

ADULTERY.

See DOWER, III. 1.

ADVANCEMENT.

See INFANT, IV., V. 1.

ADVERSE POSSESSION.

See LIMITATION OF ACTIONS, II. 4.

AFFIDAVIT.

See ARREST, II. 2 (a)—ATTACHMENT OF DEBTS, III.—BILLS OF SALE, IV. 2, 3—EVIDENCE, III.

AGENT.

See BANKS AND BANKING, I.—BILLS OF EXCHANGE, VIII.—COMPANY, IV.—INSURANCE, III. 1—LIMITATION OF ACTIONS, VII.—MONEY, II. 12—MORTGAGE, VII. 1—PARLIAMENT, I. 2—PRINCIPAL AND AGENT—RAILWAY, XVIII.—SET-OFF, I. 1—SOLICITOR, II.—SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE, V. 17—TRUSTS AND TRUSTEES, VII. 4 (b)—WARRANTY, III.

AGISTMENT.

See ANIMALS.

AGREEMENT.

See CONTRACT—LANDLORD AND TENANT, III.—SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE, II., III., IV., V., VI., VII.—VENDOR AND PURCHASER, I. 3.

AGREEMENT TO BEQUEATH PROPERTY.

See SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE, VII.

AID TO RAILWAY.

See RAILWAY, I.

AIR.

See NUISANCE, V.

ALDERMAN.

See JUSTICE OF THE PEACE, II. 1—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS, XVIII.

ALIEN.

An alien may take, hold, and transmit property of any kind (except shares in a British ship), as if a natural born British subject. See R. S. C. 1886 c. 113, also R. S. O. 1897 c. 118.

The following are cases dealing with the title of aliens to land, which it is unnecessary to set out in full:—*Wallace v. Adamson*, 10 C. P. 358; *Doe d. Macdonald v. Cleveland*, 6 O. S. 117; *Irvine v. McBride*, 23 U. C. R. 519; *Leatherman v. Trow*, 15 C. P. 578; *Wood v. Campbell*, 3 U. C. R. 269; *Dehart v. Dehart*, 26 C. P. 489; *Doe d. O'Connor v. Maloney*, 9 U. C. R. 251; *Murray v. Heron*, 7 Gr. 144; *Iler v. Elliott*, 32 U. C. R. 434; *Rumrell v. Henderson*, 22 C. P. 180; *Doe d. Chandler v. Tessier*, 6 U. C. R. 216; *Doe d. Richardson v. Dickson*, 2 O. S. 292; *Wallace v. Hewitt*, 20 U. C. R. 87; *Montgomery v. Graham*, 31 U. C. R. 57; *Doe d. Patterson v. Davis—Doe d. Patterson v. Hewitt*, 5 O. S. 494; *Doe d. Robinson v. Clarke*, 1 U. C. R. 37; *Doe d. Hay v. Hunt*, 11 U. C. R. 367.

Creditor.—In the administration of the Ontario estate of a deceased domiciled abroad, foreign creditors are entitled to dividends *pari passu* with Ontario creditors.

Re Kloebe, 28 Ch. D. 175, followed.

Con. Rule 271, which came into force since the above decision, and which relates to service of initiatory process out of the jurisdiction, if applicable at all to such a case, merely relates to procedure, and does not affect a proceeding in which all the parties have attorned to the jurisdiction of the Court. *Milne v. Moore*, 24 O. R. 456.

Insolvency.—Quare, is a foreigner liable to the insolvent laws, being neither resident nor domiciled in Canada? *Mellon v. Nicholls*, 27 U. C. R. 167.

Interpleader.—Held, in interpleader, that the claimant, a resident of the United States, having placed the goods here, would have been personally liable to the jurisdiction of this court in any question concerning them, even if he had not employed an attorney and made an affidavit to support his claim. *Buffalo and Lake Huron R. W. Co. v. Hemmingway*, 22 U. C. R. 562.

Levying War — Autrefois Acquit.—The prisoner being indicted under C. S. U. C. c. 98, and charged as a citizen of the United States, was acquitted on proving himself to be a British subject. He was then indicted as a subject of Her Majesty, and pleaded autrefois acquit:—Held, that the plea was not proved, for that by the statute the offence in the case of a foreigner and a subject is substantially different, the evidence, irrespective of national status, which would convict a foreigner being insufficient as against a subject; and the prisoner, therefore, was not in legal peril on the first indictment. *Regina v. McGrath*, 26 U. C. R. 385.

Levying War—Evidence.—The prisoner was convicted upon an indictment under C. S. U. C. c. 98, containing three counts, each charging him as a citizen of the United States. He was charged with levying war, and being in arms against Her Majesty. The Crown rested on the prisoner's statement