ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 62, line 17, add: "A life iusurauce agent sent to the company a series of bogus applicatious, selecting the names of persons in the locality. He kept up the premiunus, and from time to time reported the deaths of the iusured, forging claim papers, proofs, etc. The company sent him cheques to the order of the respective beneficiaries. He forged receipts and releases, and also forged the iudorsement of the payees, getting the cheques eashed at the local brauch of the bank on which the cheques were drawn. Neither the insured nor the beneficiaries had any knowledge of the transactions. Held by the Court of Appeal that the ease was governed by the Vagliano ease, that the payees were fictitious persons, and that the bank paying the cheques was not liable to the company: London Life Insurauce Co. v. Molsons Bank, 3 O. W. R. 858. (June 29th, 1904.)

Page 142, line 9, add: "This case is now reported in 7 O. L. R. 90. The judgment was affirmed by the Supreme Court, June 8th, 1904. (Ewing v. Dominion Bank, 24 C. L. T. 285.) Application was made to the Privy Council for leave to appeal, but was refused.

Page 201, line 11, add: "To enable C to obtain a loau from plaintiff, defendant drew a bill payable to his own order. Plaintiff accepted the bill, and gave C the mouey, not noticing that the bill was not indorsed. Held that plaintiff was entitled to defendant's indorsement and to recover the amount: Walters v. Neary, 20 T. L. R. 555. (May 19th, 1904.)

Page 389, line 42, for "165 N. S." read "165 U. S."

Page 395, line 23, for "U. S. Q. B." read "U. C. Q. B."

A A A A

An An

An

And And

And

And

Angl

Page 405, line 9, add: "A clerk of plaintiffs by fraud induced them to sign cheques crossed generally in favor of certain persons. He then forged the indorsement of the payces, and deposited the cheques in defendant's bank where he had an account. The latter credited him the amount in its books, crossed the cheques specially, and had them cashed. It then entered the amount in his pass-book, and allowed him to draw against it. Held that the bank was protected under this section: Akrokerri Mines v. Economic Bank. 20 T. L. R. 564. (June 6th, 1904.)