In the Village of Port Perry the Assessor's notice to the Company does not follow the form of assessment provided by Section 29. He gives the numbers of the lots and what he considers the acreage on these lots belonging to the Company, without discriminating between the vacant land, not used by the Company for Railway purposes, and the Station land and buildings; assessing the whole at \$6,200; nor does he state, in his notice, if any part of the Company's lands has been assessed to tenants; the facts being that a portion of the land is occupied by one Vickery who is assessed for \$200.00, and a further portion to one Delaporte who is assessed for \$400.00, the assessor stating that he has included the land occupied by these parties in the assessment to the G.T.R. and assessed the tenants for the value of the buildings only. This is incorrect. He should have assessed both building and land to the tenants and deducted their assessment from that of the G.T.R.

The assessment will be varied accordingly.

E. Donald for appellants.

F. M. Yarnold for respondents.

MEREDITH, J.] [Oct. 19.

O'CONNOR v. GEMMILL.

Solicitor and Client—Services in Exchequer Court—Taxation.

Appeal from the ruling and certificate of the senior taxing officer at Toronto upon a reference to him of the matters in question in an action against a solicitor for an account, that a certain agreement as to remuneration for services made between plaintiff and defendant is not binding upon plaintiff and that defendant should bring in a bill of his costs. The services were in respect of a claim made in the Exchequer Court of Canada. Appeal dismissed with costs.

Arnoldi, Q.C., for defendant. F. A. Anglin for plaintiff.

SUPREME COURT OCT. 19.

THE QUEEN v. BRADLEY. Civil Service Act—extra service.

Appeal from the juicment of the Exchequer Court. The respondent, who is chief reporter of the official reporting staff of the House of Commons, claimed \$3,235.35 for services as reporter, editor, and secretary of the prohibition commission, under engagement by the late Sir Joseph Hickson, chairman of the commis-The Government contested that part of the claim which is in excess of the actual reporting authorized by order-in-Council, and also contended that no portion of the claim could be sustained by reason of the provisions of section 51 of the Civil Service Act, which forbids employes being paid extra salary or additional remuneration. Held that the provision of the Civil Service Act only prohibits extra payment being made for the specific services an employee is appointed to perform. Appeal dismissed with costs.

Newcombe, Q.C., for the Crown. Hogg, Q.C., for respondent.

Armour, C. J. [Oct. 23. Falconbridge, J.] Street, J.

THE QUEEN v. VILLENEUVE.

Conviction—Liquor license law.

Motion by defendant to make absolute a rule nisi to quash summary conviction of defendant for that he, being duly licensed to sell intoxicating liquors, upon his shop premises in the town of Renfrew, did "permit" liquor sold to a purchaser to be drunk upon such premises contrary to the statute. Section 78 of the Liquor License Act, R S.O., ch. 194 provides that "if any purchaser of any liquor from a person