

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Showthrough/
Transparence

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

Co 340

THE

UPPER CANADA LAW JOURNAL

AND

LOCAL COURTS' GAZETTE;

FROM

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1856.

VOLUME II.

EDITED BY

W. D. ARDAGH, ESQ., BARRISTER-AT-LAW.

BARRIE:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT THE OFFICE OF THE "BARRIE HERALD," DUNLOP STREET.

1856.

GENERAL INDEX.

PAGE.	PAGE.
Absconding Debtor, proceedings against, under new Practice—See Reports (Chambers).....	181
Affidavit necessary for order to proceed against, under 5th Sec. C. L. P. Act—See Reports (Chambers).....	231
See Attachment.	
Absent Defendant—Service of proceedings on,—See Reports (Chambers).....	211
Acceptance—See Promissory note, Railway Company. Specific performance. Statute of Frauds, Vendor and Purchaser.	
Account Stated—Evidence of—See Reports (County Courts). Reference of claim on, to County Court Judge, which see. Plea of—See Pleadings.	207
Acquiescence of creditor—See Repertory.....	98
Acquiescence of appellant—See Repertory.....	118
Adjournment—See Bailiffs, Petty Sessions, Suitors.	
Admission of Attorneys—See Attorney.	
Admission of Evidence—See Suitors.	
Admissions of Law Society—See Law Society.	
Affidavit—See Costs, Bail to the limits, Bailiff, Garnishee.	
Agents—Bailiffs cannot act as, in Division Courts.....	82
Delivery of goods to, when binding on purchaser.....	220
Liability of—See Attorney.....	98
See Principal.	
Agreement—Packing telegraph messages—See Repertory....	118
Written, what evidence allowed as to signature of, under "non-assumpsit"—See Repertory.....	137
To Lease—See Lessor.	
Aliens—Their right to vote—See Election.	
Amendment—See Ejectment, Record, Writ.	
Answers, to Correspondents, which see.	
Appeal—See Repertory, 118, 179, also Reports (Division Courts).....	59
Appearance, notice of, what sufficient in certain cases—See Reports (Chambers).....	229
Judgment by default—See Reports (Editorial).....	171
APPOINTMENTS, OFFICIAL:—	
Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.....	40
Clerks of County Courts.....	120, 200
Clerks of the Peace.....	100, 220
County Court Judges.....	120, 160, 220
Coroners.....	120
Associate Coroners.....	20, 60, 80, 100, 120, 140, 160, 200, 220
Heir and Devisee Court, Commissioners under.....	80
Notaries.....	20, 60, 80, 120, 140, 160, 200, 220
Puisne Judges.....	40
Queen's Counsel.....	20, 30, 200
Registrars.....	140, 200
Registrars of Surrogate Court.....	100, 120
Sheriffs.....	120, 160
Arbitration—Award, when bad in certain cases—See Reports (Chambers).....	47
Pre-lit evidence after award made—See Reports (Chambers)	48
Reference to Master to settle Solicitor's bill " ".....	211
Reference to Master to settle Attorney's bill " ".....	213
Case cannot be referred to, when entered for trial under Sec. 84 C. L. P. Act—See Repertory.....	229
Award, mistake in—See Repertory.....	158
Setting aside—See Repertory.....	158
Arrest—See Writ.	
Assessment of unoccupied lands of non-residents—See Municipal Law.....	144
Mode of collecting same—See Municipal Law.....	141
Revision of—See Municipal Law.....	193
Assignment, when Creditor acquiesces, not fraudulent—See Repertory.....	98
See Debtor, Husband and Wife.	
Assurance—See Insurance.	
Attachment—Law relating to effects of absconding debtor—See Editorial.....	16
Effect of, with respect to Suit previously commenced—See Editorial.....	172
How Creditor may lose right to—See Repertory.....	179
See Bailiffs, Clerks Garnishee.	
Attorney, admission of, to Practice—See Editorial.....	49
And Client, need not give evidence touching—See Reports (Common Law).....	198
Staying proceedings when against instructions of Client—See Repertory.....	59
Bringing action without instructions of Client, and staying proceedings—See Reports (Com. Law).....	26
Change of, Affidavit not necessary to obtain,—See Reports (Chambers).....	213
Change of, by alteration in praecipe and writ—See Reports (Chambers).....	110
Committal of, for breach of order of Court—See Repertory.....	118
Country Agent of, when liable for negligence—See Repertory.....	98
Personal undertaking of, liability for—See Repertory.....	79
Privilege of, from arrest—See Reports (Chambers).....	46
Summary jurisdiction over, after action against—See Repertory.....	158
County, appointment of, advocated—See Editorial.....	12
Award—See Arbitration.	
Bail—Certificate of recognizance of—See Reports (Chambers)	66
Notice of special bail not given in time—See Rep. (Cham.)	67
To the limits, insufficiency of affidavi. of justification as to amount—See Reports (Chambers).....	91
BAILIFFS, DIVISION COURTS:—	
Action against, protection to.....	3
Defences to, arrangement of.....	3
Notice of defence under Statute, form of.....	3
Tender of amends, when and how to be made.....	22
Payment into Court.....	22
Must be sued in adjoining Division.....	82
Agents, cannot act as, in Court.....	82
Appointment of, qualifications necessary for.....	63
What objections to.....	64
When more Bailiffs than one.....	64
Form of Judge's order for.....	64
Form of Clerk's order for.....	64
Security to be given on.....	64
To be approved by Judge.....	65
Certain acts valid without approval.....	65
Sureties, death or insolvency of.....	65
Affidavit of Justification of.....	65
Covenant by Bailiff, form of.....	65
Bond for due accounting and paying fees, form of.....	66
Duties of, want of knowledge in.....	42
Difficulties in the way of performing.....	45
Heads under which to consider.....	46
<i>Law Journal</i> , use of, in explaining.....	115
General, as regulated by Statute.....	85
Attachment, in respect to.....	141
Service of process, in case of.....	104
Custody of property, seized under.....	141
Bailiff to give up, if required by Sheriff.....	141
To forfeit double value if he refuses.....	141
Creditor in Division Court to share ratably with the rest,	141
Service of process, in respect to.....	85
How to be made.....	85
Personal, when must be.....	86
Meaning of, and decisions on.....	86
On Municipalities and corporations.....	86

BAILIFFS—DIVISION COURTS, (continued).	PAGE.		PAGE.
Non personal or special.....	105	Caution—See Clerks.	
Statute relating to.....	101	Census and Statistics—See Editorial.....	131
Wife of defendant, delivery to.....	101	Certificate—See Costs.	
Servant of defendant, delivery to.....	101	ChamPERTY—See Repertory.....	98
Inmate of defendant's house, delivery to.....	101	Change of Attorney—See Attorney.	
Grown person, menning of.....	101	Change of Inheritance—See Tenant for life.	
Usual place of abode.....	101	Change of Venue—See Venue.	
Place of trading or dealing.....	104	Cheque, crossing of—See Banker.	
<i>Foreign Courts, coming from</i>	123	CLERKS—DIVISION COURTS:—	
Not required to go beyond limits of his County.....	121	Actions against, must be brought in adjoining division.....	82
Time, before Court, for service.....	121	Liability of.....	181
Return of Summons to.....	121	Costs, how to be taxed.....	181
<i>Return in Home Court, when to be made</i>	121	Can only extend to acts done by them without authority	
Requisites of.....	121	of Judge.....	181
Forfeiture of fees for non-return.....	121	Attachment, duty in respect to.	
<i>Subpoenas, service of</i>	121	Must give up goods seized under, to Sheriff when required.....	141
How to be made.....	121	Liability if he refuses.....	141
No time fixed for.....	121	Sheriff may leave goods with him at his discretion.....	111
Expenses must be tendered witness.....	125	Caution, when necessary under 19th Rule.....	61
May be made by any literate person.....	125	Contempt, when fine for, to be entered in Procedure Book.....	101
<i>Jury Summons, service of</i>	141	Execution, duty in respect to return of, by Bailiff.....	221
Bailiff to take note of any excuse or objection to		To examine, and certify if correct.....	221
attend.....	141	To report to Judge any error or omission in.....	221
Must be made 3 clear days before Court.....	141	To tax Bailiff's fees on.....	221
Mode of effecting and return.....	141	Returns of, to be open to inspection of suitors.....	221
Notices, service of.....	141	Where transcript of judgment sent.....	221
<i>Confessions, taking</i>	141	Fees to, on entering Judge's decision on application for new	
Must accept when tendered.....	141	trial.....	21
May be taken before process issues.....	141	Increase of.....	161
Form of, before and after action brought.....	141	Not sufficient for work done.....	161
Bailiff to sign his name as witness.....	141	Means to bring matter before the public.....	161
<i>Foreign Courts, on summons from</i>	141	Grog Bill, entry of suit for.....	82
<i>In Court, necessity of dispatch</i>	163	Judgment summons, where defendant in another	
Directions concerning arrangements.....	163	County.....	101, 121, 160
<i>Opening of Court, proclamation at</i>	163	Mileage, duty of Clerk when Bailiff charges excessive.....	82
Calling Suitors.....	163	New trial, duty in respect thereof.....	2
When Jury called.....	182	Application for, after Court-day must be in writing.....	2
<i>Adjournment, proclamation at</i>	183	Should shew grounds, and be supported by affidavit in	
Proclamation on resuming.....	183	certain cases.....	2
Final proclamation.....	183	Forms of application and of oath.....	2
To act as peace officers.....	183	Practice in serving, &c.....	21
<i>Executions, form of</i>	203	Form of title to accompany posted application.....	21
Endorsements on.....	203	Affidavit of service necessary.....	21
Liability in case of negligence or delay.....	201	Form of Endorsement of date of receipt of.....	21
What can be seized under.....	201	Entry of proceedings in book.....	22
Sufficient must be seized to cover claim and costs.....	201	Stay of proceedings, delivery of papers to Clerk operates as	
Return of, to be examined by Clerk.....	201	Judge's decision, notification of.....	22
Clerk to notify Judge if incorrect.....	201	Jury should be called on 2nd trial if called on 1st.....	22
<i>Fees to, increase of—See Editorial</i>	76	When immediate execution granted.....	141
Disallowance of illegal.....	42	Facts requiring proof to be supported by affidavit.....	141
Not entitled to mileage when no money made under Execution.....	11, 236	When a stay of proceedings.....	141
Nor when no service effected.....	11, 236	Particulars to be affixed to Summons.....	61
Charging excessive mileage.....	82	In Tort, Clerk not obliged to draw.....	61
Allowed, when case adjourned to serve amended account.....	122	Payments of monies by.....	81
Affidavit of justification, whom to be sworn before.....	122	Vouchers for.....	81
For service of subpoena only allowed to Bailiff.....	125	To executors and administrators.....	81
On executions to be taxed by the Clerk.....	221	Witnesses, when attending Courts on several suits, what	
On Interpleader Summons.....	61	fees to be allowed.....	101
Interpleader Summons must be sued out by.....	61	Client—See Attorney.	
<i>Late Journal, use of to—See Editorial</i>	115	Cognovit, notes on, from Harrison's C. L. P. Act—See Edit'l.....	176
Removal of, by Judge.....	66	Cohabitation may be presumptive evidence of certain facts—	
Banker crossing cheque payable to bearer—See Repertory.....	79	See Suitors.....	161
Bill of Costs—See Arbitration, Costs.		Collector of taxes, duration of authority of—See Reports	
Bill of Exchange—See Promissory Notes.		(Div. Court).....	40
Bond to convey lands, action on—See Reports (County Courts)	157	Common Law Procedure Act—See Editorial.	
Bye-Laws—See Editorial, 133, Municipal Law.		Compensation—See Highway.	
Calls—See Law Society.		Condition precedent—See Contract, Vendor and Purchaser.	
Canada Company, Imperial Act relating to—See Editorial.....	217	Confession by one defendant after record entered—See Rep'ts	
Carrier, action by, for delay in delivery of goods—See		(Chambers).....	47
Repertory.....	80	Entered in Division Court—See Bailiffs.	
Delivery of goods to, when binding on purchaser—See		See Clerks Cognovit.	
Suitors.....	201	Constable—See Magistrate.	
Ca. Sa.—See Writ		Consideration—See Vendor and Purchaser.	

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Contempt, committing Solicitor for—See Solicitor	118	Costs, (continued.)	
In Division Court—See Clerk.		Unsettled account over £50—See Reports—(County	117
Contract for delivery of goods at several times—See Repert'y	18	Courts)	117
To sell linseed, "such as it is"—See Repertory.....	79	In special case—See Reports (County Courts)..	117
For ship building—See Ships.		Granted on account of difficulty of case—See Reports	157
Condition precedent—See Repertory.....	118	(County Courts).....	157
Subject to defeasance " "	137	In action on the case for nuisance—See Repertory.....	158
For printing manuscript containing libellous matter—See		Must be granted or no costs allowed in certain cases—	
Repertory	139	See Reports (Div. Courts).....	136
When Plaintiff entitled to recover a "quantum meruit" for		" Inferior Jurisdiction"—See Reports (Chambers).....	211
services—See Repertory.....	179	County Courts, what tariff to guide—See Rep. (Chambers)	227
For supply of oil, construction of—See Repertory.....	239	As to same point—See Reports (County Courts)	214
For supply of hooks, "as soon as possible"—See Repert'y.	239	Claiming too much in Rule—See Repertory	68
By Corporation—See Corporation.		Client not attending taxation of Attorney's disputed bill—	
Conversion—See Trover.		See Repertory	58
Coroners, on the duties—		Of application to commit Attorney—See Attorney.....	118
Appearances to be noted in relation to the body	21	Of writ of trial, where Jury discharged—See Repertory....	79
Relation of body to surrounding objects.....	21	Security for—Summons and affidavit to obtain—See Re-	
Place where body found, and examination of.....	24	ports (Chambers).....	212
Position of body.....	21	When plaintiff in infant	110
State of soil on surface where body found.....	25	When documents not admitted—See Reports (Chambers)...	211
Position of surrounding objects.....	25	See Venue, Municipal Law, 9	
Parties in attendance, conduct of.....	25	Counsel, Judge's advice to—See Editorial.....	18
Clothes on body, examination	26	County Attornies—See Editorial.....	13
Ministerial duties of—		County Council, liability of, to provide books for Registrar—	
Has power analogous to Sheriff in certain cases.....	44	See Municipal Law.....	88
Fees to	44	County Courts, jurisdiction of—See Reports (County	
When acting in professional capacity.....	45	Courts).....	178, 207
Corporation Contracts by, not under seal, not binding on—		Enlarged—See Editorial.....	154
See Municipal Law	197	Equitable, extension of—See Editorial.....	53
English cases, shewing exception to above general rule....	93	Reports of Cases in—See Reports.	
Ratifying parol contracts—See Repertory.....	139	County Court Judge—Reference to, to settle matters of ac-	
Service on, how effected	86	count—See Reports (Chambers).....	214
Notice of action, not entitled to—See Mun. Law... 106, 109,	125	See also Promissory Notes.....	213
Except under certain circumstances—See Mun. Law....	186	Requirements of—See Correspondence.....	159
Liability of, for injury caused by repairs of roads—See		See Editorial.....	33, 112, 215
Municipal Law.....	223	County Officers—Remuneration of by fees—See Editorial....	52
Repairs to streets by, then jurisdiction—See Municipal		Covenant implied; debt due from parties to firm—See Re-	
Law.....	28	pertory	138, 139
Sec. 193 of C. L. P. Act does not apply to—See Reports		Construction of, as to liquidated damages—See Repertory.	178
(Chambers).....	209	Not to carry on trade—See Repertory.	
Correspondence, Queries and Replies:—		See Lease.	
Inquirer, notice of Statutory defence in Division Courts and		Crim. Con.—Action of—See Pleadings.....	230
Editorial note thereon.....	74	Cultivate, agreement to	58
Charles Robinson, Forms relating to Probate and Adminis-		Custody—See Infant.	
tration, and note thereon.....	80	Damages—Action on the case for right of eaves-dropping—	
Charles Jones—Use of <i>Law Journal</i> to Bailiffs.....	119	See Repertory.....	157
A. B. C.—Requirements of County Court Judges.....	159	Special—See Carrier, Ship, Landlord and Tenant.	
P. M.—Insolvent Debtor Act, practice under.....	160	Days of Grace—See Promissory notes.	
Hira n McCrea—Judgment Summons	160	Debt, plea of payment in action of—See Pleading.....	137
Abishai Morse—Encouragement <i>o Law Journal</i>	160	Debtor—Fraudulent assignment to Creditor—See Repertory....	60
The Law Clerk—Answer to, "Who is the Innerius," and		Insurance on life of, by Creditor—See Repertory.....	159
Editorial thereon.....	196	In close custody, discharge of—See Interrogatories.	
Robert McCurnon—Costs in Interpleader issue, and Editor-		On Limits—See Reports (Chambers)	68
ial note thereon.....	200	See Discharge, Principal and Agent, Principal and Surety.	
A Clerk of a Division Court.—Fee for receiving Summons		Declaration, service of, required under 61st Sec. C. L. P. Act	
from foreign Court, and Editorial note thereon.....	219	See Reports (Chambers).....	184
Syntax—Defect in Law of Evidence as to fees to parties in		Defeasance—See Contract.	
suit when examined as witnesses, and Ed. note thereon	236	Delivery, at several times—See Contract.....	18
Correspondents, answers to—		On payment—See Vendor and Purchaser.	
C. M., <i>A Law Student</i> , C. A., H., C. R., S. J., R. B., C.....	32	Demand of possession—See Dower, Ejectment.	
A. G., M., Clk., A. B., S.....	61	Demurrer—See Pleadings.	
Vindex, Quere, B. C. L., J. J. R., J. M., P. R. (Spencerville)..	72	Dignity of the Law, maintenance of, in Div. Courts.....	72
J. L.....	81	Directory—Division Court.	
J. C., J. McC., <i>A County Clerk</i> , W., T. S. P.....	82	Elgin.....	40
W. M., H., J. C., J. J., T. R., F. R., <i>Nemo</i>	82	Essex	20
M. P. E., J. D., M., A. B., L. B. & Co., T. & W. J. & Co.....	112	Grey.....	60
A. C., D. J. H., D.....	152	Kent.....	160
T. H., M. P. E., H., J. J.....	191	Lumbton.....	20
Costs—Certificate for, when lands brought in question—See		Lanark & Renfrow.....	220
Reports (Com. Law)	28	Lincoln	240
Must be given at trial or immediately after—See Reports		Discharge of debtor from Custody, affidavit necessary on ap-	
(Div. Court).....	56	plication for—See Reports (Chambers)	229
In action of trespass—See Reports (Chambers).....	111	See Interrogatories, Principal and Surety.	
		Distance, measurement of—See Repertory.....	138

