

White down to the date of her death, viz., 23rd July, 1903. Apparently Mrs. White was fond of money and slow pay. She thought a good deal of plaintiff, and often when not seriously ill desired his attendance, even when a physician could do little or nothing for her. She was a woman of strong will, and insisted upon having medical attendance. Plaintiff gave up his time and was obedient to her call, so he has the right to be paid what is reasonable for his time and attendance. It is often more difficult to deal with imaginary ills and nervous trouble than with wounds or fractures or diseases of bodily organs. Plaintiff gave a very clear statement of what services he rendered, and, although he has not been as careful in his book-keeping as perhaps he will be in future, he has established an indebtedness, and there has been ample corroboration in general support of plaintiff's own evidence. This corroboration is given by defendant herself and by witnesses. I have looked at the books of plaintiff to which he referred to refresh his memory, and at certain entries on which defendant relies in opposition to certain charges. Wherever entries either as to visits or amount charged have not supported items in the accounts rendered, I have disallowed the charges. Plaintiff apparently quite assented to this being done. Apart from certain entries and from a general feature of the last account, to which I will refer later, the only difficulty in the case was that presented by the evidence of Mary Anderson. She seemed most positive that there is error in the accounts to a considerable amount, and particularly as to the alleged attendances in April, 1901, and in April, 1903. This witness is a very intelligent woman, and is possessed of a good memory, but, unless she is a person of an altogether phenomenal memory, it is impossible that she should be able now, as a mere matter of memory, without having made any note of plaintiff's visits, to tell the days and number of plaintiff's visits in certain months of the years 1901 and 1903. That, however, is quite different from some important general evidence which she gave, and which, to some extent, I accept. The greatest conflict is as to April, 1903. Plaintiff charges for 48 visits in that month. The witness says plaintiff did not make one visit in that month. Plaintiff cannot be mistaken as to all those visits; the witness may be mistaken. There is nothing to warrant the conclusion that there is any wilful misrepresentation on this point.