

arbitrators appointed to adjust the accounts between the Dominion and the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec,

Held, affirming said award, that the subsidy to the provinces under s. 118 was payable from the 1st of July, 1867, but interest on the excess of debt should not be deducted until 1st January, 1868; that unless expressly provided interest is never to be paid before it accrues due; and that there is no express provision in the B. N. A. Act that interest shall be deducted in advance on the excess of debt under sec. 118.

By 36 Vic., c. 30 (D), passed in 1873, it was declared that the debt of the Province of Canada at the Union was then ascertained to be \$73,006,088.84 and that the subsidies should thereafter be paid according to such amount. By 47 Vic., c. 4, in 1884, it was provided that the accounts between the Dominion and the provinces should be calculated as if the last mentioned acts had directed that such increase should be allowed from the coming into force of the B. N. A. Act, and it also provided that the total amount of the half-yearly payments which would have been made on account of such increase from July 1st, 1867, to Jan. 1st, 1873, with interest at 5 per cent from the day on which it would have been so paid to July 1st, 1884, should be deemed capital owing to the respective provinces bearing interest at 5 per cent, and payable after July 1st, 1884, as part of the yearly subsidies.

Held, affirming the said award, Gwynne, J., dissenting, that the last mentioned acts did not authorise the Dominion to deduct in advance from the subsidies payable to the provinces half-yearly, but leaves such deduction as it was under the B. N. A. Act.

Ritchie, Q.C., & Hogg, Q.C., for appellant.

Irving, Q.C., & Moss, Q.C., for respondent, Province of Ontario.

Girouard, Q.C., & Hall, Q.C., for respondent, Province of Quebec.

DEFENCE AGAINST BURGLARS.

People are urging some authoritative declaration as to the right of every citizen to shoot his own burglar, or as one man puts it, 'as to the law in this country as to the right of self-defence against Messrs. Sikes & Co.' Mr. Justice Grantham not long since gave a ruling on the subject, but the opinion of that single judge is not regarded by the public as a sufficient authority for not hesitating to shoot. Stephen's 'Digest,' Art. 220 (5th edit.