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Distress, joint warrant for, executed by one—See Repertory	138	Editorial, (continued.)	
For rent—See Lease, Landlord and Tenant, 97, 138, Arbitration, 58.		County Courts, the enlarged jurisdiction of.....	161
Division Courts, jurisdiction of—See Reports (Division Courts).....	39, 78, 136	C. L. P. A. "Who is the <i>Incarius</i> "	155
Treatise on Law and practice of—See Editorial.....	39	Practice, the new Rules of.....	156
Writ of prohibition to prevent removal of cause from one D. C. to another—See Reports (Com. Law).....	168	C. L. P. A. English cases, in relation	156
See Bailiffs, Clerks, Directory, Reports, Suitors.		Trial of cases, the three lists for.....	156
Documents, production of, at trial—See Reports (Chambers)	181	Summary proceedings to execution in default of appearance	171
Admission of—See Costs.		Attachment, effect of, with respect to suits previously commenced	172
Erasure of—See Falsification.		Trial by Jury, advantages and disadvantages of.....	173
Double remedy—See Attorney.		Falsification of documents.....	173
Dower—Demand of possession in action of—See Reports (Com. Law)	198	Rules of Court, by Draper.....	177
C. L. P. Act applies to actions of—See Reports (Chambers)	298	C. L. P. A., decisions on.....	191
Easement, what constitutes—See Repertory.....	79	Insolvent Court, proceedings in.....	195
See Pleadings	179	Chamber Reports.....	195
Editorial—Scope and objects of <i>Law Journal</i>	11, 12	C. L. P. A.—Answer to "Who is the <i>Incarius</i> "	196
County Attorneys, appointment of advocated	13	Reports by Mr. Robinson.....	199
New trial in Div. Courts, review of recent English cases....	15	Lat. Cases in Chambers.....	199
C. L. P. A., working of, in England	16	County Court Judges, circuitous mode of effecting resignation of.....	215
Attachment, state of Law in respect to absconding debtors.	17	Canada Company, Imperial Act relating to.....	217
Suggestions for improvement of.....	17	Rights of Women.....	217
Repertory, monthly—Leading features of matter in, useful to Magistrates and others engaged in administration of Law	18	J. Leach Talbot, Esquire.....	218
Counsel, advice to, in respect to wishes of Client.....	18	A Quaker in Court	218
Judge Hagarty, appointment of.....	18	Chamber Cases.....	218, 238
Local Courts, administration of justice in.....	33	Evidence, defect in Law of, as to fees to parties in suit, when called as witnesses.....	236
Chief Justice Macaulay—Retirement of.....	38	Graud Juries, Imperial Act relating to.....	237
Division Courts, Treatise on Law and Practice of—Notice by the Editor of.....	39	Co. C. P. A.....	238
Registration of letters by officers of.....	41	Ejectment, amendment of record at trial—See Reports (Com. Law)	169
Bailiffs of, want of knowledge of their duties.....	42	Demand of possession in—See Reports (Com. Law).....	169
Attorneys, necessity of examination of, before admission to practice.....	49	Injunction to restrain cutting of timber—See Reports (Chambers)	220
C. L. P. A. now before Parliament	51	Judgment, new practice in signing—See Reports (Chambers)	212
County Officers, remuneration of, by fees.....	52	When notice with appearance wanting—See Reports (Chambers)	213
The Bench and the Bar-room.....	72	Sec. 31 of C. L. P. Act, does not apply to—See Reports (Chambers)	214
Division Courts, notice of Statutory defence in.....	74	Service on defendant's wife, good—See Reports (Chambers)	214
Medical men, duties of, in cases of suspected poisoning.....	75	Setting up two titles in—See Reports (Chambers).....	232
Trickery and Truth, "a professional scheme".....	76	Summons in, must issue from office in county where land lies—See Reports (Chambers)	226
Important decisions last Term	76	Substitution of another defendant in—See Rep. (Chambers)	212
Division Court Bailiffs, increase of fees to.....	76	Election, contested—See Municipal Law.....	7
Evidence, Law of, parties being witnesses on their own behalf.....	77	Refusal of Elector to take oath—See Municipal Law.....	149
Common Law Procedure Bill.....	77	Right of aliens to vote at—See Municipal Law	164
Index to Vol. I	77, 136	Endorsement, special, on writs of summons—See Particulars	171
Law Reforms of the Session.....	92	Summary proceedings under—See Editorial	61, 203
Corporation, contracts by, not under seal, exceptions to general rule in England.....	93	On Execution—See Bailiffs.....	62
Reports and Reporters—Mr. Robinson	93	On magistrate's warrant—See Magistrates	62
American Law Publishers, advantages of the publications of Division Courts—Information to Officers in <i>Law Journal</i>	94	Equitable Jurisdiction of County Courts—See County Courts. Defence—See Husband and Wife, Pleadings, Replevin.	
Poisoning, arsenical—The Wooler Case.....	94	Erasure—See Falsification.	
Administration of Justice—Office of County Judge.....	112	Erata	39, 77, 97, 121
C. L. P. A. with Notes, by Harrison.....	114, 157, 176, 196, 238	Estoppel—See Tolls, Patent, Stock, Repertory.....	118
Life Assurance Company, power of Agent to bind.....	114	Evidence, Defects in Law of—See Editorial.....	236
Bailiffs, one of the uses of <i>Law Journal</i>	115	See Agreement, Attorney and Client, Arbitration, False Pretences, Malicious Arrest, Municipal Law 196, Suitors, Voluntary Statement, Witnesses.	
Political Status—Professional claims.....	115	Examination of defendant as to his assets—See Rep. (Cham.)	213
Division Court Directory, lists for, from County Judges....	115	Affidavit to procure—See Reports (Chambers)	213
Mercantile Law Reform in England, assimilation between English and Scotch Laws.....	115	Execution, sale of goods under, to creditor—See Repertory ...	97
Medical men, a more reliable educational test for, required	130	See Bailiffs, Clerks.	
Census and Statistics, new scheme for taking.....	131	Executors and administrators, payment to—See Bailiffs	81
Bye-Laws, disadvantages under which Municipalities lie in respect to.....	133	Express, malice—See Slander	158
Machinery, guards about, pennies saved, lives lost.....	134	False Imprisonment—See Magistrates.	
American Law Publishers, Reprints by Johnson & Co.....	135	False Pretences, action for money paid under—See Venue... ..	138
Chief Justice Macaulay, portrait of.....	135	Obtaining board under—See Repertory	139
The Profession, "bearded like a pard".....	135	False Representations of article offered in pledge—See Rep'y	138
Post Office irregularity.....	136	That house built on land offered as security—See Rep'y... ..	138
Law Reform, "Questions of Construction".....	153	Of Credit, damages for—See Repertory	138
		Falsification of documents, ancient erasure of parchment, and how writings may be erased and restored—See Editorial	175
		Farming lease—See Landlord and Tenant.	

PAGE.	PAGE.
Fees—See Bailiffs, Clerks, Costs, Coroners, Editorial, Insolvent Courts.	Jurisdiction, of Judge in interpleader issue—See Reports (County Courts)
Fi. Fa —See Writ. 177
Finishing articles lost —See Larceny.	Interior, commencing suit in, in Counties of York and Peel—See Reports (Chambers).....
Fixtures, right of tenant to remove—See Landlord and Tenant. 212
Foreclosure before principal due—See Repertory.....	See County Courts, Division Courts, Magistrates, Petty Sessions, Reeve.
80	Jury, Trial by—See Editorial
Foreign Courts—See Bailiffs, Clerks, Confessions, Correspondence.	Should verdict be unanimous?
Foreign Railway scrip—See Larceny.	173
Fraud, action for money had and received by—See Repertory	Treatment of Jurors
118	173
In purchasing from unadvised person—See Vendor and purchaser	Value of, in modern times
159	173
In sale of goods—See Sale of Goods.	In Division Court, when suitor wishes—See Suitors.
Frauds, statute of—See Statute of Frauds.	Grand, Imperial Act relating to—See Editorial
Garnishee, order on, to pay over monies—See Rep. (Chamb.)	237
230	Misconduct of, how may be explained away—See Repertory
Order to attach debts of, affidavit necessary—See Reports (Chambers).....	97
231, 232	Summons, service of—See Bailiffs.....
Debt already assigned cannot be attached—See Repertory	143
See Reports (Chambers).....	Jus Tertii—See Trover.
213	Justice of the Peace—See Magistrate.
General Issue, evidence under—See Municipal Law.....	Justification—See Pleadings.
186	Law Journal, what objects it embraces—See Editorial
Grog bill, entry of suit for—See Clerks	11, 12
82	Law Reform—See Editorials.....
Grown person, meaning of.....	92, 153
101	Law Society, admissions and calls, Hilary Term, 19 Vic. ...
Guilty, plea of—See Petty Sessions.	xi.
Habeas Corpus, return of writ of—See Reports (Com. Law)...	Do. do. Easter Term, 19 Vic. ...
185	xxvi.
Haggarty, Judge, appointment of—See Editorial.....	Do. do. Trinity Term, 20 Vic. ...
18	xxxviii.
Harrison's Notes to C. L. P. A.	Do. do. Michmas Term, 20 Vic. ...
114, 157, 176, 196, 238	xlvi.
Highway, raising, along plaintiff's land, his right to compensation—See Municipal Law, Roads	Calls to the Bar, Hilary Term 19 Vic.
Husband and Wife, action by husband for money received to private use of wife—See Repertory	20
158	Landlord and Tenant.
Liability of husband for certain acts of wife—See Suitors	Farming lease, covenant in—See Repertory
161, 162, 181	59
Delivery of summons to wife—See Bailiff	Action for not giving possession—See Repertory ..
104	97
Illegitimate child, delivery of goods to, when binding on purchaser—See Suitors.	Distress for more rent than due, course of defendant—See Repertory
Implied contracts—See Contract.	97
In indictment, particulars of charge in.—See Repertory	Action for damages for irregular distress—See Repertory... 138
18	Right to remove window when a fixture
See Reports (Division Courts)	179
56	Larceny, finding lost note—See Repertory
Infants, custody of—See Reports (Com. Law) 185, Repertory	19
18	Foreign Railway scrip may be subject of—See Repertory... 58
Injunction, practice in granting order for—See Rep. (Cham.)	Found articles, law relating to—See Repertory.....
209	137
See Ejectment.	Leading articles—See Editorials.
Inquest—See Coroners.	Lease, perpetual covenant to renew—See Repertory.....
Insolvent Court, Table of Fees in.....	59
180	Covenant in, not to carry on trade or business, when broken—See Repertory
Where petition to be filed	137
195	Determination of—See Reports (Com. Law)
Clerk of, generally Clerk of County Court	197
195	See Landlord and Tenant.
Costs regulated by Court of Queen's Bench	Legacy, when given as a trust—See Reports (Division Court)
195	136
Whom the Act includes	To a married woman—See Married Woman.
195	Lessor and Lessee, when contract established between—See Repertory
Fees to the Fee Fund	159
195	See Lease.
Practice in—See Correspondence	Letter, money found in, misdelivered—See Larceny.
160	Libellous Matter—See Printer.
Interim order under Act, no protection when fraud shown—See Reports (Division Court).....	Local Courts, administration of justice in—See Editorial.....
77	33
Insolvent debtor—See above.	Local Superintendent, effect of decision of—See Municipal Law
Insurance, Life, power of Agent to bind Company—See Edit.	203
114	Long possession—See Patent.....
Agent has no implied authority to waive forfeiture of policy—See Reports (Com. Law).....	166
112	Macaulay, Chief Justice, Retirement of—See Editorial.....
On life of debtor—See Debtor.	38
Marine, loss from unseaworthiness of ship—See Repertory	Portrait of—See Editorial
59	135
Law property, guarantee policy	Machinery, guards about—See Pleadings, Editorial.....
157	134
Interest—See Suitors.	Magistrates, on the Duties of.
Interim order—See Insolvent Court.	Summons, service of, must be personal
Interpleader Summons—See Bailiffs, Indictment, Jurisdiction, Reports (Division Courts), Sheriff.	4
Interpreter, Form of Oath of—See Magistrates.....	Should be in duplicate
162	4
Interrogatories, for discovery of defendant's title—See Rep. (Chambers)	When service not personal, proof of
211	5
To discover material to found a plea—See Reports (Cham.)	Construction of Statute on such service
213	5
Defendant must answer, before discharge—See Rep. (Cham.)	Place of abode, meaning of.....
233	5
See Debtor on Limits.	Non-appearance of defendant.....
Irregularity—See Writ.	23
Joint-stock Company—See Railway Company.	Warrant to apprehend.....
Judgment, by default, where writ specially endorsed—See Editorial	23, 62
171	Requirements of
As in case of nonsuit—See Reports (Chambers).....	43
47	To be directed to authorised officers.....
Interlocutory, signed after C. L. P. Act—See Rep. (Cham.)	43
183	Postponement when variance.....
Notice of trial, a waiver of—See Reports (Chambers)	43
212	In first instance, form of
	43
	When summons disobeyed, form of
	43
	Apprehending defendant.
	Constable, duties of.....
	44
	Directions to (Note 4).....
	41
	Backing warrant.....
	62
	Form of endorsement.....
	62
	Without warrant, under 4 & 5 Vic. caps. 25 & 26
	62
	Defendant must be taken to nearest Justice
	62
	Postponement of examination
	62

