debtor from any other party, or sufficient thereof to satisfy the primary creditor. Section 6 directs the mode of procedure when the primary creditor's claim is a judgment, and declares subsection 2 that the service of the judge's order on the garnishee shall have the effect of attaching and binding in his hands all debts due and owing from him to the primary debtor or sufficient thereof to satisfy the judgment. Subsection 6 of the same section empowers the judge to give judgment against the garnishee for the amount so owing by him, or sufficient thereof to satisfy the judgment. When the primary creditor's claim is not a judgment, the mode of procedure is pointed out by section 7. Subsection 3 authorizes the judge to give judgment against the garnishee for the amount found to be due from the garnishee to the extent of the amount found to be due from the primary debtor. Section 9 enacts that in all cases under the Act (except where an attaching order has been served, already provided for) service of the summons on the garnishee shall have the effect of binding in his hands the debt sought to be garnisheed from the time of such service.

If the claim of the primary creditor against the primary debtor is of the competence of the Division Court, the Court has jurisdiction, and service of the attaching order or of the garnishee summons, as the case may be, binds the debt due by the garnishee, whatever be its amount, to the extent of the primary creditor's claim, and being bound the primary creditor may proceed to recover, although in order to do so the judge may have to investigate an account exceeding the jurisdiction of the Court. The words of section 5 are that he may attach and recover; sections 6 and 7 state how he may recover. There is nothing in the statute limiting the right to recover against the garnishee, to cases where the Court would have jurisdiction to try the question of indebtedness in actions between the primary debtor and garnishee. On the contrary, the intention of the Legislature seems to have been, not only to attach the debt, but also to enable the creditor in all cases to enforce the attachment and recover in the same court, and not to compel him to go into equity to make the attachment effectual for the recovery of the debt. The Court having jurisdiction in the original matter between the primary creditor and primary debtor, that jurisdiction draws after it the right to try and determine the amount due by the garnishee, although it may involve the investigation of an unsettled account exceeding $200. It is in principle not unlike the case of an interpleader where the Court has jurisdiction to try and dispose of the claimant's rights, though in doing so the title to land may be involved: *Munsie v. McKinley*, 15 U. C. C. P. 50.

With regard to the question which has been raised as to the priority between these creditors, I think that service of a garnishee summons where judgment has not been obtained, binds the debt due by the garnishee as fully as service of an attaching order after judgment. The statute makes no distinction, but states the effect of service in each case to be the same, that of binding the debt in the hands of the garnishee. If an attaching order served after a garnishee summons had priority because it was a judge's order upon a judgment, service of the garnishee summons would not have the effect, which the statute expressly says it shall have, of binding the debt from the time of service. The garnishee must rank in the order of service, the last one taking the small balance which will be left in the hands of the garnishee after payment of the other two claims; but the two primary debtors are not entitled to have their costs paid out of the moneys in the hands of the garnishee, these moneys being bound only to the extent of their respective claims.

LAW SCHOOL—INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

The Treasurer of the Law Society, the Hon. John Hillyard Cameron, opened the Law School by an address, the leading features of which we give below, for the benefit of those who had not the good fortune to be present. As the address was an extemporary one, delivered without the use of notes of any kind, we do not pretend to give it *ipsissima verba*, but we believe our reporter has faithfully sketched the substance. It is always a pleasure to listen to a speech delivered by the eloquent leader of the Bar of Ontario, on any subject. In this case that pleasure was enhanced by the speaker treating of a matter in which he has always taken the heartiest interest, and to which he has devoted much thought and time.

The interest was kept up throughout by numerous anecdotes and incidents of early professional life in this Province, related in