

The Toronto World

FOUNDED 1880.
A Morning Newspaper published
Every Day in the Year.
WORLD BUILDING, TORONTO.
Corner James and Richmond Streets.
TELEPHONE CALLS:
Main 3305—Private Exchange Connecting
All Departments.
\$8.00

will pay for the Daily World for one
year, delivered in the City of Toronto,
or by mail to any address in Canada,
Great Britain or the United States.

\$2.00
will pay for the Daily World for one
year, by mail to any address in Canada
or Great Britain. Delivered in Toronto
or for sale by all newsdealers and news-
boys at five cents per copy.
Postage extra to United States and all
other foreign countries.
Main 5305

Is The World's New Telephone
Number.

THURSDAY MORNING, MAY 11, 1911

SIR WILFRID LAURIER AND THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

According to Le Canada, generally
understood to voice the views of Sir
Wilfrid Laurier, the true reason of his
decision to adjourn parliament and
attend the imperial conference is his
apprehension that a proposal for
federalism will be brought forward.
This announcement may quite
likely be inspired, since it accords with
the attitude adopted by the premier
at the conference of 1907. Le Canada
infers that the revival of the project
of recent date, but this is hardly
correct, since the creation of an im-
perial advisory council was suggested
by the government of New Zealand
some time ago. On April 27 a memo-
rial was presented to Mr. Asquith,
signed by 232 members of the British
parliament on both sides of the house,
and urging support of the proposal.
Mr. Asquith gave the deputation a
sympathetic reception and promised to
bring the memorial before the confer-
ence.

The subject was incidentally discussed
at the 1907 conference and Sir
Wilfrid Laurier intimated that his
government demurred to the idea of
creating a permanent committee to sit
in London and thought it preferable
to keep the conferences to their pre-
sent composition without any more
power than they then had. He even
objected to the idea of having a sec-
retariat, on the ground that such a
body would, in the necessity of
things, be always inclined to act in-
dependently. Sir Wilfrid went on to
state that he shared altogether the
view of Lord Elgin, then secretary of
state for the colonies, and chairman
of the conference, that for the pre-
sent no such body should exist, but
that on the principle of responsible
government, no one should give ad-
vice of any kind except a man who
is responsible directly to the people.
There is no reason to think that Sir
Wilfrid Laurier has changed his opin-
ion and will now support the estab-
lishment of any permanent imperial
conference, however restricted to
purely advisory functions.

MODERN MORALITY PLAY.

A considerable amount of popularity
has attended the production of the
modern morality play "Everywoman"
in New York. It is an excellent sym-
ptom of the reaction that must set
in sooner or later against the homesick,
thoughtless, loveless and hopeless ten-
dencies that prevail at present in
many phases of what is called society.
Pleasure supplants the home, sensa-
tion drowns thought, passion takes
the place of love, and the future only
holds dread. There are broad colors
and strong contrasts of course, in
"Everywoman," but the lesson is evi-
dently an acceptable one. In the home
is the basis of society. Whatever
constitution of moral, ethical and so-
cial standards there may be, it is
pretty clear that the evolution of
the home unit will not be lost sight of.
In the play Truth leads Everywoman
home again, and there she finds Love.

THE BOARD AND ITS DUTY.

Mayor Goard is perfectly right in
opposing the preposterous contention
that the Ontario Railway and Muni-
cipal Board has anything to say about
the profit or loss of municipal under-
takings. The board was established
to facilitate the despatch of muni-
cipal business, not to obstruct; to take
the part of the people against the
corporations; not to tell the people to
sit still and be fleeced.
It looks as if the board had been
having some bad advice lately.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

In no civilized country is the inter-
minable struggle between organized
labor and organized capital more con-
tinuously severe than in the United
States. The opposing forces are once
more in close combat over responsi-
bility for the explosion that wrecked
the offices of The Los Angeles Times
in October last, and for other explo-
sions which have occurred in various
parts of the republic during recent
years. According to that section of
the press which more or less repre-
sents the capitalist class, these explo-
sions were directed against buildings
where structural iron was used, the
implications being that they were at-
tributable to the workers' union and
intended to intimidate the employers
who maintain "open shops." The re-
cent arrest of a prominent official of
the International Association of Bridge
and Structural Iron Workers and two
other men charged with complicity in
the Los Angeles explosion, and the
subsequent removal from Indiana to Cal-

fornia, have stirred labor circles to
their depths.

