cent., as directed by law, and apportioned thereon among the several municipalities, whereby $1,000,000 was omitted from the capitalization, and the aggregate value of the ratable property in N., and the amount directed to be raised there, was erroneously and illegally made up:—Held, on demurrer, a good defence, for such capitalization was contrary to the statute, and though it lessened the defendants' assessment they were not precluded from objecting, for the plaintiffs could only create a debt by complying with the Act. *County of Lincoln* v. *Town of Niagara*, 25 U. C. R. 578.

By-law Incorporating Village—*Application by Voter to Quash.*]—The persons applying to quash a by-law incorporating a portion of a township as a village had all voted at the municipal elections holden for the village as incorporated by the by-law in question; one of them had been a candidate for the office of reeve, and another had been elected to the school board, but none of them had in any way promoted the passing of the by-law, or had any part in the taking of the census objected to:—Held, that the applicants were not estopped from moving to quash the by-law. *Re Fenton* v. *County of Simcoe*, 10 O. R. 27.

Contest as to Site — *Restraining Payment.*]—On a motion for injunction by W., a ratepayer, against a town corporation to restrain them from paying for a site for a post-office, it was shewn that a vote of the ratepayers had been taken as to which of two sites (one owned by the town and the other by one McA.) should be chosen, that W. had taken an active part in support of the one owned by the corporation, and the majority of ratepayers had voted for the other. It was contended that W. was estopped by his conduct from maintaining the suit, and that McA. and the individual members of the corporation should have been made parties. W. having denied that he was aware that the site chosen was to be paid for by defendants, and no sufficient proof of that fact having been given:—Held, that he was not estopped, and for the purposes of the motion, that although McA. and the members of the corporation might not, if joined, have been considered improper parties, still they were not necessary parties; and the injunction was granted. *Wallace* v. *Town of Orangeville*, 5 O. R. 37.

Debenture—*Invalid By-law.*]—A debenture issued by a municipal council under their corporate seal, and signed by the head of such corporation, for payment of a debt due or loan contracted under a by-law which does not provide by special rate for the payment of such debt or loan, does not estop such municipal council from setting up as a defence to an action on the debenture the invalidity and nullity of such by-law. *Mellish* v. *Town of Brantford*, 2 C. P. 35.

Debentures — *Ultra Vires Agreement.*]—Defendants having received the plaintiffs' debentures for a bonus granted to them on the faith of an agreement, were held estopped from objecting that such agreement was ultra vires. *County of Haldimand* v. *Hamilton and North-Western R. W. Co.*, 27 C. P. 228.

Drainage—*Action by Person doing Work under By-law.*]—A ratepayer of a municipality cannot maintain an action, on behalf of himself and the other ratepayers, against the municipality for the improper construction of a drain authorized by by-law, when such ratepayer has himself been a contractor for a portion of the work, and has received his share of the money voted for the work in excess of the amount expended. *Dillon* v. *Township of Raleigh*, 14 S. C. R. 739, 13 A. R. 53.

Drainage.]—Owner of land affected acting so as to lead municipality to believe jurisdiction was not disputed. *Gibson* v. *Township of North Easthope*, 21 A. R. 504, 24 S. C. R. 707.

Quashing By-law—*Applicant Expressing Opinion in its Favour.*]—The applicant in this case was held not precluded from moving against a by-law by reason of his having expressed an opinion in its favour before its passage. *In re Peck and Town of Galt*, 46 U. C. R. 211.

Quashing By-law — *Applicant Voting against it.*]—Held, that the applicant had not by voting against the by-law disentitled himself to apply to the court to quash it, or to the costs of his motion. *Re Armstrong and Township of Toronto*, 17 O. R. 706.

Registrar—*Receipt of Fees.*]—Held, in a suit against a registrar by a municipal corporation for the proportion of fees to which the corporation was entitled under R. S. O. 1877 c. 111, that having received the money in question under the above Act he could not deny that he received it for the purposes therein provided. *County of Hastings* v. *Ponton*, 5 A. R. 543.

Relator a Candidate in Irregular Election.]—Acquiescence of a candidate in an irregular election—how far it disqualifies him from afterwards becoming a relator. *Regina ex rel. Mitchell* v. *Adams*, 1 C. L. Ch. 203.

Relator Voting for Person Attacked.]—The court will not set aside an election on the relation of a party who concurred in the election, and voted for the person whose election he afterwards attempts to set aside. *Regina ex rel. Rosebush* v. *Parker*, 2 C. P. 15.

A party cannot complain of the election of a candidate whom he has himself voted for, unless he can shew that he was at the time of voting ignorant of the objections which he desires to urge. *Regina ex rel. Coleman* v. *O'Hare*, 2 P. R. 18.

Relator Waiving Objection Conditionally.]—A. had his dwelling house at Bowmanville, where his wife and family resided, but he had a saw mill and store, and was post-master, in the township of Cartwright, which occasioned him frequently to visit that place, and while there he used to board with one of his men in a house owned by himself. After voting at Bowmanville he went down to Cartwright, and voted there also at the election for township councillor, which was being held at the same time. It appeared that the relator, one of the candidates for Cartwright, objected to A.'s vote there, but said that it should be accepted if he would swear that he was a resident; and that A. took such oath, and his vote was thereupon recorded:—Held, that the relator's conduct could not estop him from afterwards objecting to the vote. *Regina ex rel. Taylor* v. *Cæsar*, 11 U. C. R. 461.