

*Vesina v. New York Life Ins. Co.*, 6 S.C.R. 30, *Worthington v. Curtis*, 1 Ch. D. 419, and *Dalby v. India and London Life Assurance Co.*, 15 C.B. 365, specially referred to.

Judgment of MEREDITH, J., reversed.

*A. G. Browning*, for the plaintiff.

*Watson, Q.C.*, and *Latchford*, for the defendant.

ROSE, J.]

[Aug. 26, 1895.

NEWSOME v. COUNTY OF OXFORD.

*Municipal corporations—Equipment of Courts of Justice—Offices—"Furniture"—Stationery—Liability—Authority—County Council—R.S.O., c. 184, ss. 466, 470.*

By s. 466 of the Municipal Act, R.S.O., c. 184, it was enacted that the county council shall "provide proper offices, together with fuel, light and furniture, for all officers connected with the Courts of Justice, etc."

*Held*, that "furniture" must include everything necessary for the furnishing of the offices referred to in the enactment, for the purpose of transacting such business as might properly be done in such offices; and the word therefore included stationery and printed forms in use in the Courts.

*Ex parte Turquand*, 14 Q.B.D. 643, followed.

*Held*, also, upon the facts of this case, that a local officer of the Courts, who had ordered supplies of stationery and forms from the plaintiffs for his office, was duly authorized by the defendants' counsel to do so, pursuant to the provisions of s. 470 of R.S.O., c. 184.

*Fullerton, Q.C.*, for the plaintiffs.

*Osler, Q.C.*, for the defendants.

[In the Consolidated Municipal Act, 1892, s. 466 has been amended by inserting the word "stationery" before "furniture" in an earlier part of the section; but the part above quoted has not been altered.]

MEREDITH, C.J.]

[Feb. 11.

ROBINSON v. SUGARMAN.

*Action—Defamation—Trade libel—Action on the case—Pleading—Particulars—Slander—Examination of party.*

The plaintiff, a tradesman, claimed damages for injury to his credit and business by reason of the defendant having sent certain hand-bills issued by the plaintiff, advertising his business to various wholesale creditors of the plaintiff, and having written and published letters to such creditors falsely and maliciously charging that the plaintiff was advertising his business and unduly forcing sales, with the view of selling and disposing of his goods to defeat and defraud his creditors.

*Held*, that the action was for libel, and not in case for disturbing the plaintiff in his calling, and the defendant was entitled to have the words of the alleged libel set out in the pleading.

*Flood v. Jackson*, (1895) 2 Q.B. 21, and *Riding v. Smith*, 1 Ex. D. 91, specially referred to.