ants, and to meet the contention that what was done was for the plaintiff's own good.

The contention that the ruling of the trial Judge as to the admission in evidence of the examination for discovery of the defendant Spratt was erroneous, was not well-founded. Under Rule 330, a part of the examination having been read by counsel for the plaintiff, it was not competent for counsel for the defendants to insist that the whole examination, so far as it related to a conversation the defendant Spratt had with Dr. Gibson, should be read—counsel should have pointed out the parts which he desired to have read.

The damages were large; but, if the jury agreed with the contention of the plaintiff that the defendants were not acting in good faith, the damages were not so large as to warrant the Court in interfering. The jury was a special jury selected by the parties.

No objection was made to the damages being separately assessed. If there had been an objection, it should not have prevailed: McLean v. Vokes (1914), 7 O.W.N. 490. The dictum of Lord Atkinson in London Association for Protection of Trade v. Greenlands Limited, [1916] 2 A.C. 15, at pp. 32 and 33, dissented from.

The appeal of the two defendant corporations should be allowed without costs and the action as against them be dismissed without costs; and the appeals of the defendants Spratt, Regis, and Phelan should be dismissed with costs.

MACLAREN, MAGEE, and HODGINS, JJ. A., agreed with MEREDITH, C.J.O.

FERGUSON, J. A., for reasons stated in writing, was of opinion that the appeals of all the appealing defendants should be dismissed with costs.

Judgment as stated by the Chief Justice.