## THE ONTARIO WEEKLY REPORTER. [VOI

[VOL. 24

A. M. Lewis and F. F. Treleaven, for the plaintiff.

H. E. Rose, K.C., and T. Hobson, K.C., for the defendant.

HON. SIR WM. MULOCK, C.J.EX.D. (V. V.):—The members of this Court are unanimously of opinion that the judgment appealed from is right, and the appeal should be dismissed with costs.

HON. MR. JUSTICE RIDDELL:—In my opinion the dictum of Eve, J., in Bromet v. Neville (1908), 53 Sol. J. 321, (cited on behalf of the appellant and referred to in Fry on Specific Performance, 5th ed., para. 525, p. 269), to this effect (as stated in the head-note), that "it is not every excess of authority by an agent that will vitiate a contract, and where such excess is not unreasonable, it will not operate to prevent specific performance of the contract," is not a binding authority, as it was obiter and not necessary to the decision arrived at.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

192