

reinstatement, because, first of all, it was placed in the special fund called "credit fund," and, secondly, because even the executive itself had not the power to waive the conditions of reinstatement, but that this power was vested in the convention which was the supreme body of the society; and that the member, as well as his beneficiary, was bound to know the conditions.

THE COURT dismissed the appeal with costs.

---

HIGH COURT DIVISION.

MASTEN, J.

NOVEMBER 18TH, 1919.

THACKERAY v. BROWN.

*Judgment Debtor—Motion to Commit—Failure to Attend for Examination—Unsatisfactory Answers—Rule 587—Forum—Court or Chambers—Rule 207 (4)—Notice of Motion—Necessity for Setting out Answers Complained of—Undertaking to Attend and Answer—Compliance with—Dismissal of Motion—Costs.*

Motion by the plaintiff to commit the defendant for contempt of Court.

The motion was heard in the Weekly Court, Toronto.

F. L. Webb, for the plaintiff.

A. C. Heighington, for the defendant.

MASTEN, J., in a written judgment, said that the application was to commit the defendant for contempt of Court, on the following grounds:—

(1) That the defendant did not attend on an appointment for his examination as a judgment debtor on the 27th October, 1919, and did not allege a sufficient excuse for not attending.

(2) That the defendant refused to disclose his property and transactions and did not make satisfactory answers respecting the same.

The defendant was a judgment debtor, and the motion was founded on Rule 587.

Neither of the parties was to be wholly commended on the course of proceedings in this action, nor were the answers of the defendant on his examination entirely reasonable or satisfactory. Bearing in mind the provisions of Rule 207 (4), and the consistent course of practice on motions of this kind, as exemplified by Royal