

Alleged Non-performance of.—Work said to have been performed, if any, upon an adjoining claim. *Re Miller v. Babayan*133

Clearing the Land.—Clearing the land for agricultural purposes is not a proper compliance with the requirements of the Mining Act with respect to working conditions. *Re Baker and Benbow*183

Forest Reserve—Permission to Work.—Mining Claim TRS. 2509 was recorded on the 6th of September, 1911. The last period of work became in default. S. restaked on the 7th of August, 1915, and C. on the 10th. C. recorded and S. disputed. The question for determination was, when did forfeiture occur with respect to T.R.S. 2509? Held, the time elapsing between the delivery of an application to work and its acceptance being excluded, sec. 79 (B), and the day of recording also being excluded (*Burns v. Hall*), 20 O. W. R. 526, the claim was not open for restaking on the 7th of August. NOTE.—In fixing the time within which the last period of work should have been performed on the forfeited claim the several Orders-in-Council of the 17th of August and 23rd October, 1914, extending the time for working conditions 8 months, were applied. *Re Steep and Cochrane*280

Extension of Time—Orders-in-Council of 17th August and 23rd October, 1914. Construction of in regard to requirements of sec. 78 of Act. *Re Beauregard and Hebert and Bouvrette*299

Extension of Time—Co-owner — *Application Under Sec. 81 of the Act—Restaking by Co-owner.* *Re McRae and Hitchcock v. Jordan*310

Report of Work—Affidavit Verifying Report Untrue—Forfeiture—Restaking. *McDonald and Pinelle et al.*.....313

WORKING PERMIT.

Evidence of an Honest Attempt to Make a Discovery.—*Re Coutts and Aman*289