Of equal gravity are the counter
charges made by the spokesmen of or-
ganized labor. In brief they claim that
responsibility for the explosions, in so
far as they were due to external causes,
rests with the capitalist class, and
that have united in a supreme effort
to crush trades unionism in the United
States. They charge a private detec-
tive conspiracy in connection with
which the law governing the extradi-
tion of accused parties from one state
to the jurisdiction of another, and the
rights of the accused to legal advice
and to a hearing in court have been
entirely disregarded. Whatever may
be thought of these charges and cross
charges, the mere fact that they have
been made testifies to the unhealthy
state of the industrial and social con-
ditions of the United States, and it
would be wrong to minimize the irre-
gularities alleged to have occurred in
the Indiana procedure. Wealthy male-
factors have succeeded in fighting ex-
tradition for years, and there cannot
be one law for the rich and another
for the worker. Meantime, the pru-
dent course is to suspend judgment
until the real facts have been ascer-
tained.

TAFT'S WEDGE.

That section of the Canadian press
that favors reciprocity rights severely
shy of President Taft's now famous
declaration that the forces making for
closer union of the empire will derive
an impetus from its rejection. Con-
versely the president evidently be-
lieves that reciprocity will prevent that
movement and bring Canada within
the sphere of influence of the United
States. The president is not accus-
tomed to speak at random and there
is not the slightest doubt that he be-
lieves and meant precisely what he
said. Perhaps in his anxiety to con-
ciliate United States sentiment he for-
got that his desire to checkmate the
forces at work to make Canada part
of an imperial, commercial band reach-
ing from England round the world to
England again, might not be equally
effective in the Dominion. But again
his disclosure acquires all the more
significance on that account. With its
accustomed effrontery The Globe
doubtless editorially the other day
whether President Taft really uttered the
words attributed to him in its own
report of the American newspaper
men's banquet. He has had ample
time to contradict record as responsi-
ble for a policy designed to separate
Canada from the empire, toward which
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, his colleagues, his
party and his press profess absolute
loyalty.

TELEPHONE EXCHANGE.

It seems pretty clear that if the Bell
Telephone Co. cannot manage to run
a long distance telephone trunk line,
the province should take over this
branch of the business at once. There
is more business than the Bell Co. and
the independent companies can handle,
and all that is needed is an indepen-
dent authority to link up all the var-
ious local companies and the Bell
branches. The reluctance of the Bell
Co. to acquiesce in such a plan indi-
cates the profitable nature of the busi-
ness, and we suspect that it is not so
much the difficulty of handling the
business as the painfulness of parting
with any share of the gains that
causes the deadlock.

If the Bell Company had given the
service which the independent compa-
nies give their monopoly would not have
been disturbed, but the usual greed
of corporations prevented that course
being adopted.

They had better elect Theodore to
succeed Porfirio.

Rev. R. J. Campbell is said to be
contemplating a visit to Canada. This
is a great opportunity for the heres-
y-busters. Mr. Campbell actually be-
lieves that a man can and should live
a Christlike life.

KINGSTON ROAD SIDEWALKS.

Editor World: "I would so much like
to call attention to the rotten
walk on the north side of Queen-
street, east of the Kingston-road to
Woodbine-avenue; also from Queen-
street north to Kingston-road. The
chairman of the board of works seems
to pay no attention to any complaints
east of the Kingston-road.

AT OSGOODE HALL.

ANNOUNCEMENTS.

10th May, 1911.
Motions set down for single court
for Thursday, 11th inst., at 11 a.m.
1—Livingstone v. Livingstone.
2—Munro v. Mitchell.
3—Smyth v. Manteuffel.
4—Re Adanti estate.
5—Lund v. Worthington.

