

the accommodation to be possessed by taverns, and fixing the amount of license duties, was *held* not to be invalid because it omitted the words "beginning on the first day of May," after the words "license year," in prescribing the number of tavern licenses for the "ensuing license year."

In prescribing the accommodation for taverns the by-law did not limit its provisions to the ensuing license year, but was so general that it might apply to all future years:—

*Held*, that the scope of the by-law being limited on its face to the license year 1905-1906, the general words of the clause dealing with accommodation were limited to that year.

Sections 20 and 29 of the Liquor License Act, R.S.O. 1897, c. 245, considered.

Objections to the procedure of the council in relation to the passing of the by-law were overruled, the by-law being valid on its face, none of the objections having been raised by any member of the council, and the matters objected to being matters of internal regulation.

*J. Bicknell*, K.C., for applicant. *W. H. Blake*, K.C., for respondents.

Magee, J.]

WOODS v. FADER.

[Sept. 2, 1905.

*Contempt of Court—Disobedience of subpoena—Service—Necessity for shewing original.*

To bring a person into contempt for disobedience of a subpoena, it must be proved that the original writ was shewn at the time of service, as well as that a copy was delivered to and left with the person.

*J. E. Day*, for plaintiff. *G. Grant*, for defendant Fader.

Cartwright, Master.]

[Oct. 7, 1905.

McWILLIAMS v. DICKSON CO., OF PETERBOROUGH.

*Discovery—Examination of officer of company—Refusal to answer—Remedy—Master in Chambers.*

The Master in Chambers has no power to strike out the defence of a company defendant for refusal of an officer to answer questions upon his examination for discovery, nor to order him to attend again to make answer; the plaintiff's remedy, if he wishes to have the questions answered, is by motion to commit the officer.