

Master said that unless summary judgment could be given, in these circumstances, the Rule had better be repealed. Order for judgment with costs. Grayson Smith, for the plaintiff. A. Ogden, for the defendants.

---

STAVERT V. MACDONALD—STAVERT V. BARTON—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—JUNE 1.

*Pleading — Statement of Defence — Promissory Note — “Parental Influence.”*]—Motion by the plaintiff to strike out part of paragraph 7 of the statement of defence in each case, as embarrassing. In each action the plaintiff claimed upon a promissory note, and the part of the defence objected to (the same in each case) was that the note in question was “obtained from the defendant by the exercise of the parental influence of the vice-president of the Sovereign Bank and with the knowledge thereof of the general manager of the said bank.” He’d, that this was substantially the defence which was successful in *Cox v. Adams*, 35 S. C. R. 393. *Powell v. Powell*, [1900] 1 Ch. 243, referred to. Motion dismissed with costs to each defendant in the cause.

---