probably strike him that the most marked difference lay in the greater ease and facility with which discovery is obtainable in this Province, and the much greater latitude allowed therein. A few sharp contrasts would, perhaps, illustrate this :—

Under the Ontario Practice, as a matter of right, after delivery of Statement of Defence (except in certain special cases to be hereafter noticed where no right of discovery exists) he would be entitled to summon his adversary by subpœna and appointment, or by seven days' service of notice of the appointment upon his solicitor to appear before a special examiner, and conduct a practically unlimited cross-examination of him upon oral question and answer, an examination the scope of which would be wider than could be conducted at a trial, as discovery is not limited strictly to what is evidence, but may extend to anything which may, in itself, lead to the obtaining of evidence. In England he would have no such right. At the same stage of action, or similar in this to the Ontario practice, in special cases at an earlier stage, he may make an application to the court or a judge for leave to deliver interrogatories in writing for the examination of his adversary. Before he can make this application he must give security for costs. (Order 31, Rules 25 and 26.) This security being first in the sum of five pounds, with an additional sum of ten shillings for every folio by which the number of folios in the interrogatories exceed five. Then, upon the application before the judge, the giving of leave to administer interrogatories is not a matter of course. The interrogatories have to be submitted to the judge, and the leave is given as to such only of the interrogatories submitted as the court or judge shall consider necessary for disposing fairly of the cause or matter, or to save costs. The practice, as followed, is strictly in accordance with the rules, and it is safe to say that the practice in this matter affords the most marked contrast at present existing between the practice in England and the practice in Ontario, which is emphasized by the obvious consideration, that in England the answers to these interrogatories are carefully framed by the solicitor for the party, after full consultation and consideration, as against the practice in Ontario, which requires the party to go to examination without any knowledge of what specific questions will be asked of him, the form in which they will be put and compelled to answer, as in court, upon the questions as then imme-