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Magistrates, on the Duties of (continued).		Mother, right of, to child—See Custody.	
Witnesses, compelling their attendance.....	63	Municipal Councils—See Municipal Law.	
Subpoena summons to attend.....	63	Municipalities, how service of process on, effected—See Bailiffs, 80	
Form of.....	83	See Corporations, Municipal Law.	
Warrant, when witnesses refuse to attend.....	63	Municipal Law,—U. C. Reports.	
Form of.....	83	Reg. ex re. Coleman v. O'Hare, &c. :	
In first instance, on affidavit.....	63	Que Warranto—Township Councilor, disqualification for	
Form of.....	84	office of.....	0
Petty Sessions, Court of.....	81	Hodgson v. Municipal Council of York and Peel :	
May be held by any two Justices.....	81	By-law establishing a road—Insufficient description—	
Publicity of proceedings, advantages of.....	81	Discretion in quashing By-laws.....	8
Clerk, power to appoint.....	81	Tilt v. Municipality of the Township of Toronto :	
Should be a..... Court.....	85	Quashing By-law; power of Municipality to make By-law	
The hearing or trial.....	102	exceeded.....	9
Number of Justices necessary to be present.....	102	Reg. ex re. Swan v. Rousat :	
Parties must attend at time appointed.....	102	Contested Election—Costs.....	9
Non-appearance of both parties.....	102	Croft v. Town Council of Peterboro' :	
Of complainant.....	103	Repairs to street by Corporation—their Jurisdiction and	
Provisions of Statute in such case.....	103	duties under the Statute.....	28
Of Defendant.....	103	In re the Board of School Trustees of the Incorporated	
Warrant to compel attendance.....	103	Village of Galt, and the Municipality of the	
Ex parte trial.....	103	Village of Galt :	
Provisions of Statute in such case.....	103	Duty of Municipality to raise money at request of Trustees—	
Settlement between parties before.....	122	Mode of proceeding by Trustees.....	69
Only allowed when legal.....	122	Read v. The Municipal Council of the County of Kent :	
Objections, preliminary, shall not be allowed for informality.....	123	Registry Books—Liability of County Council for—16 Vic. c. 187, sec. 3.....	88
Adjournment, when defendant misled.....	123	Perry v. Town Council of Whithy :	
Guilty, plea of, sufficient to convict.....	143	By-law, form of rule nisi to quash—Insufficient rate.....	88
Justification, plea of, when admission made.....	143	In the matter of Ley and the Municipality of the Township of Clarke :	
Course of proceedings as regulated by Statute.....	143	Alterations of School Section within Township, and of Union	
Right of reply.....	162	School Sections.....	106
Witnesses may be ordered out of Court.....	162	Snook et al. v. Town Council of Brantford :	
Oath or affirmation of.....	162	Notice of action, Corporations not entitled to—14 & 15	
Form of, ordinary.....	162	Vic. c. 51.....	196
By Quakers, &c.....	162	Magrath v. Municipality of the Township of Brock :	
Of, belonging to above sects.....	162	Pleading—Duplicity—Notice of action—14 & 15 Vic. c. 54,	
Interpleader, form of oath of.....	162	Croft v. Town Council of Peterboro' :	109
Should be sworn before examined.....	182	Notice of action to Corporations.....	125
Refusing to be sworn.....	182	In re Hawke and the Municipality of Wellesley :	
May be committed for.....	182	Sale of Town Hall—By-law for levying rate.....	129
Form of commitment.....	182	The Municipality of Berlin v. Grange :	
Evidence of, mode of taking.....	202	Assessment of unoccupied lands of non-residents—Mode of	
Hearsay statements to be rejected.....	202	collecting, &c.....	144
Claim of right, assertion of.....	222	Reg. ex rel. Dillon v. McNeil :	
Principally confined to cases of assault and trespass.....	222	Elector refusing to take oath.....	149
Action against, for false imprisonment—See Repertory.....	119	Tiernan v. School Trustees of Nepean :	
Jurisdiction of, as to imprisonment of defendant, as appearing on face of warrant—See Repertory.....	157	School teacher, how can recover salary.....	150
Have none when titles to lands brought in question.....	222	Reg. ex rel. Wallis v. Bostwick :	
Maintenance—See Champerty.		Election—Quo Warranto—Right of aliens to vote.....	164
Malicious arrest, action of, against agent of former plaintiff—		O'Donahoe v. School Trustees of Section No. 4, Thorah :	
See Reports (Com. Law).....	150	School teacher—Mandamus to recover salary.....	185
Mandamus—See School Teacher, Reports (County Court).....	178	Reid v. Mayor, Aldermen and Commonalty of the City	
Married woman, legney to, restraint on anticipation—See Rep.	60	of Hamilton :	
Land devised in trust for, restraint on anticipation—See		Notice of action—Evidence under general issue.....	186
Repertory.....	60	In re The Great Western Railway Company :	
Settlement of real estate of, when ward of court—See Rep.	60	Assessment, revision of—What land occupied by road consists of—	
Application of, to revive judgment—See Revival.		What is the road and roadway—Fixtures and erections "part of the realty".....	193
Master, liability of, for acts of workmen—See Repertory.....	138, 158	Bartlett v. The Municipality of Amherstburg :	
For receipt of goods by servant—See Suitors.....	161	Contract not under seal—Value of work done—Damages.....	197
Delivery of summons to servant for—See Bailiffs.....	104	The Chief Superintendent of Schools for Upper Canada, appellant in re Gill v. Jackson et al. :	
Medical men, duty of, in case of suspected poisoning—See		Alteration of School Sections, how made—Necessity of upholding acts of Trustees de facto—Effect of Local Superintendent's decision.....	203
Editorial.....	75	Reg. v. Municipal Council of Perth :	
A stricter educational test for, required.....	130	Improvement of highway by raising it along plaintiff's land—Right to compensation—12 Vic. c. 81, sec. 195; 16	
Mercantile Law Reform in England—See Editorial.....	115	Vic. c. 181, s. 33.....	206
Mileage—See Bailiffs, Clerks.		Snook et al. Town Council of Brantford :	
Mining, use of water for purposes of—See Pleadings.....	179	Roads, liability of Municipal Corporations for injury caused by repairing.....	228
Minor, delivery of goods to, when binding on purchaser—See			
Suitors.....	222		
Mis-statement of defendant's place of residence—See writ.			
Money had and received, action for—See Fraud.			
Recovery of, when paid by mistake—See Repertory.....	179		
Mortmain—See Statute of.			

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Municipal Law (continued.)		Pleadings (continued.)	
Barchin v. The Municipality of the Township of Dartington :		<i>scilicet</i> , without leave—See Reports (Chambers)	229
Notice of action to Municipal Council—By-law.....	224	That woman, debauched, not plaintiff's wife, included in Not Guilty—See Reports (Chambers)	230
Murder—See shooting with intent to commit.		That plaintiff had left wife, a bad plea—See Rep. (Cham.)	230
Negligence—See Railway Company.		That guards about machinery not required, a bad plea— See Repertory	79
New trial—See Editorial, Clerks Indictment Reports (Di- vision Courts.)		Denying title of defendant, as alleged—See Repertory ...	118
Non-Residents—See Municipal Law.....	141	Of payment, when no occasion for—See Repertory.....	137
Nonsuit, rule to enter—See Repertory.....	179	Of account stated—See Repertory	158
Not Guilty, plea of—See Pleadings.		Of tender of part, set-off as to residue—See Repertory...	18
Notice by defendant to bring action on for trial—See Reports (Chambers)	251	Practice in, filing without serving pleas—See Rep. (Cham.)	212
Notice not to trespass—What sufficient—See Trespass.		Striking out plea of non-assumpsit—See Rep. (Cham.).....	233
Notice of action—See Bailiffs, Corporations, Municipal Law.		Surplusage in, striking out statements in declaration—See Reports (Chambers)	231
Notice of appearance—See Appearance.		Variance between evidence and—See Repertory.....	18, 58
Notice of trial—When waiver of interlocutory judgment— See Judgment.		In an action relating to Easement—See Repertory.....	179
Notices of new Law Books:		See Municipal Law, 109; Reports (Com. Law)	152
Adams' Equity.....	110	Poisoning, arsenical—The Wooler case—See Editorial.....	91
Byles on Bills of Exchange, &c.	110	Suspected, duty of medical men in cases of—See Editorial	75
Commentaries on the Common Law, by Bishop.....	98, 119	Policy—See Insurance.	
Elements of the Law and Practice of the Legislative Assem- bly in the United States, by Cushing	198	Possession, want of, for forty years—See Stat. of Limitations.	
English Reports in Common Law and Equity, vol. xxxi. ...	100	Post mortem Examination—See Coroners.	
Do. do. vol. xxxiii.	209	Practice, new Rules of—See Editorial	156
Do. do. vol. xxxiv.	210	Must be followed when possible—See Reports (Chambers)	183
Index to the Upper Canadian Statutes.....	100	See Absent Defendant, Appeal, Attachment, Costs, Eject- ment, Execution, Inferior Jurisdiction, Judgment Inter- locutory, Jury, Pleadings, Satisfaction Piece, Solicitor, Venue, Witness.	
Jurisprudence, an Introduction to the Study of, by Nath'l Lindley	140	Precipe, alteration of, without leave—See Reports (Chambers)	110
Smith's Law of Landlord and Tenant	159	Principal and Agent—See Repertory.....	159
Table of the Provincial Statutes	210	Debtor cannot set off debt of agent—See Repertory	58
Parent, influence of, on child, and family arrangement be- tween—See Repertory	60	Remuneration to Agent for work done, when Principal re- vokes authority to sell—See Repertory	98
Parol acceptance—See Repertory.....	179	Principal and Surety—Discharge of Principal by mistake— See Repertory	210
Particulars in Division Court—See Clerks, Suitors.		When giving time to debtor, a discharge of surety—See Repertory	59
When further, may be ordered under Rules of Superior Courts—See Reports (Chambers).....	208	Printer, refusal of, to print libellous matter—See Repertory	139
Special endorsement of stated sum not sufficient—See Re- ports (Chambers)	230	Prisoner, presumption against, from conduct of counsel at former trial—See Repertory	19
Partner—See Partnership.		Probate and Administration, forms relating to—See Corres.	80
Partnership, one partner sued for debt of—See Reports (Com. Law)	197	Prochein amy, appointment of—See Reports (Chambers).....	110
Accommodation endorsement by one partner does not bind the other—See Reports (Com. Law).....	198	Proclamations—See Bailiffs.	
Debt due by one partner to firm—See Covenant.		Production of Will by subpoena to Registrar of Surrogate Court—See Reports (Chambers)	233
Action by one tenant in common against another—See Rep.	158	Of documents—See Documents.	
Property of—Trove by partner against execution purcha- ser—See Repertory.....	179	Professional claims and political status—See Editorial.....	115
Delivery of goods to partner—See Suitors	202	Prohibition—See Division Courts	168
Part performance—See Repertory	139	Promissory Notes, overdue, transfer of—See Rep. (Co. Courts)	116
Patent, purchase from patentee before issue of—See Reports (Com. Law)	166	Days of grace—See Rep. (Div. Courts)	117
Payment... See Money had and received, Principal and Agent. Pleading-, Suitors		Discovery of—See Larceny.	
Penalty in bond—See Reports (County Court)	157	Endorsement, to give bill currency—See Repertory	98
Perjury—See Indictment.		Endorsee against endorser, action by—See Pleadings	118
Perpetuity—See Lease.		Payable on contingency, void.....	139
Petty Sessions, Court of—See Magistrates.		Personal liability of drawer accepting bill for a Company— See Repertory	80
Place of abode, meaning of—See Magistrates.		Pleas in actions on, affidavit of truth of—See Pleadings.	
Pleadings, affidavit of truth of pleas in action on Bills of Ex- change—See Reports (Chambers).....	233	Plea of non-assumpsit in action on, struck out—See Rep. (Chamber-)	208
Demurrer to Equitable Replication—See Repertory	210	Reference to County Court Judge to compute on	213
Double, summons granted to plead, without affidavit—See Reports (Chambers)	211	When Company liable on—See Railway Company.	
Equitable defence—See Husband and Wife.....	158	Public Commissioners—See Repertory	138
Equitable replication to plea of Statute of Limitations—See Reports (Chambers).....	179, 239	Public Works, power of Company to erect, under Statutes— See Repertory	58
To plea of set-off—See Reports (Chambers).....	179, 239	Quantum Meruit—See Contract.	
Not Guilty, plea of, to action for not cultivating—See Rep.	58	Quaker—Wearing hat in Court—See Editorial	218
Plea of Not Guilty, and inconsistent pleas, cannot be pleaded together—See Reports (Chambers)	209, 223	Affirmation by—See Magistrates	162
Of payment, "did not endorse," and want of notice, can be pleaded together without leave—See Rep. (Cham.)	227	Quo Warranto—See Municipal Law	6, 164
Of want of consideration cannot be pleaded with "non-		Race, action to recover stakes at—See Repertory.....	97
		Railway Company, actions against—See Reports (Div. Courts)	51
		For negligence, in not placing guards at crossing—See Reports (County Courts)	67
		Bound by time given in Time Table—See Rep. (Com. Law)	79
		Liability of Treasurer of, for accepting draft—See Reports	

R	PAGE.	R	PAGE.
Railway Company (continued.)		REPERTORY, (continued.)	
(Common Law)	224	Chancery.	
Of Directors of, in certain cases—See Rep. (Com. Law)	239	Renecke v. Chadwicke:	
What land occupied by, consists of—See Municipal Law ...	193	Specific performance—Parol acceptance.....	179
Rates—See Municipal Law.		Green v. Low:	
Records, amendment of, by adding plea at trial—See Reports		Specific performance of one branch of an agreement, after	
(Common Law).....	169	failure of the rest.....	180
To be entered for trial in three lists—See Editorial	156	Common Law.	
When passed on change of venue—See Venue.		Kent v. Godts:	
Reference—See Arbitration, Promissory Notes.		Contract—Deliveries at several times—Discharge.....	18
Registral, liability of County Council to provide Books for—		Searles v. Sadgrove:	
See Municipal Law	88	Pleading—Tender of Part—Set off as to residue.....	18
Registration of letters by officers of D. C.—See Clerks	41	Experte v. Young:	
Remuneration—See Fees.		Custody of Infant—Husband and Wife.....	18
Remote damages—See Carrier	80	Crofts v. Vivian:	
Repertory, Monthly, (notes of English cases)—See Editorial... 18		Principal and Agent—Sharebroker and customer—Vari-	
Replevin—Sec. 289 of C. L. P. Act does not apply solely to—		ance between pleading and evidence.....	18
See Reports—(Chambers)	232	Reg. v. Richard Haslam:	
Replication—See Pleadings.		Indictment—Particulars of charge.....	18
Reports and Reporters—See Editorial	93	Ponting v. Watson:	
REPERTORY, Monthly, (Reports of English Cases.)		Staying proceedings—Action against good faith.....	18
Chancery.		Reg. v. Smith:	
Dixon v. Gayfere:		Shooting with intent to murder—Mistake as to person	
Vendor and Purchaser—Purchase in consideration of annu-		shot at.....	19
ity—Charge on Land	19	Reg. v. Dixon:	
Wood v. Searth:		Larceny—Finding lost note—Means of discovering owner—	
Vendor and purchaser—Specific performance—Omission of		Prisoner's belief that owner could be traced	19
a term of stipulation—Mistake	19	Haughton v. Morton:	
Morley v. Morley:		Contract—Statute of Frauds—Constructive Signature	19
Tenant for life paying off Bond debts—His right to change		Reg. v. Coyle:	
inheritance considered—Costs	19	Presumption against prisoner from conduct of counsel at	
Hope v. Corporation of Gloucester:		former trial between same parties.....	19
Lease—Perpetual Covenant to renew.....	59	Wright v. Scott:	
Wallgrave v. Tehbs:		Public Works, power to erect, under Statute	58
Will—Statute of Mortmain—Secret trust for charitable		Croft v. Vivian:	
purposes—Statute of Frauds—Parol evidence dehors the		Variance—Declaration—Contract—Sale of shares.....	58
Will rejected	60	Eblin v. Newsome:	
Robinson v. Wheelwright:		Costs—Practice—Claiming too much in rule.....	58
Married woman—Restraint on anticipation—Condition.....	60	In re Johnson (an Attorney):	
French v. French:		Costs—Practice—Order for taxation, setting aside.....	58
Debtor and Creditor—13 Eliz. c. 5—Fraudulent assign-		Webb v. Clarke:	
ment—Consideration	60	Award—Agreement to cultivate—Evidence of award—	
Field v. Moore, Field v. Brown:		Damages to successive reversioners	58
Married woman—Jurisdiction—Real Estate—Ward of Court		Godts v. Rose:	
Baker v. Bradley:		Vendor and purchaser—Property passing—Sold note—De-	
Parent and child—Influence—Family arrangement— <i>Igno-</i>		livery on payment—Acceptance.....	58
<i>rantia juri</i> —Construction of Will—Restraint on antici-		Tomlinson <i>et al.</i> v. State:	
pation—Pleadings—Unproved charges of fraud.....	60	Vendor and purchaser—Sec. 17 of Statute of Frauds.....	59
Edwards v. Martin:		Reg. v. Smith:	
Foreclosure before principal due	80	Larceny—Foreign Railway Scrip—"Valuable security" ...	59
Olliver v. King:		Strong v. Foster:	
Fraudulent assignment—13 Eliz. c. 5—Acquiescence of		Principal and Surety, doctrine of, at Law and Equity—	
creditor	98	Giving time to debtor a discharge of surety—Payment—	
Clark v. McNally:		Balance on account	59
Champerty—Contract to advance money to carry on a suit		Thatcher v. D'Aguilar:	
<i>R v. Chandler</i> :		Attorney and Client—Practice—Staying proceedings	59
Solicitor—Striking off Rolls	118	Underwood v. Nicholls:	
Lawford v. Spicer (<i>Re a Solicitor of the Court</i>):		Principal and Agent—Payment	59
Solicitor—Contempt—Breach of undertaking—Costs	118	Lowndes v. Fountain:	
Drysdale v. Pigott:		Landlord and Tenant—Farming lease—Covenant to expend	
Debtor and Creditor—Insurance on life of debtor—Subse-		hay and straw on land.....	59
quent premiums paid by Creditor—No claim made by		Thompson v. Hopper:	
debtor, during his life, or by the surety.....	159	Marine Insurance—Time policy on outward-bound ship in	
Warner v. Willington:		home port—Warranty of seaworthiness—Loss from	
Lessor—Lessee—Agreement—Specific performance—De-		wrongful act of assured	59
marterer—As a general Rule, to establish contract, name		Corlan v. Ireland:	
of contracting parties must appear.....	159	Banker crossing cheque—"Bona fides" of taker of do.	79
Harrison v. Guest:		Jefferies v. South-Western Railway:	
Vendor and Purchaser—Conveyance—Fraud—Inadequacy		Trover—Setting up " <i>ius tertii</i> " by defendant, a wrong-doer,	
of consideration—onus probandi—Duty of Solicitor in		against party in possession at time of the conversion.....	79
purchasing land	159	Wheeler v. Schilizzi:	
Re Cheslyn Hall (a Solicitor) and Re Dollond v.		Contract— <i>Tal quod</i> —"Such as it is"	79
Johnson:		Denton v. Great Northern Railway Company:	
Solicitor—Striking of Rolls—Practice.....	170	Railway Company—Passenger—Time Tables—Contract—	
		False representations	79

