an

est

the

ind

uc-

rly

ent

ion

hat

nk.

the

z. it

and

ons

ring

ıust

iller

f by not

use.

the

nom

it is

nave

fthe

vhat

the

and

mire

tials

than

ered

the

ould

the

ce of

the opinion which I gave, it would give Fuller the possessory right, although not expressed in the original agreement in writing, and such is my legal opinion." And again: "My answer in regard to Craig's question as to the effect of marking the logs was made to Craig, but it was given for the benefit of all, and in the presence of all the parties concerned; and I consider that the marking of the logs was understood by Richmond and Carl to give to Mr. Fuller a certain right-an indefinite right-over the logs." What this witness means by the term "possessory right" is not very apparent. Perhaps he meant that the property would vest in Fuller, subject to the defendants' right to retain till payment. There is a passage in the re-examination which would seem to import that. He says, "I cannot say that Carl and Richmond considered that the possessory right I said the marking of

the timber would give to Fuller would entitle Fuller

to go and take possession in the event of a breach of

Fuller Richmond.

Judgment.

Carl, one of the defendants, has been examined as a witness on behalf of Richmond. Upon what principle that was done I do not understand, for, looking at the last order drawn up upon the injunction motion, by consent of parties, Carl and Richmond's interest in the suit is clearly admitted and provided for. Still he has been cross-examined, and the objection has been, I suppose, waived (a). Now, Carl's account of the matter is this: " James Craig spoke about security, and Mr. Robertson said he thought, according to the writings or instructions Craig had from the plaintiff, security could not be taken. Craig said he did not know that it would make any particular difference. Craig said he wanted a heavier hammer, with "J. W. F." upon it. I did not care, I said, what mark was upon the logs so long as I could tell my own logs from the others in the river. Crai said he did not care

the contract."

⁽a) Tristan v. Hardey, 14 Beav. 24.

⁴ K