence, as before, there is no basis for expert opinion evidence. If the real basis of expert opinion evidence above stated is kept in mind, there will be no danger of going astray in such cases. The practice of expressing an opinion upon little or no sufficient grounds, as we have attempted to shew in this case, is in our opinion largely responsible for the little esteem in which expert evidence is often held, both by the laity and the profession. A conservative course for which sufficient reason can be given is the only proper one to pursue.

We would call attention to the case of *Wolfson* v. *Oldfield* ante infra p. 623), in which Mr. Justice Robson, of Manitoba, deals with the too common practice of agents acting for both parties in the sale and purchase of property. Land agents are frequently found doing that which divine wisdom says is impossible, i.e., serving two masters. They are often so anxious to effect a sale and pocket the commission that they entirely forget that they, in most cases, owe a special duty to one or other of the parties. In the case referred to the agent was found guilty of a fraud and the sale was set aside. What was done on that occasion is being done every day by other agents and the same result would follow in many cases if the parties either knew the view judges take of such fraudulent conduct, or took the trouble to bring it to their attention. Conduct such as this has brought land agents into well-merited disrepute. A few decisions of the kind above referred to would conduce to more honest dealing and brush up the dulled consciences of those who know right from wrong in such matters, and be a salutary lesson to those who do not.