

\$1,100. Judgment for the plaintiff for that sum with costs. A. N. Fulton and J. E. Anderson, for the plaintiff. L. V. O'Connor, for the defendants.

---

REX v. SOO TONG—FALCONBRIDGE, C.J.K.B., IN CHAMBERS—  
APRIL 17.

*Ontario Temperance Act—Magistrate's Conviction for Offence against sec. 40—Evidence of Intoxicating Quality of Liquor Sold.*]—Motion to quash the conviction of the defendant, by the Police Magistrate for the Town of Orillia, for selling intoxicating liquor contrary to the Ontario Temperance Act, 6 Geo. V. ch. 50, sec. 40. FALCONBRIDGE, C.J.K.B., in a written judgment, said that, disregarding entirely the analysis of the "extract of lemon" sold to the witnesses who testified before the magistrate, there was abundant evidence of its intoxicating quality. If there was any discrepancy, real or apparent, in the testimony of the witnesses, that was a matter for the magistrate. Motion dismissed with costs. J. M. Ferguson, for the defendant. J. R. Cartwright, K.C., for the Crown.

---

RE GRAND TRUNK R.W. CO. AND BROOKER—SUTHERLAND, J.  
—APRIL 17.

*Money in Court—Distribution of Fund—Sum Paid by Railway Company as Compensation for Land Expropriated—Equitable Assignments and Orders upon Fund—Notice to Railway Company—Priorities—Reference—Costs.*] Upon an expropriation of land in the city of Toronto, an award of compensation was made by an arbitrator, and the compensation-money was paid into Court. There were various claimants of the money; and, as the claims were conflicting, an order was made on the 20th December, 1917, directing a reference to the Master in Chambers to determine which of the claimants were entitled to the money and their priorities. The order directed that the Toronto General Trusts Corporation, one of the claimants, should have the conduct of the reference and should notify all parties represented on the motion for the order, who were to attend at their own risk as to costs; further directions and costs were reserved until after report. The reference proceeded, and the Master made his report on the 29th May, 1918. Thereupon the trusts corporation appealed from certain parts of the report and moved for judgment on further directions. It then appearing that one Arnold, who had obtained and lodged with the Accountant a stop-order in respect of the fund in Court, had not been served with