Peremptory list for divisional court
for Thursday, 11th inst., at 11 a.m.
1—Re Sturmer and Beaverton.

Peremptory list for court of appeal
for Thursday, 11th inst., at 11 a.m.
1—Euclid-ave. Trust Co. v. Holes (to
be continued).
2—Carter v. Canadian Northern
Railway Co.
3—Warren v. Forest.
4—Harley v. Canada Life Assurance
Co.

Master's Chambers.
Before Cartwright, K.C., Master.
The Quebec Bank v. Marsh v. Margh

CANADA PERMANENT

ONE DOLLAR

opens an interest-bearing de-
posit account. No account is
too small to be afforded

EVERY FACILITY

TORONTO ST. TORONTO.

MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Thomson (Kingstone & Co.) for
plaintiff. Motion by plaintiff
to leave to issue a concur-
rent writ for service out of the juris-
diction. Order made.

Crowther v. Town of Cobourg—E.
N. Armour, for the town. J. MacGregor,
for plaintiff. Motion for order
requiring plaintiff to elect, against
which defendant she will proceed, or
to amend. Motion enlarged until 15th
inst., with stay of proceedings mean-
time.

Tucker v. C. P. Ry.—McCormick
(MacMurchy & Co.) for defendants.
Motion by defendants on consent for
order made, declaring that respon-
dent, for an order dismissing ac-
tion without costs. Order made.

Atteaux Dye Co. v. Polson Iron
Works—Day (Aylesworth & Co.) for
defendants. Motion by defendants on
consent, for an order dismissing ac-
tion without costs. Order made.

Denison v. Bakin—G. T. Denison, Jr.,
for plaintiff. Motion by plaintiff for
a final order of foreclosure. Order
made.

Re ex rel Slater v. Honan—A. C.
Kingstone (St. Catharines) for relator.
F. W. Griffiths (Niagara Falls) for
respondent. Motion by relator to have
the election of respondent by plaintiff
set aside. Reserved.

Judges' Chambers.
Before Meredith, C. J.
Re Anthony Wagner—A. Spotton
(Harriston), for petitioner. No one
contra. A petition by Annie Diemert
for an order declaring Anthony Wag-
ner to be a person of unsound mind.
Order made, declaring that respon-
dent, thru disease and age, is incap-
able of managing his affairs. Refere-
nce to local master at Walkerton, to
appoint a committee to administer the
other members of the family, such
notice to be given to the members of
the family residing in the United
States, by registered letter.

Telfer v. Dun—H. E. Rose, K.C.,
for W. C. Matthews. H. M. Mowat,
K.C., for plaintiff. Motion by W. C.
Matthews for leave to appeal from the
order of Britton, J., of 8th inst.,
ordering the said Matthews to at-
tend in court and answer the ques-
tions asked, saving all just ex-
ceptions. Motion refused with costs.

Single Court.
Before Meredith, C. J.
Re Adanti estate—J. T. White, for
administrator, et al. Motion by the
National Trust Co., administrators of
the estate of Anibal Adanti, under
the Trustee Act and under C. R. 338,
for advice of court as to payment of
insurance moneys and moneys received
as damages for the death of Anibal
Adanti. Enlarged for further infor-
mation until 11th inst. The official
guardian to be named.

Gord v. Small—E. C. Cattnach, for
defendant. W. M. McClelland (Ham-
ilton), for plaintiff. Motion by defen-
dant for advice of court as to the ques-
tions of law raised by the pleadings
before the trial. No order made.
Costs of motion in the cause to the
successful party.

Trial.
Before Mulock, C.J.
Quinto v. Bishop—R. A. Agnew for
plaintiff. T. N. Pihlman for defendant.
An action under the Workmen's Com-
pensation for Injuries Act for damages
for injury sustained by plaintiff when
in defendant's employment. Plain-
tiff, a laborer, was employed by de-
fendant company, who were erecting a
concrete dam on the River, work-
ing at a mixer machine for making
concrete. On Sunday, Nov. 13,
1909, defendant's foreman ordered
plaintiff to assist in erecting a
crib work of square timber, and whilst
so engaged he slipped and fell from
the wet and icy timber, sustaining the
injury sued for.

