

The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXVI.

AUGUST 16, 1890.

No. 13.

The following announcement has been made with regard to the dates of the Law Examinations of Law Society, Trinity Term: 1st Intermediate, Aug. 26th; 2nd Intermediate, Aug. 28th; Solicitor, Sept. 2nd; Barrister, Sept. 3rd; Orals, Sept. 4th; Law School, 1st Year, Sept. 1st; 2nd Year, Sept. 5th. Last day for filing notices for call and admission as students, August 11th. Last day for filing papers and paying fees for Final Examinations, August 23rd. Term begins on Monday, September 8th.

THE recent case of *Cameron v. Walker*, 19 Ont., 212, reveals a somewhat curious state of the law in regard to the operation of the Statute of Limitations. The facts of the case were as follows: The property in question was owned by Mrs. Gardiner, a married woman. In 1869 her husband put the defendant in possession, and he continued in possession ever since without paying rent, or acknowledging title in any other person. In 1881, Mrs. Gardiner gave a mortgage on the lot containing a power of sale, and the plaintiff in the action claimed title under a sale had under this power. The Court held that Mrs. Gardiner (being a married woman) was not prejudiced by the possession of the defendant from 1869 to 1876; but that on 1st July, 1876, under the operation of 36 Vict., c. 16, ss. 1, 5, 16 (O.), the disability to sue, by reason of coverture, was removed, and it was consequently not till then that the Statute of Limitations began to run in the defendant's favor as against her. Consequently when the mortgage of 1881 was given, the defendant had not acquired a title by possession as against her. And the effect of the giving the mortgage, the Court held, was practically to create a new starting point for the Statute in favor of the mortgagee, whose right of action did not accrue until default had been made in the payment of his mortgage. The result was, that although the defendant had twenty-one years' undisturbed possession without having given any acknowledgment of title to any other person, he nevertheless failed to acquire a title under the Statute, as against the mortgagee's vendee. This is certainly a somewhat curious result, seeing that, as against the mortgagor, the defendant had acquired a good title. The effect of the decision is practically to enable an owner of the paper title indefinitely to postpone the operation of the Statute—for if the time for payment of the mortgage is fixed a hundred years hence, and interest is regularly paid in the mean-