

by the answers given by the appellant, and by her refusal to answer upon cross-examination on her affidavit. From what appears, I think it of advantage to the appellant to put an end to this contest about a bill of costs between her and the solicitor, and so dismiss the appeal. . . . I do so because I realize that, under the special circumstances of this case, if the truth between the parties could be arrived at, it would be impossible, where so small amount of money is involved, to give the applicant adequate redress if she should be entitled to succeed.

Appeal dismissed without costs.

FERGUSON, J.

MAY 4TH, 1903.

CHAMBERS.

PREET v. MALANEY.

Pleading—Statement of Defence—Application to Strike out Irrelevant Matter.

Appeal by defendant Annie Malaney from order of Master in Chambers (ante 388) striking out part of statement of defence.

W. J. Clark, for appellant.

F. A. Anglin, K.C., for plaintiff.

FERGUSON, J., affirmed the Master's order, and dismissed the appeal with costs.

CARTWRIGHT, MASTER.

MAY 5TH, 1903.

CHAMBERS.

MORAN v. McMILLAN.

Judgment Debtor—Examination of—Default of Attendance on Adjourned Appointment—Costs.

Motion by plaintiff for an order requiring defendant to attend at his own expense for the conclusion of his examination as a judgment debtor.

W. N. Ferguson, for plaintiff.

F. C. Cooke, for defendant.

THE MASTER.—On the material I have come to the conclusion that there was a misunderstanding between the counsel. No doubt plaintiff's counsel was anxious to have the examination proceeded with at the somewhat unusual hour of 8.30 a.m., and held out hopes of being able to conclude in half an hour. The defendant was equally pleased at the prospect of escaping from the unpleasant ordeal within a