

MIDDLETON, J., IN CHAMBERS.

MAY 27TH, 1912.

RE MCGILL CHAIR CO.
MUNRO'S CASE.

RE MATTHEW GUY CARRIAGE AND AUTOMOBILE CO.

*Company—Winding-up—Leave to Appeal to Court of Appeal
from Order of Judge on Appeal from Master—Contributory
—Payments to Directors—Policy as to Granting or Refus-
ing Leave—Winding-up Act, R.S.C. 1906 ch. 144, sec. 101.*

Motion by Munro, in the first case, for leave to appeal from the order of MEREDITH, C.J.C.P., ante 1074, allowing the appeal of the liquidator in a winding-up proceeding from an order of the Local Master at Cornwall, and directing that the name of Munro be put upon the list of contributories in respect of two shares.

J. A. Macintosh, for Munro.

George Wilkie, for the liquidator.

Motion by the liquidator, in the second case, for leave to appeal from the order of MIDDLETON, J., ante 1233, allowing the appeal of the directors of the company in a winding-up proceeding, from the order of the Master in Ordinary requiring the directors severally to repay certain sums received by them from the company in remuneration for services rendered.

G. H. Kilmer, K.C., for the liquidator.

F. S. Mearns, for the directors.

MIDDLETON, J.:—In each of these cases an application is made for leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal from the judgment of a Judge in Court upon an appeal from the decision of the Master during the course of a liquidation. The cases have nothing in common save that they involve the consideration of the circumstances under which such leave ought to be granted.

The Dominion Winding-up Act itself, R.S.C. 1906 ch. 144, sec. 101, indicates the policy of the Act, viz., that the decision of a single Judge should be final unless the question to be raised upon the appeal involves future rights or is likely to affect other cases of a similar nature in the winding-up proceeding. Leave may also be granted if the amount involved exceeds \$50. This policy is, no doubt, based upon the view that in cases not falling