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Broadbent v. Ramsbottom <i>et al.</i> :		Pim v. Campbell :	
Easement—Flowing water—Overflow from a pond—Natural channel.....	79	Agreement—Evidence—Conditional signature—Postponing operation	137
Doel v. Sheppard :		Wickenden v. Webster :	
Pleadings—"Fencing machinery," meaning of.....	79	Lease—Covenant not to carry on trade	137
Seedham v. Baxter :		Wood <i>et ux v.</i> Bletcher :	
Attorney—Personal undertaking—Liability	79	Pleadings—Debt—Plea of payment	137
Wall v. London and South-Western Railway Co. :		Dobson v. Collis :	
Costs—Practice—Abortive trial—Jury discharged without costs	79	Contract subject to defeasance—Statute of Frauds	137
Kingsford <i>et al v.</i> Merry :		Reg. v. Mary Anne Strip :	
Sale of Goods—Fraud—Right to rescind contract—Property—Trovee	79	Evidence—Voluntary statement of accused made before a magistrate upon application for a remand	137
Winter v. Bartholemew :		Reg. v. Leech :	
Interpleader Act—Practice—Trespass, staying proceedings in action of, against Sheriff	80	Venue—False pretences—Jurisdiction	138
Mann v. General Steam Navigation Company :		Jewell <i>et al v.</i> Stead :	
Carrier—Special and remote damages	80	Distance—How to be measured—Tolls—Local act.....	138
Mare v. Charles :		Scott v. the Mayor, Aldermen, and Citizens of Manchester :	
Bill of Exchange—Personal liability for other persons—Acceptance by drawer for others	"	Master and servant—Public Commissioners—Liability for acts of workmen	138
Brown v. Overbury :		Rodgers v. Parker :	
Race—Stakes—Decision of Stewards.....	97	Landlord and tenant—Distress—Irregularity—No damage	138
Jones v. Powell :		Tatton v. Wade :	
Jury—Misconduct—Practice—Affidavit of Jurymen	"	False representations of credit, partly written, partly oral—Lord Tenterden's Act—Damages	138
Herrman <i>et al</i> (Assignee, &c.) v. Bowker :		Lee v. Vesey :	
Execution <i>fi. fa.</i> —Sale of goods taken under, to Execution Creditor	"	Distress for rates—Joint warrant executed by one.....	138
Tomlinson <i>et al v.</i> Straight :		Aulton <i>et al v.</i> Atkins :	
Statute of Frauds, sec. 17—Acceptance and receipt of goods, "so sold"	"	Covenant implied—Debt due from partner to firm.....	138
Jinks v. Edwards <i>et al.</i> :		Reg. v. Roebuck :	
Landlord and tenant—Lease—Action for not giving possession	"	False pretences as to quality of article offered in pledge—Evidence of scienter	138
Glynn v. Thomas :		Reg. v. Burgon :	
Landlord and tenant—Distress for more rent than due—Pleading—Duress of Goods—Voluntary payment	"	False pretences that a house was built on land offered as security for a loan	138
Simpson <i>et al v.</i> Lamb :		Reg. v. Gardner :	
Principal and agent—Authority to sell, revocation of—Liability for work already done	98	False pretences—Personation—Obtaining board and lodging	139
Fulton v. Waterson :		Cowie v. Stirling :	
Bill of Exchange—Indorsement	"	Promissory note—Payee—Sufficiency of designation—Collateral agreement.....	139
Re C. & W. Denuchey (<i>Petitioners</i>) v. Hamilton (<i>Respondent</i>):		Clay v. Yates :	
Attorney—Practice—Liability of country agent for negligence.....	"	Contract—Pleading—Work and materials—Printing—Statute of Frauds—Illegality—Part performance	139
Wood v. Bell :		Rever v. The Electric Telegraph Company :	
Ship—Contract for building—Property—Bankruptcy—Special damages	"	Corporation—Trading Company—Parol contract in the course of business ratified by Company	139
Guarding v. Brown :		Aulton v. Atkins.	
Sickness—Practice—Postponing Application	118	Covenant implied	139
Reg. v. Harrop :		Batteshill v. Read <i>et al.</i> :	
Appeal—Party aggrieved—Assent of Appellant to act complained of	"	Damages—Action on the case.....	157
Litt v. Martindale :		Ward v. Law Property Assurance and Trust Society :	
Fraud—Action for money had and received.....	"	Insurance—Guarantee policy—Condition—Notice of criminal misconduct.....	157
Bowes v. Croll :		Reg. v. Guardians of Holborn Union :	
Contract—Construction—Condition precedent	118	Jurisdiction of Justices appearing on face of warrant—Order allowing indenture of apprenticeship	157
MacGregor v. Rhodes :		Hanks v. Palling :	
Pleading—Bill of Exchange—Indorsee against Indorser—Plea denying plaintiff's title as alleged—Estoppel	"	Vendor and purchaser—Objection to title of fee—Farm rent—Non-payment for twenty years—Condition of sale	157
International Telegraph Company v. Reuter :		Perry v. Attwood :	
Agreement—Construction—Packed telegraph messages	"	Pleading—Plea of account stated, all the items being on one side, and balance of payment—Error in stating account—Accord and satisfaction	158
Grady v. Hunt :		Bennett v. Thompson :	
Justice of the Peace—Action against, for false imprisonment—Illegality—Warrant—Probable cause—Malice—Jurisdiction—Bail to keep the Peace.....	119	Costs—Certificate—Action on the case for nuisance	158
Reg. v. John Davis <i>alias</i> Bush and William Davies :		Marrin v. Wallis :	
Larceny—Mistaken letter.—Found articles, law as to, inapplicable	137	Statute of Frauds, sec. 17—Sale of horse—What amounts to a receipt	158
Revis v. Smith :		Eastmead v. Witt :	
Witness—Swearing to defamatory matter in a judicial proceeding—Belief of witness—Reasonable and probable cause	137	Slander—Privileged communication—Express malice	158
		In the matter of an Attorney :	
		Attorney, summary jurisdiction over, after action against—Double remedy	158

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Sloper v. Cotterell:		Dean v. Peterboro' and Cobourg R.R. Company:	
Husband and Wife—Action by husband for money received		Arbitration—Discovery of fresh evidence after award made	48
to separate use of wife—Trust fund—Assignment—No-		Wheeler v. Munro:	
tice—Equitable plea and replication.....	158	Sheriff, duty of—Action against for non-committal of de-	
<i>In re Shaw and Pitt's Arbitration:</i>		fendant when certificate of recognizance of bail, &c., being	
Arbitration—Distress, expenses of—Mistake of law—Set-		filed, not given—Relief against action	66
ting aside award	158	Craig v. Ruttan:	
Hirsch v. Coates; Fountain, Garnishee:		Sheriff neglect to commit defendant on limits to close cus-	
Garnishee—Attachment of debts—C. L. P. Act.....	158	tody—Notice of special bail not being given in time—	
Tarrant v. Webb:		Action against, for an escape—Stay of proceedings	67
Master and Servant—Liability of master to servant for		Ross et al v. Jones:	
injuries caused by negligence of fellow-servant	158	Fi. Fa., Issue of Second—the first being returned—"Money	
Jones v. Brown:		made by mistake	68
Partnership property—Action by one tenant in common		Brown et al v. Stevens:	
against another.....	158	Debtor on limits—application for recommitment of—Interroga-	
<i>In re Hodgson and Brown's Arbitration:</i>		tories—Means of debtor which may be considered avail-	
Arbitration—Meeting behind back of one of the parties—		able	68
Interference of attorney—Setting aside award—Legal		Ross et al v. Bryan:	
maxim	158	Ca. Sa., under what circumstances it may be sued out after	
Reynolds v. Bridge:		issue and before return of Fi. Fa.....	89
Covenant—Construction—Liquidated damages	178	Same v. Same:	
Aikins v. Short:		Bail, allowance of—Insufficiency of affidavit of Justification	
Money had and received—Mistake—Payment—Recovery		as to amount—Venue	91
back of money paid	179	Spence v. Drake:	
Barstow v. Reynolds:		Weekly allowance—How to be paid—Suggested Fraud....	91
Appeal under C. L. P. Act—Practice—Rule to enter non-		Ferguson v. Clarkson:	
suit—Rule for new trial	179	Stay of proceedings—Order with—What a breach of.....	92
Gulliver v. Gulliver and others, Executors:		O'Reilly v. Van Every et al:	
Pleading—Equitable replication—Statute of Limitations—		" v. Van Nuck et al:	
Set off.....	179	Alteration of precept and writ, without leave of Court—	
Hasset v. Burt:		Change of Attorney—Appointment of Prochein amy—	
Landlord and tenant—Fixtures—Plate glass in shop front		Security for costs, Plaintiff being an infant.....	110
—Right of tenant to remove—Covenant—Construction... ..	179	Cooper v. Godd:	
Jones v. Jenner:		Costs—Certificate for, in action of Trespass, where less	
Attachment of debts—Practice—Judgment in County Court		than 40s.—Damages recovered—Notice not to trespass,	
—C. L. P. Act	179	what sufficient.....	111
Insole v. James et al:		Smythe et al v. Tower:	
Pleading—Easement—Flowing water—Diversion—Grant of		Change of Venue—New Rules—Practice.....	183
water for mining purposes—Variance	179	Reg. v. Hunter:	
Jones v. Brown:		Interlocutory Judgment signed before passing of C. L. P.	
Partnership property—Trove—Conversion—Joint owners		Act—Subsequent issue of Execution—Practice.....	183
Taylor v. Laird:		Pawson et al v. Wightman:	
Contract—"Quantum meruit"	179	Satisfactor piece—Signature of under New Rule.....	184
Pardington v. South Wales Railway Company:		Cron v. Askin:	
Railway Company—Promissory note—Liability.....	239	Writ, irregularity in—Amendment.....	184
Gulliver v. Gulliver et al:		Kekendall et al v. McKrimmon:	
Pleadings—Equitable replication—Statute of limitations—		Absconding debtor, proceeding against—Practice.....	184
Set-off—Will—Assent of executor	239	McGuire v. Sneath:	
Thomas v. the Baron Von Stutterheim:		Documents, production of Trial—Application for.....	184
Witness in extremis, examination of—Practice—Application		Wallace v. Frazer:	
for rule absolute in first instance—C. L. P. Act	239	Service of declaration in case of non-appearance under old	
Ward v. Stewart et al:		practice—Substitution by order of Court or Judge.....	184
Contract—Construction of	239	Carruthers v. Dickey:	
Atwood et al v. Emery:		Change of Venue—Practice.....	185
Contract—Meaning of "as soon as possible"	239	Hall v. Bowes:	
Vorley v. Barret:		Particulars—Power of Judge to order further.....	208
Pleadings—Demurrer to equitable plea—Principal and		Rosse v. Dalson:	
surety—Discharge of principal by mistake	240	Plea of non-assumpsit to promissory note struck out under	
REPORTS, U. C.		101st Sec. C. L. P. Act.....	208
<i>Chambers.</i>		Street v. Dolson:	
Otis v. Rossin et al:		Dower, C. L. P. Act applies to actions of.....	208
Writ—Irregularity in original—Acceptance of service how		Davis v. Carruthers:	
far a waiver	5	Writ—Plaintiff allowed to amend irregularity of, on condi-	
Young et al v. Laird:		tion of re-service.....	209
Writ of trial—Service of notice of trial, before order for,		Gamble v. White:	
made a nullity	6	Writ of Ca. Sa. amendment of, granted on payment of	
Re N. C. McIntyre:		costs, without setting aside arrest of defendant under....	209
Attorney's privilege from arrest	46	Warren v. Munroe:	
Bank of Upper Canada v. Ward et al:		Injunction to restrain—A summons only will be granted on	
Judgment as in case of non-suit—Confession by one defen-		first application, under Sec. 236, C. L. P. Act.....	209
dant after record entered	47	Goldburgh v. Leeson:	
Bowen v. Sains et al:		"Not guilty" and justification cannot be pleaded together. 209	
Arbitration—Award bad in certain cases—Affidavits shewing		Cameron v. Brantford Gas Company:	
facts on which award based when allowed	47	Corporations—Sec. 193, C. L. P. Act does not apply to....	209

