

no difficulty in securing a conviction for perjury." It would seem necessary, therefore, to give the date of each report and the name of the person making it; for, "where the name is a material fact, it must be disclosed, and it is no answer that in giving the information the party may disclose the names of his witnesses." Bray's Digest of Discovery (1904), p. 39, citing *Marriott v. Chamberlain*, 17 Q.B.D. 154. So, too, Odgers on Pleading, 5th ed., p. 179, citing in addition (with other cases) *Milbank v. Milbank*, [1900] 1 Ch. 376. A further and better affidavit must, therefore, be made, within a week, as above directed. In this the claim of privilege could also be amended by adding "solely," if the deponent thought it wise to do so, and could so declare, in view of what might appear when the reports were dated. The affidavit on production of the Holland Detective Bureau, made a defendant in this action, mentioned: "Reports made at various times between the 20th November and the 27th December, 1912, by the Bureau to James R. Rogers." These were probably the reports mentioned in the affidavit made by Mr. Rogers, as an officer of the defendant company. This action was begun only on the 27th December, 1912, though the libel action was begun earlier. The plaintiff was entitled to the costs of this motion in any event. W. E. Raney, K.C., for the plaintiff. A. R. Hassard, for the defendant company.

---

RUNDLE V. TRUSTS AND GUARANTEE CO.—MASTER IN CHAMBERS  
—JUNE 10.

*Discovery—Production of Documents—Better Affidavit—Identification of Documents—Issue as to Release—Account—Relevancy of Documents.*—This action was brought to set aside a release given by the plaintiff, C. A. Rundle, to the defendants, as administrators of his mother's estate, and to reopen the accounts, which on the 22nd December, 1909, were passed in the Surrogate Court, in his absence, on the strength of a letter which he was induced to sign after it had been prepared by the defendants. In this he was made to say that he had carefully examined the accounts, and was quite satisfied with them, and did not desire the defendants to produce vouchers on the audit. The plaintiff objected to the affidavit on production made by an officer of the defendants, and moved for a further and better