some other offence than that for which he was being tried. No evidence had been given as to the good character of the appellant. The questions were objected to, but admitted, on the ground that the dead man was the prosecutor and that the defence involved an imputation on his character, and also because they tended to shew that the appellant did not always speak the truth. The Court of Criminal Appeal (Lord Reading, C.J., and Avory, and Sankey, JJ.) held that the questions, in the circumstances, were inadmissible under the Evidence Act, 1908, and quashed the conviction: and it would seem that they would in the like circumstances have been inadmissible under the Canada Evidence Act, R.S.C. c. 145, s. 5 (2).

GAMING—PLAYING TENPINS FOR PRIZE—PRIZE PRESENTED BY OWNER OF PREMISES—MONEY SUBSCRIBED BY PLAYERS—(R.S.C. c. 146, s. 226).

Welton v. *Ruffles* (1920) 1 K.B. 226. This was a prosecution for permitting a game of chance for gain to be played on licensed premises. The facts were as follows: The landlords of the premises were brewers and they offered a copper kettle as a prize for a tenpin contest. In order to take part in the competition players had to pay 6d. each to one Whiting who had been asked by the appellant to collect the money, and something in excess of 18s. was so collected. This sum was paid to the appellant and the balance retained by Whiting. On the transaction being called in question the appellant, on the advice of the brewers, paid the 18s. to a hospital. The magistrates convicted the appellant. On an appeal from the conviction it was contended that the kettle having been provided for by a third party and not paid for out of the entrance fees, no offence had been committed. On the other hand, it was claimed that the payment of the entrance fees shewed that money had been staked, and that constituted gaming. A Divisional Court (Lord Reading, C.J., and Avory, and Sankey, JJ.) affirmed the conviction, being clearly of opinion that what had been done amounted to gaming.

PRACTICE—ADMISSION OF DOCUMENTS—PLAN PREPARED FOR PURPOSE OF ILLUSTRATION—ABSENCE OF NOTICE TO ADMIT—COSTS OF PROVING—(ONT. RULE 671).

Hayes v. *Brown* (1920) 1 K.B. 250. The simple point involved in this case was whether a plan prepared for the purpose of illustrating the locality where a horse was killed, which was the subject of the action, should have been included in a notice to admit in order to entitle the plaintiff to the costs of it. The County Court Judge allowed the plaintiff the costs of the plan