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Barrow v. Capreol:		Leclaire et al. v. Prudhomme:	
Arrest on Bailable writ before C. L. P. Act came into force and after expiration of 8 Vic., Chap. 48—Irregularity in affidavit.....	210	Pleadings—Plea of want of consideration to action on promissory note cannot be pleaded with "non fecit" without leave.....	229
De Costa v. The Gordon Estate:		Shae v. O'Neil:	
Notice to admit documents at trial—New Practice.....	211	After a cause has been entered for trial, it is no longer within the provisions of the 84th section of C. L. P. Act.	229
Moffatt v. Fitzgibbon:		Wilkes v. The Buffalo, Brantford, & Goderich R. Co.:	
Taxation of Costs on entering judgment in the Superior Courts on a confession in a case marked "Inferior Jurisdiction".....	211	Special endorsement of stated sum on summons not sufficient particulars of demand.....	230
Horsman v. Horsman:		Thom v. Huddy:	
Interrogatories for the discovery of the nature of the defendant's title allowed upon a summons to shew cause.....	211	Crim. Con.—Plea that person debauched not plaintiff's wife not allowed with "not guilty"—Plea that plaintiff living apart from his wife not allowed.....	230
Duggan v. Bright:		Robins v. Porter:	
Arbitration upon a summons for reference under Sec. 143, an order granted under Sec. 84, C. L. P. Act.....	211	Ejectment—Writ of injunction granted on <i>ex parte</i> application to restrain the cutting and carrying off of timber from land in dispute.....	230
Moore v. Cotton:		Mellish et al. (judgment creditors) v. The Buffalo, Brantford, & Goderich R. Co. (judgment debtors); Zimmerman, Garnishee:	
Affidavit unnecessary on an application for summons to plead double.....	211	Acceptance of order—Third party.....	230
Gill v. McAuley:		Bullen v. Lingham et al.:	
Absent defendant—Practice.....	211	Garnishee—Order—Affidavit necessary.....	231
McCallum v. McCallum:		Clark v. McIntosh:	
New practice in ejectment—Sec. 251, C. L. P. Act.....	211	Absconding debtor—Eudeavours to serve papers on—Affidavit necessary to ground application to proceed as if personal service effected.....	231
Morris v. Smythe:		Ullborn v. Chapman:	
New practice in ejectment—Sec. 225, C. L. P. Act.....	212	Mis-statement of defendant's place of residence in writ of summons—Reasonable supposition.....	231
Torrance v. Gross:		O'Keefe v. O'Brien et al.:	
Security for costs—What affidavit for, must contain—application cannot be received on amended affidavit.....	212	Notice by defendant to bring action on for trial—When time may be granted plaintiff.....	231
Moberly v. Baines:		Wilkins v. Blacklock:	
Interlocutory judgment, setting aside without costs—Notice of trial a waiver of.....	212	Pleadings—"Not guilty" cannot be pleaded with separate pleas traversing the different allegations of same count of declaration without leave.....	232
Darling v. Maitland:		Connor v. McBride:	
Practice—19 & 20 Vic. cap. 91.....	212	Garnishee order—Affidavit necessary on <i>ex parte</i> application	232
In re Glasse v. Glasse:		Todd v. Cain et al.:	
Attorney, change of—Affidavit for summons to show cause not required.....	213	Title by possession and paper possession can be set up together, upon affidavit that both can be established.....	232
Kane v. Kane:		Reilly v. Clark:	
Ejectment—Informal defence under new practice—Setting it aside and entering judgment—Defendant allowed to amend on payment of costs.....	213	Replevin—Sec. 289, C. L. P. Act not confined solely to actions of.....	232
Brown v. Benniger:		Corcoran v. Taylor:	
Garnishee—Oral examination of defendant under sec. 193 of C. L. P. Act.....	213	Interrogatories—Debtor in custody on mesne process—Default of payment of weekly allowance—Discharge.....	233
Housen v. Stickle:		Garrett et al. v. Cotton:	
Practice—Sec. 25 C. L. P. Act.....	213	Pleadings—Bill of exchange—Accommodation acceptance..	233
Allan v. Skead:		Sladden v. Smith:	
Promissory note—Reference to Co. Court Judge to compute	213	Production of original will—Subpoena to registrar of surrogate court—Affidavit.....	233
Nimmo v. Welland:		Carruthers v. Dickey:	
Garnishee—Affidavit in support of summons under sec. 193 C. L. P. Act.....	213	Application for leave to plead several pleas, time for making	233
Gifford v. Johns:		Moberly v. Baines:	
Attorney and client—Reference of bill of costs to master to tax.....	213	Pleadings—Surplusage.....	234
Street v. Proudfoot:		Swan v. Cleland:	
Interrogatories to found a plea, when allowed.....	213	Revival of judgment by married women under sec. 303, C. L. P. A.—Husband must join with wife in application for	235
Cotton v. McKenzie:		<i>General Law.</i>	
Reference to County Court Judge under sec. 84, C. L. P. A.	214	Shaw v. Ormiston:	
Hanley v. Helderstott:		Action brought without authority of Plaintiff—Staying proceedings—Duties of attorneys in taking instructions.....	26
Ejectment—Service on defendant's wife.....	214	Conolly v. McCann:	
Chard v. Lout:		Venue—Practice in changing—When record passed on change of venue—Waiver of irregularity—Discrepancy between rule and motion paper—Costs of application.....	27
The Tariff of costs under C. L. P. Act does not apply to County Courts.....	227	Running Administratrix v. Kidd:	
Rosse et al. v. Cummings:		Costs—Certificate for when lands brought in question.....	28
Plea of payment, "did not endorse" and "want of notice," may be pleaded together without leave of Judge.....	227	Baby qui tam v. Watson:	
Metropolitan Building Society v. McPherson:		14 & 15 Vic. ch. 7, effect of—Sale of right of entry and pretended rights—Registry laws.....	87
Ejectment—Practice under sec. 221, C. L. P. Act.....	229		
McLeod v. Buchanan:			
Discharge of prisoner from custody, affidavit necessary on application for.....	229		
Lanark and Drummond Plank Road Co. v. Bothwell:			
Signing judgment when appearance entered after time for, elapsed, set aside though no notice of appearance served.	229		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
British Life Assurance Company (Appellant) v. Ward (Respondent)—(English case):		<i>Division Courts, U. C.</i>	
Insurance—Agent of Company has no implied authority to waive a forfeiture of a policy	112	Hatford v. Hunt :	
McLarren v. Blacklock :		Jurisdiction—Unsettled accounts—Balance.....	39
Malicious arrest—Evidence	150	Stockdale v. Wade and Brady :	
Brockville and North Augusta Plank Road Company v. Crozier :		Levy taxes—Duration of collector's authority—Whose goods liable to seizure.....	40
Tolls—Too high rate—Estoppel—16 Vic. ch. 90, sec. 2.....	151	Reg. v. Doty :	
Same v. Same :		Indictment—Perjury—Interpleader issue—New trial—13 & 14 Vic. cap. 53, sec. 102	56
Tolls—Action for against Road Company—Grade of Road—Pleading.....	152	Kennedy v. Henderson :	
McDonald v. Prentiss :		Fraud—Insolvent Debtors' Act—When interim order under, a protection against commitment.....	77
Patent, purchase from patentee before issue of—Long possession—Estoppel—Presumption of grant.....	166	C. B. v. J. C. :	
McWhirter v. Bongard :		Jurisdiction—Where cause of action arose—Where and how to be tried	78
Division Courts—Prohibition.....	168	Park & Co. v. McKenny :	
Reaume v. Gurchard :		Promissory note—Days of grace—Premature suit.....	117
Sheriff's deed—Previous conveyance—Consideration.....	169	Wallace (Claimant) v. Bellows (Execution Creditor):	
Dewson v. St. Clair :		Interpleader—Favouring particular creditor	235
Amendment—Ejectment—Demand of possession	169	<i>English Cases in relation to.</i>	
Ketchum v. Mighton et al :		Mossop v. Great Northern Railway Company :	
Statute of Limitations—Want of possession	170	Prohibition—Power of Judge to grant new trial.....	19
Reg. v. Smith and Corbett :		Ackroyd v. Gill :	
Custody of infant—habeas corpus and return.....	183	Officer of Court acting as attorney—Assistant clerk.....	53
Taylor v. Jarvis :		Cawley v. The Northern Staffordshire Railway Co. :	
Partnership debt—One partner only sued—Seizure of partnership goods	197	Appeal—Action against Company for non-delivery—Joint Stations—Laches, liability for.....	54
London Gas Company v. Campbell :		Picard v. Cornell :	
Calls on stock—estoppel	197	Costs, certificate for, must be given at trial or immediately after	56
Farley v. Gilbert et al :		Phillips v. Hewston :	
Usury—Variance.....	197	Legney—Jurisdiction	136
Grant v. Lynch :		Ashcroft v. Foulkes :	
Lease—Distraint for rent.....	197	Costs—Set-off—C. L. P. A. 1857	136
Anderson v. Marriott :		Challiner v. Burgess :	
Dower—Demand—Trial—Costs.....	198	Interpleader Summons—Want of adjudication	137
Harris v. McLeod and Fraser :		Reprints, American. See Editorial.....	135
Partners—Promissory notes—Attorney and client.....	198	Restraint on anticipation. See Married women.	
McMurtry v. Munro :		Reversioner. See Repertory.....	58
County Court, appeal from—Jurisdiction of, where sum reduced by payment—Evidence of account stated	207	Reversal of judgment, Husband must join wife in application for. See Reports (Chambers)	235
Clarke v. Easton :		Roads. See Municipal Law, s. 193—Tolls—Corporation.	
Plea that money seized in defendant's hands under execution from Division Courts—13 & 14 Vic. cap. 53, sec. 89—Construction	222	Rule, claiming too much in. See Costs.	
Foster v. Geddes :		Rule Nisi to quash By-laws, form of. See Municipal Law....	88
Railway Company—Acceptance by treasurer—Liability—seal.....	224	Salaries of Judges. See Editorial	112
<i>County Courts, U. C.</i>		Of School Teachers. See School Teacher.	
Gronden v. Great Western Assurance Company :		Sale of Goods, Fraudulent representations to obtain. See Repertory	79
Negligence—Highway—Guards at Railway crossing.....	57	Evidence of in D. C. See Suitors	142
Ferguson v. Stewart :		See Execution, Statute of Frauds.	
Promissory note overdue, transfer of—Subsequent payment to payee by maker without notice of transfer—No answer to plaintiff's action as transferee of note.....	116	Satisfaction piece, Signature of, before Attorney, when may be dispensed with. See Reports (Chambers).....	184
Risdale v. Stamour :		School Teacher, must recover salary by arbitration. See Municipal Law.....	150
Certificate—Verdict £10. 8s. 9d.....	117	Mandamus to recover salary. See Municipal Law....	185
Bell v. Holcomb :		School Trustees, raising money for, from Municipalities. See Municipal Law.....	69
Certificate—Verdict £15.....	117	School Sections, alteration of. See Municipal Law	106, 203
McLeod v. McDougall :		Seal, what sufficient to constitute. See Reports (Com. Law)	224
Certificate—Verdict £24. 12s. 6d	117	Security for costs. See Costs.	
McLane v. Nelson :		Seizure of Plaintiff's money in Defendant's hands. See Reports (Com. Law)	222
Bond—Certificate for costs—New trial.....	157	Servants, delivery of Summons to. See Bailiffs	104
Coulter v. Willoughby :		of goods to. See Master.	
Costs in County Courts suits to be the same as formerly until altered by rules of Superior Court Judges.....	219	Service of Process. See Absconding debtor, Bailiffs, Declaration, Judgment by default, Magistrates, Municipalities, Writ.	
<i>English Cases.</i>		Set-off. See Pleadings, Suitors.	
Mercer v. Stanberry :		Sharebroker. See Pleadings, 53. Principal and Agent, 18.	
Interpleader—Summons—Damages by Seizure—Jurisdiction of Judge—Staying proceedings in action.....	177	Sheriff, action against, for an escape. See Reports (Chambers)	67
Kernot v. Bailey et al :		Relief from. See Reports (Chambers)	66
Jurisdiction—Mandamus	178	See Stay of proceedings.	
		See Attachment, Coroners, Reports (Com. Law).....	169

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Ships contract for building. See Repertory	98	Interest may be recovered	142
Shooting with intent to kill, mistake as to person shot at. See Repertory	19	When supplied to third party	161
Sickness, postponing application under excuse of. See Repertory	118	Servant, delivery to	161
Slander, privileged, communication. See Repertory	158	Wife, "	161
Solicitor, commitment of, for contempt. " "	118	When husband liable	162, 181
Duty in effecting purchases. See Vendor and purchaser.		Cohabitation, presumptive evidence of authority	161
Striking off Roll, practice in. See Repertory	179	Woman not being wife, delivery to	162
For misapplication of trust monies. See do.	118, 179	Carrier, delivery to	201
Special damages. See Repertory, Reports.		When proof required that deft. receives goods	201
Specific performance. As to agreement for lease, see Repertory	179	Partner, delivery to	202
Of one part of an agreement after failure of rest. See Repertory	180	Agent, "	221
Omission in stipulation for. See Vendor and purchaser.		When personally liable	222
Stakes. See Race.		Minor, delivery to	222
Statistics. See Census.		Illegitimate child, delivery to	222
Statute of Frauds, constructive signature. See Repertory ...	19	Summons. See Bailiffs, Clerks, Magistrates, Suitors, Writ.	
What constitutes sufficient acceptance under. See Repertory	59, 97, 137	Surety. See Bailiffs, Principal and surety.	
Decisions on 4th section of. See Contract	137	Surplusage. See Pleadings.	
Statute of Limitations, want of possession for 40 years. See Reports (Com. Law)	170	Surrogate Court, subpoena to Registrar to produce will, see production.	
See Pleadings.		Talbot, J. Leach, Esquire, death of. See editorial	218
Statute of Mortmain. See Wills.		Taxation of costs. See Costs.	
Statutory defence. See Suitors, Correspondence.		Taxes, levying. See Reports (Div. Courts)	40
Stock, illegal calls on. See Reports (Com. Law)	197	Telegraphs, packing messages. See Agreement.	
Striking off the Rolls. See Solicitor.		Tenant. See Landlord.	
Stay of proceedings, breach of order with. See Reports (Chambers)	92	Tenant for life paying off bond debts. See Repertory	19
On ground that the proceedings are against the instructions of client. See Attorney.		Tenants, common, action between. See Partnership.	
In action on Interpleader Summons. See Reports (County Courts)	177	Term of years can be sold under D. C. Execution. See Bailiffs	101
In action against good faith. See Repertory	18	Time, computation of, Sunday included under sec. 60, C. L. P. Act. See editorial	172
In action against Sheriff on Interpleader Suit. See Repertory	80	Time tables. See Railway Company.	
On payment of costs. See Reports (Chambers)	67	Toll gate, measurement of distance from. See Distance.	
Subpœna. See Bailiffs, Surrogate Court, Witness.		Toll, action for. See Reports (Com. Law)	152
SCITORS, D. C.		Too high rate of. " " "	151
Defendant after receiving Summons to examine claim annexed, how to act	4	Town Hall, sale of. See Municipal Law	129
Payment into Court, should make if claim correct	4	Township Councillor. " "	6
Confession, when and how to be given	4	Transcript of judgment. See Clerks	41, 221
Admission to save expense of proof	4	Treasurer of Railway Company, which see.	
Notice of, when and how to be given	4	Trespass, notice not to trespass, what sufficient. See Reports (Chambers)	111
Form of	4	Staying proceedings in actions of against Sheriff. See Sheriff.	
Set-off may be given with	4	Trial, what constitutes in action of Dower, which see.	
Defence, Statutory, different kinds of	23	Trover, action of, setting up "just tertii" by Defendant. See Repertory	79
Notice of	23	When will lie by partner. See Partnership.	
Adjournment when not served	42	Trust. See Husband and Wife, Legacy, Solicitor.	
Set-off	42	Unseaworthiness of ship. See Insurance.	
Jury, when Defendant wishes trial by	42	Unsettled account. See Reports (Div. Courts)	39
The trial or hearing, conduct of parties at	61	Usury, plea of, when one Defendant not party to contract. See Reports (Com. Law)	197
Non-appearance of Plaintiff in person	62	Vacation in Division Courts, advantages of. See editorial	201
Of Defendant in person	62	Valuable security, foreign railway scrip considered as. See Repertory	58
Necessity of coming to point in issue	102	Variance. See Pleadings, Usury.	
Proof of Plaintiff's case	122	Vendor and purchaser. See Statute of Frauds.	
Of Defendant's case	122	Omission in stipulation for specific Performance. See Repertory	19
Judgment of Judge	122	Passing property. "	58
Evidence must be to the point	122	When latter cannot repudiate purchase. See Repertory	157
The best attainable must be procured	122	Onus probandi when fraud suggested. "	159
Must be confined to particulars	142	Venue, charge of, cost of application for. See Reports (Com. Law)	27
Particulars may be amended	142	On common affidavit. See Reports (Chambers)	185
Admissions, when can be used	142	Want of Bail-piece. "	91
Written must be produced when possible	142	Must be laid where Writ issues. See Reports (Chambers)	213
Parol, when to be received	142	How to be laid in action for money obtained under false pretences through P.O. See Repertory	138
Secondary evidence of lost writings	142	Voluntary statement of accused before Magistrate, when binding. See Repertory	18
Evidence of sale of goods	142	Ward of Court. See Married woman	60
Delivery how to be proved	142	Warrant. See Magistrates.	
		Weekly allowance, how to be paid. See Reports (Chambers)	91
		Discharge in default of payment of. " "	233
		Wife, see Husband, Married woman.	

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Wills, construction of. See Repertory	60	Writ—(continued).	
Secret trust for charitable purposes. See Repertory	60	Acceptance of service, how far a waiver. See Re-	
Windows, when considered as fixtures. See Landlord and		ports (Chambers).....	5
tenant.		Setting aside for mis-statement of Plaintiff's resi-	
Witnesses, swearing to defamatory matter in judicial pro-		dence. See Reports (Chambers)	231
ceeding. See Repertory	137	Of Ca. Sa., when may be sued out before return of	
When action lies against, for. See Repertory	137	Fi. Fa. See Reports (Chambers).....	90
In extremis, examination of. "	230	Irregularity in for want of endorsement. See Re-	
See Clerks, Petty Sessions.		ports (Chambers).....	209
Woman, Rights of. See editorial.....	217	Of Fi. Fa., issue of second, first returned "Null a	
Work and materials. See Repertory	139	Bona" by mistake. See Reports (Chambers).....	68
Writ of Summons, alteration of without leave of Court. See		Of trial, service of notice of trial under. See Re-	
Reports (Chambers)	110	ports (Chambers).....	6
Irregularity in for want of Chief Justice's name. See		Of Habeas Corpus, which see.	
Reports (Chambers)	181	Bailable, irregularity in affidavit for. See Reports	
For want of endorsement. See Reports (Chambers)	209	(Chambers)	210

T A B L E

OF THE

CASES REPORTED AND CITED IN THIS VOLUME.

