

Canada Law Journal.

Toronto, January, 1878.

CONTENTS.

PART II.

NOTES OF CASES :

Court of Appeal 21

Queen's Bench 21

Common Pleas 28

Chancery 29

ONTARIO REPORTS :

COMMON LAW CHAMBERS.

Little v. Lines. 28

Arbitration—Reference—Costs 28

Gillespie v. Robertson. 28

Stakeholder—Lien on Deposit—Interpleader—C. S. U. C., cap. 30 28

CHANCERY CHAMBERS.

Sadler v. Smith. 30

Examiner's Room—Witnesses—Contempt. . . 30

LAW STUDENTS' DEPARTMENT :

Scholarship examinations 30

Examination questions 30

Conveyancing made easy 32

CORRESPONDENCE 33

REVIEWS 38

RULE OF COURT 39

FLOTSAM AND JETSAM 39

NOTES OF CASES.

IN THE ONTARIO COURTS, PUBLISHED IN ADVANCE, BY ORDER OF THE LAW SOCIETY.

COURT OF APPEAL.

From Elec. Ct.] [Jan. 8.

RE LINCOLN ELECTION.

Defective voters' list.

Held (Moss, C. J. A., Burton, Patterson and Morrison, J. J. A.), that the right of a voter, whose name has been entered on the voters' list to exercise the franchise, is not destroyed by the omission of a sufficient description (or any description) of the real property on which his qualification depends.

Hodgins, Q.C., for the petitioner.

Bethune, Q.C., for the respondent.

From C. C. York.] [Jan. 8.

RE WALKER.

Insolvent Act of 1875—Composition and discharge. The Insolvent Act of 1875 does not contain

any provisions for the joint and separate creditors dealing independently with the estates on which they respectively have a primary lien.

Held (Moss, C.J.A., Burton, Patterson, and Morrison, J.J.A.), that a deed made between a member of an insolvent firm and his separate creditors, without reference to the joint creditors is invalid.

J. K. Kerr, Q.C. (with him W. R. Mulock,) for the appellants.

Rose, for the respondents.

Appeal allowed.

QUEEN'S BENCH.

IN BANCO.—MICHAELMAS TERM.

DECEMBER 28, 1877.

PLOWES V. MAUGHAN.

Married woman—Separate estate.

The plaintiff, a married woman, acquired a farm with her own money, subsequent to the Married Women's Act of 1872. She and her husband and family lived together on another farm at some distance therefrom. The husband sowed the seed on the plaintiff's farm from which the crop of hay seized by the defendant under a *fi. fa.* goods against the husband was raised, but the hay was cut and stacked for the plaintiff as her own property, and the husband had not further interfered in the management of her farm.

Held, that the husband not being in the apparent possession or management of the farm, and the same having been acquired by the wife after the Married Woman's Property Act, 1872, it was to all intents the wife's separate estate, and that the hay raised from it was not liable to be seized by the husband's creditors.

Rule absolute to enter verdict for the plaintiff.

J. Reeve, for plaintiff.

F. Oster, for defendant.

BARBER V. MAUGHAN.

Chattel mortgage—Renewal of.

Held, following Walker v. Niles, 18 Grant, 210, and dissenting from O'Halloran v. Sills, 12 C. P., 468, that where the affidavit and statement filed on renewing a chattel mortgage