l'ordre de la Cour ou au moins pour montrer cause. Alors son avocat aurait pû parler pour lui en montrant cause, mais comme je l'ai dit plus haut, son absence était un nouveau mépris de Cour.

Le jugement qui a condamné l'appelant pour mépris de Cour est donc bien fondé. Nous n'avons pas à juger la question de savoir si les procédés entre le juge et l'avocat étaient plus ou moins corrects ou courtois, car ceci ne fait pas partie du litige qui nous est soumis. Je confirmerai.

Mr. Justice Martin:—Appeal from a judgment of the Superior Court of the 26th of September last, declaring absolute against appellant a rule nisi for contempt, the rule being issued on judgment of said Superior Court, dated the 21st day of September 1918.

Appellant was summoned by the Court as a witness in the suit of The Towle Maple Products Company against The Canada Maple Exchange Company, and admitted that he had been in the employ of the defendant up to the 6th of September 1918, fourteen days before his examination. He admitted that he had been in that Company's employ for a couple of years and had different offices, but refused to enumerate them giving as his reason that the question had nothing to do with the case.

The objection was argued before the judge in Chambers who overruled the witness' objection and ordered him to answer. The witness again refused to answer "for the reason that the law gives me the right to refuse". The parties again appeared before the judge in chambers who questioned him as follows:

"Q.—You understood that I ordered you to answer this question, a few minutes ago? A.—Yes.