

Province of British Columbia.

SUPREME COURT.

Gregory, J.] EDMONDS v. EDMONDS. [March 8.

Divorce and separation—Acts of cruelty—Evidence.

Held, that the cruelty charged in a suit for divorce in British Columbia must be such as would cause danger to life, limb or health, or a reasonable apprehension of it.

Russell v. Russell, [1895] P. 315, and *Tompkins v. Tompkins* (1858), 1 Sw. & Tr. 168, followed.

2. In a suit for divorce on the ground of adultery, corroboration of the fact will be required in addition to proof of an admission of adultery made by the defendant unless the admission is entirely free from suspicion.

Macleay, K.C., for petitioner. No one for the respondent.

Province of Saskatchewan

SUPREME COURT.

Full Court.] MAHONEY v. LESCHINSKI. [March 9.

Intoxicating liquors—Sale during prohibited hours—Serving two persons at same time—Separate sales.

Where a bar-tender of a licensee, permitted to sell intoxicating liquors, sold, during prohibited hours, two separate orders for intoxicating liquors to two individuals both present at the same time and place, each man paying for the liquor furnished him, this constitutes two separate and distinct violations of the Saskatchewan liquor license law, and the holder of the license is liable to two separate penalties.

Apothecaries' Co. v. Jones, [1893] 1 Q.B.D. 89, and *R. v. Scott*, 33 L.J.M.C.15, distinguished.

A. Ross, for appellant, informant. *J. F. Bryant*, for respondent.