

appeals from the Supreme Court of Canada, viz., that leave will not be granted unless the case is one of gravity involving matter of public interest or some important question of law, or involving property of some considerable amount, or is otherwise a case of public importance, or of a very substantial character. In the present case a limited company acting upon a transfer executed by attorney, the power of attorney having been signed by the plaintiff when of unsound mind, had transferred shares standing in the plaintiff's name, and the High Court had held the power was void, and the transfer a nullity. Their Lordships did not see any reason to doubt the correctness of the decision, and refused leave to appeal. This case at all events shews one of the dangers of acting on the faith of a power of attorney.

R.S.C. c. 47, s. 4—CONSTRUCTION.

In *Attorney-General of Manitoba v. Attorney-General of Canada* (1904) A.C. 799, the meaning of R.S.C. c. 47, s. 4, was in question. That act provides that all Crown lands in Manitoba that may be shewn to the satisfaction of the Dominion Government to be swamp lands shall be transferred to the Province of Manitoba and enure wholly to its benefit and uses. The question was whether the Province was entitled to the benefit of such swamp lands as from the date of the Act. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Macnaghten, Davey, Robertson and Lindley and Sir A. Wilson) affirmed the judgment of the Supreme Court, holding that the section did not operate as an immediate transfer to the Province, but only from the date of an Order of Council made after survey and selection as prescribed by the Act, directing that the selected lands be vested in the Province, and down to that date, the profits of such lands belonged to the Dominion Government.

SPECIAL LEAVE TO APPEAL TO KING IN COUNCIL.

*Ewing v. Dominion Bank* (1904) A.C. 806 was an application for special leave to appeal to His Majesty in Council. The applicant had appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada and had failed. No important question of law was raised and the leave to appeal was refused.

---

ERRATUM:—On p. 260, in the third line from the end of the page, for 1893 read 1903. And on p. 261, line 7, for s. 14 read s. 4.