

drawal or cancellation of the Socialist charter was not made known to Vick or those who adhered to the original constitution, and practically there was no change in the conduct of the meetings thereafter. The Young People's element was slighted and minimised, while questions of socialism were the controlling factor. To outward appearance the Young People's Society in the hall up to Christmas, 1913, was still Local No. 31 of the Social Democratic Party. Thus we find ticket 803 (one of a series) giving, on payment of 25 cts., right of admission on the 15th December, 1913, to a sale in aid of Copper Cliff's Young People's Society, Local No. 31.

The membership books have disappeared as to both lines of the opposing claimants, which for the sake of distinction may be concisely called the Temperance as opposed to the Socialistic; but it may be taken that the utmost number of the latter was 74, as disclosed in the vote of 1912; now that number has diminished to about 50. The aggregate of those who support the action of Vick is 70; so that, counting heads and treating all as members of the original society, the clear majority is in favour of those now in possession. That ground is of itself sufficient to indicate that it is not the duty of the Court to interfere actively by changing the possession of the hall. But quære, were those adherents of the plaintiffs' side to be reckoned as rightful members in regular succession to the associates of 1903? Guided by the reason assigned by the Court of Appeal, I should take it that there was a distinct breach in the society occasioned by the ultra vires action of the then majority. They voted themselves out of the original body and established a new chartered entity, bound together by obligations to and connection with the Social-Democratic Party of Canada. They separated themselves from the original body, and the true line of associated succession is to be found in the then minority, who have remained faithful to its principles throughout the whole period. Can the separated ones seek to retrace their steps to equal status with the faithful ones, without some inquiry as to their suitability? For instance, those represented by the plaintiffs are all or almost all members of the local body No. 31 of the Social-Democratic Party. Now, it is one of the rules laid down in the constitution of the Young People's Society that a person is "not able to act energetically enough in two societies at the same time;" and those who now hold the majority may think fit to invoke that provision to exclude outstanding Socialists who are thought over-zealous in their propaganda. It is not neces-