

walls of 230 and 232 reached exactly to the dividing line between houses 232 and 234, thus giving to plaintiff the full width of 20 feet 6 inches in the front of 232, as called for by his deed. . . .

According to my view, the description intends that the northern face of the northern wall of 232, no matter how devious its course may be, is to be followed and produced easterly through the intersection or dividing line between houses 232 and 234.

If I am right in the conclusion that the northern face of the northern wall of 232 is that wall which runs from the front or easterly junction of the two houses westerly through and along where the wall of 232 abuts on the wall of 234, and from such junction ends at the rear of 234 along the face of the brick wall of 232 (added by Mrs. Wood) to the rear of the house, then all plaintiff is entitled to recover is the land described in a conveyance thereof from defendant and his wife to plaintiff, bearing date 18th August, 1904. That land is of the value of \$30, and a conveyance thereof was tendered to plaintiff on 19th August, 1904.

Defendant added a storey to 234, and in doing so built in the south wall of his own house. He never interfered with or claimed any of the land on which 232 was built, or any part of the wall of that house.

Plaintiff is entitled to judgment for the land covered by the deed to him from defendant above referred to, with costs up to 19th August. Defendant is entitled to the costs from 19th August.

APRIL 3RD, 1905.

DIVISIONAL COURT.

RE SLATER v. LABEREE.

Division Courts — Jurisdiction — Ascertainment of Amount over \$100—Extrinsic Evidence—Promissory Note—Indorser.

Appeal by plaintiffs from order of MAGEE, J., in Chambers, ante 420, dismissing motion by plaintiffs for an order in the nature of a mandamus to the junior Judge of the County Court of Carleton to compel him to try an action, in the 1st Division Court in that county, against the indorser of a