DIARY FOR MARCH.

Reports.

ONTARIO.

(Reported for THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL.)

WEST v. SINCLAIR.

Mechanics' lien – Jurisdiction of Master, under 53 Vict., c. 37, to declare deeds fraudulent—Actual or constructive notice to affect mechanics' lien.

On a claim filed by a lienholder under the Mechanics' Lien Procedure Act, 53 Vict., c. 37, alleging that the owner had, after the contract with the plaintiff, conveyed the property to his wife, with notice of the plaintiff's lien; and that the wife had thereafter mort-gaged the property to one M., with like notice of the plaintiff's lien, it was

Held, (1) That the jurisdiction conferred upon the Master by the said Act is statutory, and that although the Act is silent as to the jurisdiction to invalidate deads for fraud, and the presumption of the law is against extending a statutory grant of judicial power, yet as the parties had proceeded as if the Master had jurisdiction in mechanics lien cases to declare deeds fraudulent and void under the Statute of Elizabeth, and R.S.O. (1887), chaps. 96 and 124, it was proper in the ampliare justiciam, to dispose of the questions raised as to the invalidity of the deed and mortgage.

(2) That the protection given to instruments registered prior to the registration of a mechanics' lien applies only to instruments registered by innocent purchasers or mortgagees who had not actual notice of the mechanics' lien

(3) That the notice which is necessary to postpone a tegistered instrument, so as to give priority to a mechanics' lien, must be actual notice; and that a notice which merely puts a party upon inquiry as to facts of which it is material he should have actual knowledge is insufficient to postpone a registered instrument.

(4) That seeing work being done on a building, or materials being delivered on the premises to be used in such building, is not actual or sufficient notice that a la unpaid, or that he is entitled to a mechanics' lien in temperature.

[Toronto, January 14, 1892.

The plaintiff filed his statement of claim in respect of a mechanics' lien before the Master in Ordinary, under the Act 53 Vict, c. 37, setting out a contract with the defendant George Sinclair, who was then the owner of the property. The claim alleged that the defendant George Sinclair had, after the contract and prior to the registration of the plaintiff's lien, conveyed the property to his wife, the defendant Margaret Sinclair, with notice of the plaintiff's claim; and that the last named defendant had mortgaged the said property to the defendant McCausland, giving like notice of plaintiff's claim.

D. Macdonald for plaintiff.
Vickers for McDonald & Co.
Haverson for McCausland.
Abbott for the Sinclairs.

Mr. Hodgins, Q.C., Master in Ordinary: The question of the right of a Master or Referee, acting under the statutory jurisdiction in respect of mechanics' liens conferred upon them by the Act 53 Vict., c. 57, to try cases involving the validity or invalidity of conveyances and mortgages of land alleged to be fraudulent and void against creditors and lienholders under the Statute of Elizabeth, and R.S.O. (1887), chaps. 96 and 124, though incidentally referred to in this case, has not been argued.

The statute is silent as to this jurisdiction, although another statute appears to have been necessary to give a jurisdiction to the Master in Chambers (R.S.O. (1877), c. 49, s. 10, now Con. Rule 1007) in cases where a judgment creditor is impeded in his remedy by a fraudulent conveyance; and it may be further noted that a special statutory provision was considered necessary to vest in the referee in drainage cases the powers of the High Court (54 Vict., c. 57), but no similar powers have been conferred upon the Master under the Mechanics' Lien Act, 53 Vict., c. 37. In ordinary cases, a simple contract creditor must seek his remedy against the fraudulent conveyance by action, Longeway v. Mitchell, 17 Gr. 190.

The Act of 1890 gives an original and special jurisdiction to certain judicial officers, and therefore comes within the rules governing statutory powers conferred upon a judge or officer as a persona designata. It has been held that no jurisdiction other than that given be an Act, or necessarily incident to the statutory jurisdiction, can be exercised; that statutes creating special