

the treasurer and the last chance for redemption disappeared.

Jackson when asked as to the letters he sent being addressed to Liberty St., answered "The only address I ever knew," p. 39.

Such is the precise fact; that is the only address he knew and that was the address lodged with the department by the plaintiff as his address and that direction the plaintiff never revoked.

The learned Judge finally held that the address of the plaintiff was not known to the treasurer (for the time being). That conclusion on this evidence I am unable to follow. The statutory notice called for by sec. 165, which is an essential pre-requisite before the right of redemption can be extinguished by a tax deed, says it is to be sent to the owner's address "if known to the treasurer." What is the meaning of that? Not his personal knowledge as an individual but the knowledge which he has or is required to have as an official. Here the new treasurer knew nothing *per se* of the address of a West Toronto taxpayer, but he was required to possess himself of the knowledge held by the department which was taken over by the city. The evidence is simply overwhelming that to the municipality of Toronto Junction, later West Toronto and the treasurer, assessors and collectors and clerks of that place the address and the only address they would regard was that given by the plaintiff and known to them all and acted on by them all for nearly 20 years. None of the official notices in all these years had miscarried or been returned to the senders. Why was there a break as to this most important of all the statutory notices required? A lame excuse is given; granting the truth of all said by Jackson, at most it is that two private letters did not get to the address given by the plaintiff. That did not import a revocation; it may have given rise to a doubt as to whether the address was a right one and such a doubt may exculpate the officer or the treasurer from a charge of culpable mistake, but it does not exonerate either from fulfilling the statutory requirement. They knew the address given by the plaintiff and they should have acted as theretofore in sending the official notice to that and no other address. It would then have been received by the plaintiff and his land would have been redeemed. The mandate of the plaintiff was to send to that address—that was, as con-