A.	PAGE.	PAGE.	PAGE.
Abbott v. Richards	177	Browley v. Gerish	172
Acey v. Fernie	112	Brown et al v. Stevens	68
Ackroyd v. Gill	53	" v. Benniger	213
Aikins v. Shortt	179	" v. Clegg	30, 189
Alexander v. Harvey	176	" v. Municipal Council of Savina, 23,	
Allan v. Skead	213	29, 30, 32, 108, 109, 188, 189, 191,	
Allen v. Hayward	29	193, 226.	
Anderson v. Marriott	198	" v. Municipal Council of York	
Archer v. Garrard	228	and Peel	8
Arnold v. Hamel	123	" v. Overbury	97
" v. The Mayor, &c., of Poole, 30,	189	Bullen v. Lingham et al.	231, 232
Arthur v. Marshall	89	Bullet v. B. of Pennsylvania	117
Arundel v. Whitto	151	Bulwer v. Bonsfield	235
Ashcroft v. Foulkes	136	Butler v. Thomas	233
Attwood et al v. Emery	239		
Aulton et al v. Atkins	138	C.	
Aulton v. Atkins	139	Calcutt v. Ruttan	66
Avery v. Scott	150	Caledonia Railway Co. v. Ogilvie	189
Awards v. Rose	136	Calwon v. Burford	235
		Cameron v. Brantford Gas Co.	198, 209
B.		" v. Thompson	39
Baby qui tam v. Watson	76, 87	Cane v. Chapman	29, 192
Baker v. Bradley	60	Cannon v. Remington	170
Bamberger et al v. The Commercial		Carpue v. The London and Brighton	
Credit Assurance Co.	235	Railway Co.	191
Banc v. Methuen	23	Carruthers v. Dickey	184, 223
Bank of Montreal v. DeLatre	224	Carter v. Smith	220
Bank of Upper Canada v. Ward et al.	47	Caulde v. Seymore	24
Barclay v. The Municipality of Dar-		Cawley v. The Northern Staffordshire	
lington	108, 235	Railway Co.	55
Barnes v. Hunt	29	Challoner v. Burgess	137
Barrow v. Capreol	198, 210	Chambers v. Bernasconi	151
Barston v. Reynolds	179	Chandler v. Horn	143
Bartlett v. The Municipality of Am-		Chard v. Lout	227, 228
herstburg	197	Chief Superintendent of Schools <i>appel-</i>	
Bates v. Townley	208	<i>lant</i> in re Gill v. Jackson	203
Battishill v. Reed et al.	157	Chief Superintendent v. McRae	204
Beck v. Mordaunt	171	Chilton v. London Railway Co.	152
Bell v. Holcomb	117	Clark v. Shee	117
" v. Howard	29	Clarke v. Luckfield Union	93
Benecke v. Chadwicke	179	" v. Easton	222
Bennett v. Thompson	153	" v. McIntosh	231
Beswiek v. Bofay	178	" v. McNally	98
Blayes v. Baldwin	91	Clarkson v. Miller	176
Bofield v. Padmore	90	Clay v. Rates	139
Baker v. Westbrook	209	Cleal v. Lattram	176
Bougaard v. McWhirter	168	Com'l Bank et al v. Broadgeest et al.	176
Boulton v. Crowther	31, 189, 206	Colou v. McKenzie	214
Bowen v. Kemp	172	Connell v. Cheney	167
" v. Gaines et al	47	Conolly v. McCann	27
Bowes v. Croll	118	Connor v. McBride	232
Boyd v. Croyden Railway Co.	191	Cooper v. Todd	111
Boyfield v. Porter	31, 189	Copper Mines Co. v. Fox	93
Braithwaite v. Lord Moreford	111	Corcoran v. Taylor	233
Breck v. Smith	208	Cock v. Nethercote	143
Breckley v. Hanon	78	Corlan v. Ireland	79
Brett v. Smith et al	289	Coulter v. Willoughby	214
Bridgett v. Coyney	24	Cowie v. Stirling	139
British Life Assurance Co. v. Ward, 112,	112	Craig v. Ruttan	67
Broadbent v. Ramsbottom et al.	79	" v. Proctor	67
Brockville and North Augusta Plank		Crawshaw v. Bailey	27
Road Co. v. Crozier	151, 152	Croft v. The Town Council of Peter-	
Bromage v. Prosser	151	boro. 28, 108, 123, 190, 192, 195, 206	
		Croft v. Vivian	18, 58
		Cronyn v. Askyn	184
		Crosby v. Jones	172
		D.	
		Da Costa v. The Gordon Estate	211
		Dale v. Pollard	222
		Darling v. Maitland	212
		Daubney v. Cooper	85
		Davey v. Warne	128
		Davies v. The Mayor, &c., of Swansea, 128	
		Davies v. Watton	85
		Davis v. Carruthers	198, 209
		" v. Fortune	151
		Dean v. The Peterboro' and Cobourg	
		Railway Co.	48
		" v. Warne	90
		Dean of Windsor v. Gover	189
		Dehaisfield v. Farmer	171
		Dennehey v. Hamilton	98
		Dennis v. Hughes et al	8, 189
		Denton v. The Great Northern R'y Co.	79
		Dewson v. St. Clair	169
		Diggie v. Blackwall Railway Co.	93
		Diles v. Warne	90
		Dixon v. Gayfer	19
		Dixon v. Walker	136
		Dobson v. Collis	137
		Doe d. Barber v. Roe	27
		" Bowerman v. Syburn	167
		" Charles v. Colton	167
		" Corbyn v. Bramston	170
		" Davis v. Eaton	27
		" Hay v. Hunt	9
		" Hollingsworth v. Stennett	170
		" Kerr v. Shoff	177
		" Knight v. Quigley	170
		" Maclean v. Turnbull	170
		" McGill v. Shea	167
		" Richardson v. Dafeo	170
		" Roby v. Masey	170
		" Williams v. Evans	87
		Doel v. Sheppard	79
		Dolland v. Johnson	179
		Dowse v. Impey	206
		Drew v. Warne	90
		Drysdale v. Pigott	158
		Duggan v. Bright	211
		Dunstan v. The Imperial Gas Co. 30, 126, 190	
		E.	
		Eardley v. Otley	48
		Eastham v. The Blackburn R. W. Co.	127
			128, 191
		East London Water Works v. Bailey	93
		Eastmead v. Witt	158
		Eblin v. Newsome	58
		Edwards v. Martin	80
		Edmunds v. Ross	90
		Ellis v. The Sheffield Gas Co.	30, 189
		Elwood v. Monk	233
		England dem Syburn v. Stade	168
		Evans v. G H	171

	PAGE.		PAGE.		PAGE.
Every v. Wheeler	238	Henderson v. The Australian Steam Navigation Company	93	Kennedy v. Henderson	77
Ex parte Young	18	Henly v. The Mayor of Lyme	224	Kennett and Avon R. W. Co. v. The Great Western R. W. Co.	191
F.		Hennell v. Lyon	160, 151	Kent v. Godt	18
Farley v. Gilbert et al.	107	Henning et al v. Gwinnerston	48	" The Great Western R. W. Co.	191
Farr v. Hollis	29	Hermann et al v. Bowker	97	Kerby v. The Grand River Navigation Co.	29, 31, 189
Farrell v. The Town Council of London [126, 128, 189]	30	Hill v. Swift	39	Kernot v. Bailey et al	178
Ferguson v. Clarkson	92	Hilliard v. Webster	128	Keyse v. Powell	170
" Stewart	116	Hirsch v. Coates	153	Kier v. Lecmon	122
Field v. Brown	60	Hodgkinson v. Whately	90	Kimpton v. Willing	207
" v. Moore	60	Hodgson v. The Municipal Council of York and Pecl.	8, 39	King v. Robins	176
Figg v. Weddehan	27	Holmes v. Tatton	231	Kingsford et al v. Merry	79
Finn v. Fitzgerald	163	Homersham v. The Wolverhampton Water Works	93	Kirk v. Nowell	127
Fisher v. The Thames Tunnel R'y Co. et al v. Edgar	191, 176	Hope v. The Corporat'n of Gloucester	57	Kirkpatrick v. Kelly	47
Flitcroft v. Fletcher	224	Hopkins v. The Mayor of Swansea, 31, 211	190	Knight v. Coleby	90
Foster v. Geddes	224	Horn v. Ivy	30	L.	
" v. Pearson	117	Horsman v. Horsman	198, 211	Lanark and Drummond Plank Road Co. v. Bothwell	229
Fraser v. Newton	208	Housen v. Stickles	213	Lane v. Isaacs	172
French v. French	60	Hubbart v. Phillips	26	Lavery v. Patterson	176
Faller v. McKay	136	Humphry v. Mears	129	Lawes v. Codrington	90
Fulton v. Waterson	98	Huntley v. Bulwer	212	Lawford v. Spicer	118
G.		I.		Lawrence v. The Great Northern R'y Company	127
Gamble v. White	198, 209	Inhabitants of the County of Cumberland v. Thucking	127	Leader v. Moxon	29, 30, 189, 206
Garrett et al v. Cotton	233	In re Armitage	189	Leclair et al v. Prudhomme	229
Gettings v. Symons	209	" Chandler	118	Lee v. Vesey	138
Gifford v. Johns	213	" Chesley v. Hall	179	Levi v. Coyle	90
Gilbert v. Hales	235	" Glasse v. Glasse	213	Listed v. Lee	171
Gill v. Jackson et al.	197	" Hawke and the Municipality of Wellesley	129	Litt v. Martindale	118
" v. McAuley	211	In re Hodgson and Brown's Arbitration	159	Livingston v. Ralli	150
Gillin v. Boddington	189, 219	" Hopewood	8	Lock v. Harris	239
Gittins v. Symes	230	" Johnson	58	London Gas Co. v. Campbell	197
Glen v. Lewis	233	" Ley and the Municipality of the Township of Clarke	106	Lord Lonsdale v. Nelson et al.	31
Glover v. The North Staffordshire Railway Company	127, 189, 190	" McIntyre	46	" Oakley v. The Kensington Canal Co.	192
Glynn v. Thomas	97	" Peerless	43	Lowe v. Kellett	27
Godts v. Rose	58	" Sells and the Municipality of St. Thomas	89, 129	Lowndes v. Fountain	59
Goldburgh v. Leeson	193, 209	" Shaw and Pitt's Arbitration	158	M.	
Goodman v. Hervey	117	" The Board of School Trustees and the Municipality of Galt	69	Maddock v. Holmes	171
Gorrie v. Beard et al	176	" The Great Western R. W. Co.	193	Magrath v. The Municipality of the Township of Brock	109
Gosla v. Tunc	176	Insole v. James et al	179	Major <i>qui tam</i> v. Reynolds	87
Gosling v. Veley	31, 190	International Telegraph Co. v. Renter	118	Mann v. The General Steam Navigation Co.	80
Goszter v. The Corporation of Georgetown	191	Ipswich v. Martin	189	Mare v. Charles	80
Grady v. Hunt	119	J.		Mareh v. Boulton	128, 192
Graham v. Burgess	39	Jackson v. Taylor	30	Martin v. B. U.S.	117
" v. Fieber	169	Jeggins v. Dawson	111	" Henning	211
Grant v. Lynch	197	Jefferies v. The South Western R. W. Co.	79	Marvin v. Wallis	168
" v. McIntosh	177	Jeffries v. Williams	91	Mason v. Baker	4
" v. Vaughan	117	Jenkyu v. Vaughan	169	Matthews v. The West London Water Works Co.	31, 189
Green v. Horton	213	Jessopp v. Crawly	178	Maud v. The Mounmouthshire Canal Co.	30
" v. Low	179	Jewell et al v. Stead	138	Mayor of Thetford's Case	30
Grocers Company v. Dunn	189	Jinks v. Edwards et al.	97	" Lynn Regis v. Henley	126
Grouden v. The Great Western R'y Co.	57	Jones v. Bird	30, 189	Mears v. Gilberton	39
Guarding v. Brown	118	" Brown	158, 179	Mellish et al v. The B. B. & G. W. R. Co.	230
Gulliver v. Gulliver et al	179, 239	" Falls	117	" Mercer v. Stanberry	177
H.		" Jenner	179	Metropolitan Building Society v. McPherson	228
Halford v. Hunt	39	" Jones	20, 212	Miller v. Parnell	90
Hall v. Bowes	198, 208	" Powell	97	Mitchell v. Foster	89
" v. Scotsun	172	Jordan v. Mann	39	Moberly v. Baines	212, 234
" v. Smith	189	" Marr	207	McEatt v. Fitzgibbon	211
Haveman v. Smith	79	Joynes v. Collinson	90, 212	Monk v. Bonham	47
Hanley v. Heldershot	214	K.		Moore v. Cotton	211
Hanks v. Palling	157	Kane v. Kane	213	Morgan v. Hughes	24
Harris v. McLeod et al	198	Kekendal et al v. McKrimmon	181		
Harrison v. Guest	158	Kelly v. Delabays	208		
" v. Paynton	223				
Haslett v. Burt	179				
Haughton v. Morton	19				
Hazleton v. Brundige	176				

	PAGE.		PAGE.		PAGE.
Morley v. Morley	19	Platt v. Else	228	R. ex Rel. Coleman v. O'Hara	6
Morris v. Smythie	212	Ponting v. Watson	13	" Corly v. Brown	6
Mossop v. The Grand Trunk R. Co.	19	Pugh v. Roberts	58	" Dillon v. O'Neil	149
Municipality of Berlin v. Grange	144	Pureell v. Macnamara	151	" Loyall v. Panton	6
McCallum v. McCallum	211			" Padweil v. Stewart et al.	6
McDonabl v. The Hamilton & Port Dover Road Co	152	R.		" Swan v. Rowat	9, 39
" v. Prentiss	166	Ramsden v. Gray	235	" Wallis v. Bostwick	164
McGregor v. Rhodes	118	R. v. Barton	90	Read v. The Municipal Council of the County of Kent	88
McGuire v. Sneath	144	" The Bristol Dock Co	31	Rees dem. Howell v. Bowen	151
McIntyre v. The Municipal Council of Bosanquet	9	" Burgon	138	Reid v. Leslie	30
McKenna v. The Western Assurance Co.	228	" Clement	5	" v. The City of Hamilton 108, 186	226
McKinnon v. Pexson	127	" Cokely et al.	76	Reilly v. Clark	232
McLane v. Nelson	157	" Colamins	4	Remington v. Cannon	170
McLaren v. Blacklock	150	" The Commissioners of Sewers for Pagham 127, 189	190	Renaud v. The Great Western R. Co.	58
McLean v. Waters	30	" The Commissioners of Sewers for Co. Somerset	188	Revis v. Smith	137
" v. Cumming	176	" Coyle	19	Reuter v. The Electric Telegraph Co.	130
McLeod v. McDougall	117	" Crowther	182	Reynolds v. Bridge	178
" v. Buchanan	229	" Curran	62	Richards v. Easto	128
McMurtry v. Munro	197, 207	" Davis et al.	137	Ridsdale v. St. Amour	117
McWhirter v. Bougard	168	" Dixon	19	Roach v. Potash et al.	176
		" Dodson	222	Roberts v. Hazleton	176
N.		" Doty	56	" v. Reed	30, 189, 192
Nash v. Brown	235	" Dunn	190	Robins v. Porter	230
Ness v. The Municipality of Saltfleet	106	" Francis	8	Robinson v. Wheelwright	60
Nertou v. Matthews	27	" Gamble	71	Rodgers v. Parker	138
Niagara Falls Road Co. v. Benson	152	" Gardner	139	Ross et al v. Bryan et al.	89, 91
Nichol v. Cartwright et al.	176	" Greenway	63	" Cameron	90
Nimmo v. Flannigan et al.	239	" Halls	4	" Jones	68
" v. Welland	213	" Harland	90	Rosse et al v. Cummings	27
Nixon v. Manning	202	" Harropp	118	Rosse v. Dolson	198, 208
		" Haslam	18	Rowbottom v. Dupree	172
O.		" Holland	29	Rowbury v. Morgan	172
O'Donahoe v. The School Trustees of Section 4, Thorah	185	" Hunter	183	Rowley v. Ball	117
O'Keefe v. O'Brien et al.	231	" Keddy	181	Running v. Kidd	29
O'Leahy v. McGuian	177	" Ledyard	190		
Oliver v. King	98	" Leech	138	S.	
O'Reilly v. Van Every et al.	110	" Martin	5	Samprill v. The Billercay Union	93
" v. Van Nuck et al.	110	" Parry	8	Sanders v. Westley	90
Otis v. Rossin et al.	5	" Pickles	90	Schofield v. Higgins	172
Overton v. Freeman	189	" Quayle	8	Scott v. The Mayor, &c., of Manchester	138
Owen v. O	27	" Roebuck	138	" Nixon	170
" v. Van Uster	224	" Scott	30	Searls v. Sadgrove	18
		" Simpson	23	Seedham v. Baxter	79
P.		" Slythe	9	Seymour v. Maddox	29
Page v. Smith	172	" Smith	19	Shae v. O'Neil	229
Palmer v. The Grand Junction R. Co.	191	" Smith, H. J.	59	Shaw v. Ormiston	26
Pardington v. The South Wales R. Co.	239	" Smith and Corbet	184	Shearwood v. Hay	128
Park et al. v. McKenny	117	" Strip	137	Shuttleworth v. Cocker	56
Parker et al. v. Roberts	177	" Symmons	9	Silimany. McLean	76
Parker v. Serle	136	" The Birmingham and Gloucester R. Co.	30, 152	Simpson et al v. Lamb	98
" v. The Great Western R. Co.	191	" The Eastern Counties Railroad Company	127, 189, 191	" Rand	235
Parnaby v. The Lancaster Canal Co.	126	" The Great North of England Rail road Company	30, 152	" Ready	226
Parnel v. The Great Western R. Co.	58	" The Guardians of Holborn Union	157	Sladden v. Smith	233
" v. Young	28	" The Inhabitants of St. Edwards	190	Sloper v. Cotterell	158
Pawson et al v. Wightman	184	" The Inhabitants of St. Paul's	224	Smart v. The West Ham Union	93
Patterson v. Squire et al.	176	" The Justices of Glamorganshire	189	Smith v. The Birmingham Gas Light Co.	30
Peachy v. Rowland	189	" The Leeds & Manchester Railway Company	90, 189, 191	" v. Collier	89
Peacock v. Rhodes	117	" The Mayor of Bridgewater	190	" v. Lloyd	170
Pears v. Wilson	136	" The Municipal Council of Perth	107, 206	" v. Page	158
Pelmere v. Hood	48	" Trevencri	9	" v. Samsberry	48
Perry v. Attwood	158	" Vipont	182	Smyth et al. v. Tower	183
" v. The Town Council of Whitby	88	" Williams	76	Snook et al. v. The Town Council of Brantford	106, 222
Peters v. Claison	31, 189	" Wrotherly	222	Spafford v. Buchanan	150, 151
Phelps v. Protheroe	235	" York	190	Spence v. Drake	91
Phillips v. Hewston	136			Starrett v. Manning	239
Phillips v. Lewis	111			Stattiam v. The Liverpool Dock Co.	170
Picard v. Cornell	56			Stevenson v. Oliver	226
Pim v. Campbell	137			Stechdale v. Wade et al.	40
Pintard v. Tackington	117			Street v. Cuthbert	228
Plate Glass Man'y v. Meredith 31, 189.	206			" v. Dolson	198, 208

