

of the injunction granted. Secondly, items numbers 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 42 relate to numbers placed opposite the names of solicitors by way of reference to the Toronto agents. This, the defendant contends, is not within the scope of the injunction; and I think he is right.

A large number of other objections relate to mistakes in the initials of solicitors, the omission of the title "K.C." in a number of cases, and the fact that solicitors in partnership are reported as practising separately. The great majority of these alleged errors appear to exist in the original material derived from the sources I have indicated. This applies to items No. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 23, 25, 27, 29, 30, 31, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49.

In the preparation of the list, Mr. Wharton has had access afforded him to other lists which are probably the common source from which both lists have in some measure been derived: hence the existence of the common errors.

In reference to some individual names, further explanation has been given. In the case of objections Nos. 12 and 14, sufficient original information was acquired to make the list accurate; but the accurate information was changed to its erroneous form by the defendant, owing to his belief that correction was needed.

Number 19, the name of the Junior Judge of the County Court of Elgin, is given as "C. O. Ermatinger," instead of "C. O. Z. Ermatinger." The name of the learned County Court Judge is given in the same way in the Canada Law Journal Almanac, which is used by Mr. Wharton by the permission of its authors; and I may say that in years gone by I have personally addressed many letters to the learned Judge, and until now did not know of his third initial.

More difficult to deal with is the case of the name of "W. T. McMullen, Local Master, Woodstock"—No. 20. This in the interdicted list is spelled "McMullin;" and in the 1912 list appears in the same incorrect form. The explanation given limps. The material said to have been given to the printer was the official list published by the Inspector of Legal Offices. This list was, no doubt, in Mr. Wharton's possession. The name is there correctly spelled; and it is said that the error was that of the printer. After giving the matter the best consideration I can, I do not think I could find against Mr. Wharton's sworn statement, by reason merely of this one coincidence. I have the less hesitation in adopting this view because manifestly much labour was gone to in order to obtain independent lists. The