

By s-s. 11 of the said s. 87, it is enacted that "no union school section shall be altered or dissolved for a period of five years after the award of the arbitrators has gone into operation," etc. This prohibition does not apply to the case of an award that "no action should be taken in the matter of the said petition," but only to awards effecting some change in the *status quo ante*.

Garrow, Q.C., for the plaintiffs.

Dickenson for the defendant.

Common Pleas Division.

MEREDITH, C.J., }
ROSE, J. }

[Jan. 24

REGINA v. MCBRIDE.

Criminal law—Forgery—Corroborative evidence—Criminal Code, ss. 684, 743.

This was a case reserved by the police magistrate of Chatham, under s. 743 of the Criminal Code.

There were two charges of forgery against the prisoner. The writings alleged to have been forged were a certificate of death for the purpose of supporting a claim against an insurance company, and an endorsement upon a cheque drawn by the company in settlement of the claim.

It was proved that the writings were forgeries, and it was sought to connect the accused with them by the evidence of a single witness, who testified that they had been written by the accused.

By s. 684 of the Criminal Code, it is enacted that no one shall be convicted of forgery, amongst other enumerated crimes, upon the evidence of one witness unless such witness is corroborated in some material particular by evidence implicating the accused.

The only corroboration in this case was supplied by proof that certain names written in a book, which were sworn by the same witness to be in the handwriting of the accused, were written by the same hand as the forged writings.

Held, that this was not such corroboration as the section requires, and that the convictions upon both charges must be quashed.

Dymond for the Crown.

Lewis for the prisoner.

MEREDITH, C.J., }
ROSE, J. }
MACMAHON, J. }

[Jan. 28.

STEWART v. WOOLMAN.

Trial—Jury—Improperly influencing—New trial.

Where the plaintiff was proved to have conversed with members of the jury, after they had been sworn upon the subject of his case, and, either personally or by another in his interest, to have treated them to drink, the verdict was set aside and a new trial ordered.

Lennox for the plaintiff.

Strathy, Q.C., for the defendant.