	PAGE.		PAGE.		PAGE.
Street v. Proudfoot.....	213	Toronto Gas Co. v. Peters.....	69	Wheeler v. Erskine et al.....	53
Strong P.O. v. Foster.....	59	Township of Moore v. McRae.....	205	Wheeler v. Munro.....	66
Surtcees v. Ellison.....	226	Tyrrell v. Annis.....	235	" v. Schilizzi.....	79
Sutton v. Clarke.....28, 30, 31, 128, 186,	206			White v. Clarke.....	128, 192
Suznlati v. Powell.....	212	U.		Wickenden v. Webster.....	187
Swan v. Cleland.....	235	Uhlborn v. Chapman.....	231	Wilkes v. The B. B. & G. Railway Co.	230
		Underwood v. Nicholls.....	59	Wilkins v. Blacklock.....	232
T.				Wilkinson v. Page.....	171
Tarrant v. Webb.....	158	V.		Wilks v. The Hungerford Market Co..	30
Tate v. Bodfield.....	172	Vorley v. Barrett.....	240	Williams v. Teith.....	102
Tatton v. Wade.....	138			Wilson v. Braddyl.....	235
Taylor v. Carroll.....	239	W.		" v. Kingston.....	90
" v. Jarvis.....	197	Wade v. Simeon.....	171	" v. Port Hope.....	139
" v. Laird.....	179	" v. Stanley.....	27	Wing v. Harvey.....	112
" v. McKiriley.....	239	Wagstaffe v. Sharp.....	128	Winter v. Bartholomew.....79,	178
Thatcher v. D'Aguiar.....	59	Wakefield v. Gone.....	76	" Lord Anson.....	19
Thom v. Huddy.....	230	Walker v. Watson.....	208	Withers v. Spooner.....	90
Thomas v. The Baron Von Stattazheim	239	Wall v. The London & South Western		Wood v. Bell.....	98
Thompson v. Gibson.....	66	Railway Company.....	79	" v. Hurne.....	111
" v. Gayon.....	170	Wallace v. Bellows.....	235	" v. Searth.....	19
" v. Hopper.....	59	" v. Fraser.....	181	" et ux. v. Bletcher.....	137
" v. Zywick.....	176	Waller v. Smith.....	136	Woodhams v. Newman.....	137
Tieman v. The School Trustees of Ne-		Wallgrave v. Tebbs.....	60	Wright v. Castle.....	26
pean.....	159	Walton v. Hayward.....	176	" v. Court.....	44
Tilt v. The Municipality of the Town-		Ward v. Stewart et al.....	239	" v. Peggim.....	28
ship of Toronto.....	9	Ward et al v. The Law Property, &c.,		" v. Scott.....	98
Tinkler v. Hilder.....	178	Society.....	157		
Todd v. Cain et al.....	231	Warner v. Wilmington.....	158	Y.	
Tomlinson et al v. State.....	59	Warren v. Munro.....	198, 209	Yarborough v. The Bank of England...	30
" v. Straight.....	97	Webb v. Clark.....	58	Young v. The Grand River Navigation	
Torrance v. Gross.....	212	Wedge v. Berkeley.....	128	Co.....29, 31,	189
Torrence v. Gibbins.....	29	Weld v. Gas Light Co.....	30	" et al v. Laird.....	6

DIVISION COURTS.

OFFICERS AND SUITORS.

At the commencement of a new volume, we may be permitted to make a brief reference to what has already appeared in the *Law Journal* under this department. In the first number it was intimated, that under this heading would appear matters having special reference to *Clerks* and *Bailiffs*, as well as information for *Suitors*. We desired to assist officers in the performance of their arduous and important duties, and promised special attention to what more immediately concerned them. On referring to our pages it will be found that the law and practice of arbitration in the Division Court has been treated of, and suitable forms furnished—that the practice of attachments has been discussed both in reference to Clerk and Bailiff, and forty-four necessary forms given, which neither the Statute nor Rules supplied—that the Clerk's duties in taxing costs have been very fully explained and appropriate forms furnished—that the duties of Clerks and Bailiffs in Court were copiously treated of, and a set of forms comprehending all the ordinary business of the Court, set down in order for their convenience—that the provisions generally of the late Act in its bearing on officers were not left unnoticed, while the subject of "Transferred Judgments," "Foreign Summonses," the transmission of papers, &c., and the mode of opening and keeping the necessary books under the requirements of the same Act, were examined and explained, and forms made out—that the appointment of Deputy Clerks, with its incidents, was noticed, and also the process of Subpoena in arbitration with an examination as to the proper practice and forms.

With respect to *Bailiffs*, those parts of their duties not immediately connected with the Clerks—such as the service of process generally, arming Bailiffs with information at all points for their guidance—practical hints respecting their responsibilities, their remuneration and privileges—their protection under the Statute, and the proceedings necessary to avail themselves of this privilege—seizures, &c., were specially examined in our pages.

We have spoken of what appeared under this head, but editorially, also, in many reports of cases, their duties and responsibilities were illustrated and explained: moreover, officer's just claims for increased remuneration were advocated, with what success, truth is all powerful, we leave our readers to determine; we were, at all events, as the Organ of the Local Courts, the first in the field to represent their grievances and claims.

Suitors will have seen that every pains have been taken to enable them to use with advantage the Tribunals to which they resort, "the People's own Courts" as the Division Courts are emphatically styled. Our aim has been to show in plain language what should be done and attended to by Suitors from the commencement of a suit—with this in view, we gave full and practical instruction for reference to arbitration, by parties having matters in difference with the jurisdiction of these

Courts; and for the due and orderly holding of arbitration, also hints on securing the attendance of witnesses and their payments—and a series of articles showing what causes of action are within the jurisdiction, what are exempted, the parties to sue and be sued, in what Court the plaintiff is required to enter his suit, the form and requisites of a plaintiff's account, demand or claim; including the statement of the cause of action, leaving particulars for suit, the preparations for trial, &c.

We briefly glance at these heads of subjects treated of in the volume just concluded, not so much to show that officers and suitors have had a liberal supply of original matter for their information, as with a view to make those, who have not yet become subscribers, aware of the character and design of the *Law Journal*, and to enable them to judge from the matter of the first volume what may be expected in the one commencing with this number.

We feel that we have a just claim to be supported by Division Court officers and suitors—and that we can promise them good value for their subscriptions. More than a year ago the County Judges expressed an opinion that they recognized in such a Publication "A source of great public utility in advancing the sound administration of Justice in Courts, which from their local character so immediately comprehend the interest evolved from the masses of a peculiarly industrious and progressive people, &c., &c."

Notwithstanding this there are several Clerks and Bailiffs who do not yet take the *Law Journal*, though it seems not unreasonable to suppose that every officer would desire to make himself better acquainted with the duties of his office; and we may add that a number of the most intelligent officers (subscribers) have acknowledged in strong terms the value and usefulness of our publication. Surely an office cannot be worth holding, if it does not enable the party holding it to pay at the rate of 1s. 8d. per month for a work, the leading object of which is to explain his duties and responsibilities, and thus to give him confidence and security in acting.

We will send this number to those who are not now on our list and ask them to become regular subscribers. Those who refuse, will please return in an open cover directed to the Publishers, marking it "Refused," with their names and addresses.

We have already offers to produce in our columns the treatises referred to in our advertisement on another page, viz.: the Law and Practice of the Division Courts, including the duties of Clerks—and a manual of the office and duties of Bailiffs) and one or both will probably be commenced in the February number. We have also commenced and will continue to completion, a full Directory of all the Division Courts in Upper Canada, a work indispensable under the recent Act: these will alone cost us upwards of £100 so much disbursed for the benefit of officers, and additional inducement to new subscribers. The question is to be answered whether officials will support us by their individual subscriptions and by inducing Suitors and others to take the *Law Journal*.

CLERKS.

APPLICATIONS FOR NEW TRIALS.

The difficulties which suitors experience in procuring legal assistance in remote parts of the country often throw upon clerks the work of drawing papers for parties applying for new trial. To do so is no part of the officer's duty, but as he is generally the best informed person in the neighborhood, and moreover the best acquainted with the subject, the Clerk is the person commonly applied to to prepare the necessary papers. He may refuse doing so, if inconvenient to him, but if he renders this service to Suitors, it is not necessarily in his capacity as Clerk, and as a private individual he may, it would seem, charge a reasonable sum for his work, and is not tied down to the scale of charges in the Tariff, unless what is done is of that description of work, which is *specified* therein. We desire to give a few hints for the information of those who act in the assistance of parties in the matter referred to. Looking to the 52nd Rule of Practice it will be seen that applications made after the Court day must be in writing, showing briefly the grounds on which they are made, which grounds "*if matters of fact requiring proof* shall be supported by affidavit." The meaning of this is that where the Judge has personal knowledge from what passed before him at the trial of the matter on which the application is founded—as for example, where the new trial is applied for on a point of Law arising out of the facts proved at the trial, a perverse verdict or the like, it is sufficient to *state* the grounds in the form of an application; but this is rarely the foundation of an application unless when made by professional men. When the grounds are not within the knowledge of the Judge, but are facts capable of proof, they must be supported,—in other words, proved by affidavit: the following are, among others, the class of applications requiring proof, viz.: on the ground of the perjury of witnesses, the discovery of fresh evidence that is material, being misled or surprised by the opposite party, the applicant having been disabled from attending by sudden sickness, accident, or otherwise, the misconduct of the Jury.

To the last description of applications we confine ourselves at present. When a party thinks he has fair claim for a new trial, the first thing is to set

down the facts he considers material. For those not familiar with drawing affidavits, the simplest way is to state the grounds plainly and briefly in ordinary language, and append an affidavit verifying the statement of facts: if more than one person's statement is material to be laid before the Judge, each must be verified in the same way. Perhaps the simplest plan of illustrating our meaning will be, to suppose *An Application by Defendant for new Trial on the ground of the discovery of fresh evidence that is material*—and give suitable forms.

In the——Division Court for the County of——

Between A. B. Plaintiff;

and,

C. D. Defendant.

I C. D.—The Defendant states that since the Verdict was rendered against me in this cause, I have discovered that the note which forms the plaintiff's claim was endorsed and delivered to him by E. F., to whom the said note was made payable by me, long after the same was due and payable,—that the Plaintiff gave no value for the same—that in point of fact the note now belongs to E. F.—that the Plaintiff has allowed his name to be used in order to deprive me of the right of set off against the said note and that I expect to be able to substantiate these facts by the evidence of——. I state further, that said E. F., is justly indebted to me in the sum of———for goods sold and delivered to him, on the understanding that the amount should be credited on the note—and unless I am enabled to set off my claim against the said note, great injustice will be done me, as the said E. F. is in insolvent circumstances.

On the grounds above stated, I make application to set aside the Verdict rendered at the last sittings of this Court, and for a new trial in this cause.

C. D. Defendant

This statement must be verified by oath. It may be in form of affidavit following:—

In the——Division Court for the County of——Between A. B. Plaintiff;

and,

C. D., Defendant.

C. D. of——, the Defendant, maketh oath and saith, that the within (or annexed) statement, signed by him, is true in substance, and in matter of fact.

Sworn before me at——

In the County of——this

day of——A. D. 185—

X. Y. Clerk.

C. D.

Should the party making application for a new trial, bring the statement of his grounds ready prepared to the office instead of employing the Clerk to draw it, the above form of affidavit will in general be sufficient to verify the statement of fact therein; but, in such case, the statement and affidavit must be accompanied by an application attached thereto, which may be in the following form, or to the like effect.

In the—Division Court of the County of—
Between A. B. Plaintiff;
and
C. D., Defendant.

I maketh application to set aside the Verdict rendered in this cause, and for a new trial on the grounds disclosed in the statement signed by me which is hereunto attached.

C. D., Defendant.

(To be continued.)

Bailiffs.—In the December Number we examined the defences that Bailiffs may avail themselves of, under the D. C. Act, Sec. 107: let us now turn to the 14th Sec. of the D. C. Extension Act—which provides that no action shall be brought against a Bailiff for anything done in obedience to a warrant of the Court, until a demand of perusal and copy thereof has been made and the same refused or neglected to be given for the space of six days; and that if such demand be complied with, the Clerk who signed the warrant shall be joined, and on proof at the Trial of the warrant that a Verdict shall be given for the Bailiff. In the September number, we pointed out to Bailiffs the necessity for prompt compliance with this demand. We now proceed to notice what the officer should do to avail himself of a defence under the clause.

The object of the Section is to protect Bailiffs in what they have done in obedience to a warrant under the hand of the Clerk and the Seal of the Court, although the warrant may be defective or irregular; but it does not protect where a Bailiff has no warrant so signed or sealed, and has acted beyond his authority: in such case he is liable for the excess, and no demand of copy is necessary; thus if he take the wrong person, or if the warrant direct him to take the goods of A and he takes the goods of B, he is not within the protection of the Statute.

The defences under this Section may be arranged as follows:—

1. That no *written* demand signed by the party demanding the same, was made of the perusal and copy of the warrant.
2. That the demand of warrant was complied with, and that the Clerk who signed it, is not joined as a Defendant.
3. That the Bailiff acted in obedience to a warrant signed by his co-defendant the Clerk, and sealed with the seal of the Court.

The grounds of defence may be given in evidence

under the general issue, and what has been said in the last number may be repeated here, that the *principle* may be so far applied to suits in the Division Court as to make a general reference to the clause in question sufficient; but it will be best to specify the particular ground of defence relied on. Some question may arise as to whether this clause applies to actions in the Division Courts, or is confined to actions in the Superior Courts: but this is not the proper place to discuss that question. We hold that it applies to Suits in *any* Court, and have therefore so assumed in this article.

A notice in the following form should be given where a defence under the Section referred to is open to the Bailiff:

Notice of defence under Statute (D. C. E. Act, Sec. 14.)

In the—Division Court for the County of—
Between A. B., Plaintiff;
and,
C. D., Defendant.

The Plaintiff is required to take notice that upon the hearing of this cause the Defendant intends to plead and to avail himself of all and every of the provisions of the 14th Section of the Upper Canada Division Courts Extension Act, and especially that he intends to insist on the following grounds of defence, viz.: that he is not guilty of the matter alleged against him in the Plaintiff's claim; that the Plaintiff's claim is in respect to acts done by him in obedience to a warrant, &c. (*state the nature of the warrant*) directed to him and issued from (*state the Court from which issued*) under the hand of the Clerk of the said Court and the Seal of the Court, and that no demand hath been made or left at his residence by the Plaintiff or by his Attorney or Agent in writing signed by the party demanding the same of the perusal and copy of such warrant, (*if necessary add other grounds which can be readily framed from the foregoing.*)

C. D., Defendant.

Dated this—day of—A.D. 185
To A. B., Plaintiff.

