

added to the pay list." It cannot mean, as counsel for defendants urged, that clergymen upon the list, who, regardless of when he was added to it, happens to be junior in service in the diocese.

I, therefore, find that plaintiff is, upon the undisputed facts of this case, "junior on the pay list" to defendant Spencer, and is therefore the clergyman "to be unpaid" until the claim of the defendant Spencer upon the fund has been satisfied.

This conclusion renders it unnecessary for me to consider the effect of the "decision" of the present chancellor of the diocese.

The action will be dismissed with costs.

---

MARCH 2ND, 1905.

DIVISIONAL COURT.

CAMPBELL v. BAKER.

*Costs—Taxation by Local Officer—Motion to Review—Limitation to Specific Objections—Reference of whole Bill to Taxing Officer at Toronto as upon Revision—Erroneous Practice—General Objection to all Items—Inefficacy—Delegation of Judge's Duty to Taxing Officer.*

Appeal by plaintiff from order of FALCONBRIDGE, C.J., in Chambers, referring plaintiff's bill of costs to the senior taxing officer at Toronto to be taxed as upon a revision of taxation and to report.

The order appealed from was made on the application of defendants, pursuant to Rule 774, to review the taxation of plaintiff's costs by a local taxing officer.

Defendants, being dissatisfied with the taxation, delivered, pursuant to Rule 1182, to plaintiff and to the taxing officer, objections in writing to the taxation.

These objections, besides specifying, as objected to, a large number of the items of the bill, and giving in each case the reason for the objection, concluded with the following general complaint: "The defendants also complain that the bill generally is exorbitant, that the allowances as a rule are too large, and that altogether too much has been taxed for folios, attendances, etc., etc."