Held, that the report of the Master under such reference was not subject to the provisions of Rule 848 as to confirmation by filing and lapse of time, but that any time after it was made, a motion for judgment upon it was in order under Rule 753, and upon such motion the Court could adopt it wholly or in part, and any party dissatisfied with it might, before or on the return of the motion for judgment, move to set it aside or vary it.

W. H. Blake for the plaintiff. Langton for the defendant.

FERGUSON, J.]

Feb. 10.

IN RE MURRAY.

infants—Service on official guardian—Quieting Titles Act.

In a proceeding by petition under the Quietng Titles Act service on the official guardian is good service upon infants who are required to be notified of the proceedings.

H. D. Gamble for petitioner.

FALCONBRIDGE, J.]

[Feb. 18.

PAYNE v. NEWBERRY.

Costs—Security for—Motion for judgment under Rule 739—Rule 1251.

Since the passing of Rule 1251, the practice sanctioned by *Doer* v. *Rand*, 10 P.R., 165, and *Anglo-American Casings Co.* v. *Rowlin*, ib., 391, is no longer applicable.

And where a plaintiff against whom a præcipe order for security for costs had been obtained, moved to set it aside, and for judgment under Rule 739, without paying \$50 into Court under Rule 1251, his motion was dismissed.

E. Taylour English for plaintiff.

Douglas Armour for defendant.

Q.B.D., Ct.]

[Feb. 12.

DANAHER v. LITTLE.

Costs—Scale of—Jurisdiction of County Court
—Title to land.

The plaintiff, by his statement of claim, alleged that he was and had been for more than six years the owner of certain land, which was unoccupied, and claimed damages for timber cut

by the defendant on such land. The defendant by his statement of defence, disputed the plaintiff's claim, and set up certain facts by way of confession and avoidance. The action was brought in the High Court, but the plaintiff recovered only \$120 damages.

Held, that under the pleadings the plaintiff was obliged to prove his title to the land, and therefore the County Court would have had no jurisdiction, and the costs should be on the scale of the High Court.

J. B. Clarke for plaintiff. Langton for defendant.

FALCONBRIDGE, J.]

[Feb. 18.

CENTRAL PRESS ASSOCIATION v. AMERICAN PRESS ASSOCIATION.

Discovery—Examination of officer of company —Refusal to attend—Motion to strike out company's defence.

There is no power to strike out the defence of an incorporated company for the refusal of an officer to attend for examination for discovery. Badgerow v. Grand Trunk Railway Co., 13 P.R., 132, approved.

McCrimmon for plaintiffs.

C. J. Holman for defendants.

Law Students' Department.

EXAMINATION BEFORE HILARY
TERM: 1800.

CERTIFICATE OF FITNESS.

Mercantile Law-Statutes-Practice. Examiner-R. E. KINGSFORD.

- sale for B. by fraudulent misrepresentation at a high price. A. is subsequently compelled by the purchaser to refund the money. He is then sued by B. to recover the price. How far should he succeed? Why?
- 2. What is a Charter Party? What are its customary stipulations?
- 3. A. is mortgagee of chattels under a chattel mortgage whereby the mortgage debt is to be