Judgment: I think the case comes
within the act. There is no evidence to
show that the accident was caused by
want of care on the part of plaintiff.
The injury he sustained is a serious
character, and I award him \$1500
damages and \$10.50 arrears of wages
owing to him, with costs of the ac-
tion.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

Judgment: It is urged on behalf
of the defendants that they have all
the rights in regard to bridges that
under the judgment in the Toronto
case it has been held they have in
regard to streets. The whole case
rests upon the decision in the
Toronto case, and I award the plain-
tiffs the costs of the action.

Before Latchford, J.
Haldimand v. Bell Telephone Co.—
T. C. Meredith, K.C., and T. A. Sald-
er, K.C., for plaintiff. G. S. Staun-
ton, K.C., for defendant. This is an
action by the County of Haldimand
for a declaration that the defendants
have not the right to erect telephone
poles upon a bridge built by the plain-
tiffs over the Grand River in the
Village of Niagara, for a manda-
tory injunction commanding the de-
fendants to remove their poles and
wires from the bridge.

age, and this action must be dis-
missed with costs.

Divisional Court.

Before the Chancellor, Latchford, J.:
Stewart v. Kribbe—C. S. Dunbar
(Guelph) for plaintiff. D. C. Ross
for defendant. An appeal by plaintiff
from the judgment of the second di-
visional court of Waterloo of March 28,
1911. An action to recover \$148.15, be-
ing balance claimed by plaintiff to be
due and owing upon a bill of exchange
drawn by plaintiff and accepted by
defendant for certain flooring bought
from plaintiff by defendant. Defen-
dant denied liability on ground that
flooring was not as represented. At
trial judgment of non suit was given
on ground of partial failure of con-
sideration. Appeal allowed. Judgment
below set aside and a new trial order-
ed. Leave to defend to counter
claim if so advised. Costs of former
trial and of this appeal to be in dis-
cretion of judge at new trial.

Re Milne and Township of Thorold.
J. Haverson, K.C., for Milne. W. L.
Ross, K.C., and H. S. White, for the
township. An appeal by D. Milne,
from the order of Sutherland, J., of
April 10, 1911. This was the case in
which the ballots were marked "For
the bylaw," "against the bylaw," in-
stead of "For local option," "Against
local option." Appeal argued and dis-
missed with costs.

Toronto General Trust Corporation v.
Robins—D. O'Connell for defendants.
Robins, C. Bell, K.C., for plaintiff.
An appeal by defendants Robins from
the order of Sutherland, J., of 12th
April, 1911. This was a question of
account in a mortgagee's suit. After
partial argument it was referred to
Middleton, J., to go thru the accounts
and argument of appeal to be resumed
at next sittings of court on 5th June
next.

Robins v. Hees—J. G. O'Donoghue
for plaintiffs. A. J. Thomson for de-
fendants. An appeal by plaintiffs from
the judgment of Britton, J., of 28th
March, 1911. This was an action
to recover \$625 claimed as commission
on a mortgage of real estate. After
partial argument it was referred to
Middleton, J., to go thru the accounts
and argument of appeal to be resumed
at next sittings of court on 5th June
next.

Judgment—Appeal dismissed with
costs.

Re v. White—W. N. Tilley for
defendants. H. C. Macdonald for
plaintiff. An appeal by defendants
from the judgment of the County
Court of York of 1st March, 1911.
Court of appeal. Plaintiff, keeper of
restaurant, contracted with defendants
for supplies of fish, and alleged that defendants
owed him such a state of de-
compositure as to be unfit for food,
which fish were impounded by an in-
spector of the medical health depart-
ment, and destroyed upon instructions
of said inspector. Plaintiff in conse-
quence of being unable to get good
fish from other dealers, sued for \$600
for breach of contract. At the trial
judgment was awarded plaintiff for
\$500 damages and costs.