In addition to the proof of the service of this notice, the Bailiff should in all cases be prepared at the trial to produce and prove his warrant, and if he has on demand shown the warrant and allowed a copy of it to be taken, he should also produce proof of that fact. Cases may occur where the Defendant, Bailiff, may be able to avail himself of a defence under the Section above referred to, as well as the 107 Sec. of the D. C. Act. When this is the case, both Sections should be referred to in the notice of defence: a form embodying a reference to both may be easily framed from this and the form given in the December number.

SUITORS.

What the Defendant should do between the service of Summons and the Court day:

When a Defendant is served with a copy of Summons, he will find annexed to it or written in the margin, a copy of the Plaintiff's account or claim. He should at once examine it, and if he finds it wholly correct, let him pay the amount and costs to the Clerk of the Court with as little delay as possible; or if not able to pay at the time, sign a confession for it like an honest man. The confession may be made before the Clerk or Bailiff, so it may save a journey to the Clerk's office if the party who means to confess, tells the Bailiff that he is willing to do so: and as the Bailiff is bound to have forms with him or to draw up a confession when required, should he refuse, the Judge would probably order him to compensate the Defendant for his trouble in coming to the Clerk's office, for the purpose of confessing judgment in the suit: the prompt admission or confession of a claim saves the Defendant costs, that might otherwise be incurred. If the claim be *in part* correct, for example—if only one or two of several items in an account are denied, or if the claim be made up partly of a note and partly of an account, and the latter only is objected to, there is a provision made by the Rules of Court for saving unnecessary expense in proof, of which the Defendant may avail himself. He is at liberty to give the opposite party a notice in writing that he will admit on the trial of the cause any part of the claim, or any facts which would otherwise require to be proved, the effect of which will be to deprive the Plaintiff of any expense incurred by him, after such notice given, for the purpose of proving any part of the claim, or any fact so admitted.

This Notice must be served personally on the plaintiff or left for him at his usual place of abode, at least six days before the trial or hearing.

A form of the notice is given in the rules† which it will be well to follow. It is headed in the Court and cause (same as in the heading of the summons) and shortly notifies the plaintiff "that the defendant will admit on the Trial of the cause, the *first, second* &c., items in the plaintiff's claim to be correct" [or

the signing "of the promissory note sued upon" or any other fact as the case may be, otherwise requiring proof]. This notice is to be signed by the defendant and may be embodied with a notice of set off or of any other defence. This is an equitable and valuable regulation and should be acted on: it will serve to bring up the *real questions* in every disputed case and to reduce them to the narrowest point; thus saving as was intended by the Judges, unnecessary expense.

(To be continued)

ON THE DUTIES OF MAGISTRATES.

(SKETCHES BY A. J. P.)

(Continued from vol. 1., p. 223.)

THE SERVICE OF THE SUMMONS.

In those cases which are not within, the 16 Vic. O. 178, the directions regarding service given by the particular act must be followed, and where no special direction is given the service of the summons should be personal. (a.)

In cases which are within, the 16 Vic., c. 178. that statute expressly authorizes the summons to be delivered to the defendant, or left with some person for him at his place of abode: the language of Sec. 1. on the subject is as follows:

Every summons shall be served by a constable or other Peace officer, or other person to whom the same shall be delivered upon the person to whom it is so directed, by delivering the same to the party personally, or by leaving the same with some person for him at his last or most usual place of abode.

It will be found convenient in practice to make out the summons in duplicate, both to be signed and sealed by the Magistrate and delivered to the person appointed to serve it. One of these to be delivered to the defendant *personally* or *left for him*, as the statute requires the other to be retained by the person who serves the summons, and a memorandum should be endorsed thereon of the time and manner of service. When not personally served the name of the person with whom the summons is left should be found out, and the relation in which such person stands to the defendant, as wife, daughter, servant, &c., noted down. The person who serves is required to attend at the hearing, to depose if necessary

† The rules and forms, prepared by the Judges for the Division Courts, were printed in pamphlet form, at the Leader Steam Press, Toronto, and maybe procured there, or, at Maclear & Co.'s; every sutor should have a copy.

(a) R. v. Hall 6 D. & R. 74. R. v. Colmans, S.D. & R. 314. R. v. Simpson, 12 Mod. 351. Mason, & Baker, 1 Car. & Kin. 367—680.

to the due service of the summons; that in case of non-appearance the Magistrate may be able to proceed against the defendant *ex parte* or issue a warrant for his apprehension. (b)

Where no duplicate is delivered to the Constable or other person he should make a copy, in order to be able to prove the service properly, and deliver the original to the defendant or leave it for him. A word of caution to Magistrates as to what may be considered proof of due service, when the summons is not personally served. Every principle of justice demands that a party who is to be affected either in pocket or person by any proceeding against him should have notice thereof, that he may not be condemned, without hearing what he has to urge in his defence: and this is obviously necessary in proceedings of a criminal nature, wherein the defendant may upon conviction incur a penalty or be subject to loss of liberty.

Now the statute in allowing service to be made by leaving the Summons with *some person* for the defendant at his last or most usual *place of abode* goes on the presumption that the summons will by this means come to the notice of the defendant. "With *some person*," can scarcely be taken in its broadest sense; it must mean some person who is a relation of the defendant, or a person in his employ, or some one who may reasonably be supposed to have intercourse with him, and from whom he is likely to receive the summons. Leaving it with a mere stranger who happens to be in the house, or with a child of tender years, could not be held a sufficient service. And, therefore, the necessity of the Officer making proper enquiries and being prepared to state the name of the person with whom he leaves the process and the relation in which he stands towards the defendant.

"Place of abode" is synonymous with the word "*dwelling*"; it is a place where a man lives and considers his home. A man's dwelling is *prima facie* where his wife and family reside; and if he has a family dwelling in some place, and he occupy a house and occasionally sleep in another, he will not be a resident in the latter place, for his residence is his domicile, and his domicile is his home, and his home is where his family reside. (c.)

(b) 16 Vic. c. 178. Secs. 1 & 2.

(c) Story's, Conflict of Laws. S. 63. R. O. Duke of Richmond, 6 T. R. 561.

And where a man had a shop and private parlour in which he carried on his business and entertained his private friends, but neither himself nor his servant slept there, the Judges held that such occupation did not constitute a dwelling. (d.)

On the whole, it is recommended that Magistrates should require proof that the summons, when not personally served, has been delivered to the wife or child or servant of the defendant or other person having intercourse with him: and the propriety of such practice has been distinctly recognized by the Judges (e). Whether this practice be adopted or not, Magistrates should require such evidence of service as will satisfy them, by a fair inference, that the summons has in fact found its way to the hands of the defendant a reasonable time before the hearing (f); for this purpose the officer should be questioned on oath as to the manner and particulars of the service (g). If the Magistrate is of opinion that the defendant has not been duly summoned either with reference to the time or manner of service, he should issue another summons. It may be added, that proof of the summons having actually come to the knowledge of the defendant a reasonable time before the return, will relieve the Magistrate of any difficulty in proceeding *ex parte* or issuing his warrant as the case may seem to require.

Having spoken of what seems to be the reasonable construction of the statute and the practice most in accordance with sound principles of justice, it only remains to add on this head that the Magistrates are the proper judges of what is due service, and that if they are satisfied, the Courts above will not in general interfere with their decisions.

TO BE CONTINUED.

U. C. R E P O R T S .

GENERAL AND MUNICIPAL LAW.

IN CHAMBERS.

OTIS vs. ROSSIN *et al.*

Irregularity in original writ—Acceptance of service how far a waiver.
An application to set aside original writ or the service there-

(d) R. v. Martin, R. & R. 108.

(e) R. v. Clement 4 B. & A. 218.

(f) In re Hopwood, 19 L. J. 197. M. C. 152 R. 121.

(g) If we are rightly informed the able and experienced Magistrate who presides over the Police Court of Toronto, makes it a practice in all cases where the service of summons is not personal to enquire very minutely as to the mode of service and to postpone the case, if the Officer in his evidence is not able to state, facts and circumstances, from which it may be reasonably inferred that the summons came into the defendant's hands.

of on the grounds that it bore no indorsement of the name and place of abode of the Attorney by whom it was issued, and that the copy contained no place marked on the margin where issued, nor the name of the Clerk by whom issued.

Defendant's Attorney endorsed and signed an admission of service on the original writ.

BURNS, J.—The question is whether in case of service on the party himself being warned, and service on the Attorney being substituted for convenience as we may suppose, technical irregularities, such as in the present instance, can be taken advantage of. It appears to me that when an Attorney accepts service of a writ for his client, the Attorney should refuse to accept it and oblige service in the ordinary way. The client cannot complain when it is served on the Attorney, because no service has in fact been made; and the question always is, when the Attorney accepts service, whether he can be compelled to appear. The Attorney may take that course here, and refuse to appear, and take the opinion of the Court whether he shall be compelled to do so.

The Summons is, therefore, discharged with costs.

YOUNG *et al.* vs. LAIRD.

A Judge's Summons was obtained on the 10th of November, 1855, to send the issues down for trial to County Court. On the 19th, the Summons having been enlarged in the meantime, an order was made to try the cause at the 1st or 2nd Sittings of the County Court, after the making of the order. On the 13th November, notice of trial was served for 20th—the sitting day of the County Court. The cause was entered on the 2nd day of the sittings of the Court, without defendant's leave, and was tried.

Defendant moved, during last Term in Practice Court to set aside Notice of trial and order for writ of trial, and all subsequent proceedings thrown upon the grounds.

1. That the notice of trial was served before any order was made for the writ of trial. 2. That the order was made too late to admit of proper notice of trial being given for the next sittings of the County Court. 3. That the writ of trial was entered without the defendant's consent, on the second day of the sittings of the Court.

The rule was enlarged, by consent, on the merits only, to be disposed of by the Judge in Chambers.

BURNS, J.—I do not see that this case can be distinguished from *Reach et al. vs. Hall*, 11 U.C.R. 356. It is urged that having applied for the writ of trial before the notice served, though the order was obtained afterwards, distinguishes it from that case. Further, it is urged that the order specially mentioning that the plaintiffs might take down the cause at the first sittings of the County Court, so far cures any irregularity, that it would have the effect of compelling the defendant to move to set aside the service of the notice immediately, and that it was too late to make the application now. I do not think there is any weight in the argument. The service of a notice of trial, previous to obtaining an order for a writ of trial, is not a mere irregularity—it is a nullity, and the obtaining an order from a Judge authorizing the taking down the cause at the first sittings of the County Court, does not cure the nullity or impose an obligation on the defendant to move to set aside such notice previous to the cause being tried. The order was obtained the day before the sitting day of the Court, but because it is worded that the plaintiff might take down the cause at the first sittings, did not sanction the dispensation of a proper notice of trial according to practice. The Judge, when granting the order did not intend it to have that effect; and, indeed, he had no power to do it. The meaning of the order is that the plaintiff might take the cause down at the first sittings, if proper notice could be given; if not, then it might be done at the second sittings. The proper order to

make is, that the verdict and any subsequent proceedings be set aside with costs. The writ of trial is rightly obtained and will stand good. The notice was a nullity, and requires nothing to be said about it.

REGINA Ex. REL. COLEMAN vs. O'HARE.

“ “ “ LOYALL vs. PONTON.

“ “ “ CORLY vs. BROWN.

“ “ “ PADWELL vs. STEWART, HAWBLY, DAVY,
BOGART and McAMMANY.

BURNS, J.—Writs in the nature of Quo Warranto were issued at the relation of the different persons named, calling upon the respective defendants to show by what authority they respectively claim to hold and exercise the office of Councillor for the town of Belleville—the different relators complaining that the defendants were respectively disqualified to be elected at the last election held in January.

1. The grounds alleged against Mr. O'Hare are, that he was at the time of the Election and afterwards, surety to the town of Belleville by bond, for the due performance of his office by the Treasurer of the town. That he was also surety by bond to the Treasurer for the due collecting of the taxes by the Collector of the said town. Further, that at the time of the Election he was employed by the Town Council as the Attorney and Solicitor of the town, in defending suits then pending. Also, that Mr. O'Hare was and is a member, or shareholder, in the Belleville Gas Company, in which Company the town, as a corporation, hold 600 shares, and besides has lent to the Company £2,000, to secure the repayment of which, the Company has given a mortgage to the Corporation of the town. A further complaint against Mr. O'Hare is, that at the time of the election he was a stockholder in the Belleville Harbor and Marine Railway Company, and a Trustee thereof which Company holds a license of occupation, by resolution of the town Council, for occupying the water lots in front of the town under a contract for remuneration to the town.

The charges made in the statement are not denied in any way, and the only one attempted to be explained is that of the employment as an Attorney and Solicitor on the part of the Corporation. It is shown that Mr. Benson was formerly the Solicitor for the town Council, and since his death no appointment of a Solicitor has been made, and that Mr. O'Hare has not received any remuneration for services, nor has he demanded any. It is not denied that he is acting in the defence of suits against the Corporation in the ordinary way. It is sworn that neither the relator nor any other person objected to Mr. O'Hare's qualification at the time of the Election, though the relator was himself a candidate.

It is no answer to this application to say that the relator did not object at the Election to Mr. O'Hare's qualification. If the relator was seeking to obtain the seat, it would be an answer to that part of the application to say that no notice of disqualification was given; because before it can be said the electors have wasted or thrown away their votes, it should be shown that the candidate's qualification was questioned.

If the relator had assisted or taken part in the election of Mr. O'Hare, that fact would disqualify him from afterwards questioning the validity of the Election—the relator was a candidate opposing Mr. O'Hare, and though he knew of the disqualification he was not bound to mention it. The 25th Sec. of 16 Vic. ch. 181, enacts “that no person having by himself or partner, any interest or share in any contract with or on behalf of the town in which he shall reside, shall be qualified to be or be elected Councillor therein.” The rule with respect to disqualifying a relator from complaining is personal, but the rule is not to be applied in case of acts of omission, where all that is asked by a relator is to ascertain whether the person complained of is disqualified; for if he be, then the

Law declares he shall not be a Councillor, and shall not be elected such.

The objections against Mr. O'Hare that he is surety for the Treasurer of the town, and that he is acting as the Solicitor for the Corporation, are fatal to his retaining his seat as a Councillor for the town. By the 17th Sec. of 12 Vic. ch. 81, it is imperative upon the Treasurer to give security for the due accounting and paying over of all monies; and the relator's statement shows that to have been done by bond. Here we have a direct contract with the Corporation. Though the town Council may not have appointed Mr. O'Hare, to conduct suits on behalf of the Corporation either under a Corporation seal or by a resolution—yet I cannot suppose Mr. O'Hare would undertake business of that description without being sanctioned in some way which must give the matter a character of being a contract; in fact, to be remuneration for his services. It is said that the Collector has given security for the due performance of his duties to the Treasurer, and that it is not a contract with the Corporation. The terms of the bond are not shown, but the taking of such security must be under the authority conferred upon the town Council for regulating the bonds, recognizances or sureties, to be given by the Municipal officers for the faithful discharge of their duties.

There must be a new election ordered for Coleman Ward, for a Councillor in room of Mr. O'Hare, whose election is void, and the relator must have his costs.

2. The grounds alleged against Mr. Ponton are, that he is also a Shareholder in the Gas Company and a Shareholder and President of the Harbor and Marine Railway Company. The relator in this case is a voter in the Ward for which Mr. Ponton was elected, namely Retcheson Ward, and it is shown that the relator, at the Election, voted for Mr. Ponton, and must have known all the time that he was a shareholder in both of the Companies mentioned. The relator, having been himself instrumental in electing Mr. Ponton, is disqualified from afterwards complaining of the election, unless he could show that he was at the time of being so instrumental in his election, ignorant of his disqualification. The objection, if it be one, to Mr. Ponton, is not removed or got rid of by adjudging against the relator; but as the relator complains of the election which he was instrumental in bringing about by his vote, and with as much knowledge then as he had afterwards, he is prevented from questioning the Election. This writ must be quashed with costs against the relator.

3. The objections made to Mr. Brown's election to Baldwin ward are, that he is a Shareholder in the Gas Company, and also the Harbor and Marine Railway, Company, and further, that he is one of the sureties for the Collector of taxes. It now appears that the relator attended at the Election and voted for Mr. Brown, knowing, as I must believe from the depositions that he was such Shareholder in the Companies mentioned. For the reason already given, he is disqualified to complain against an election which he has been instrumental in promoting.

4. The objection made against Messrs Stewart, Hambly, Davy, Bogart, and McAmmany, is, that they are respectively shareholders in the Gas Company. The relator is a voter in Retcheson Ward. Stewart and Hambly were elected for the same Ward. Davy and Bogart were elected for Baldwin Ward and McAmmany for Sanson Ward. It is said in answer to the objection made against the defendants, that the relator is an alien. If this were clearly made out, of course it would disqualify the relator from properly being such; but the proof is entirely the belief and opinion of the respective deponents; and their statements that they have searched and cannot find any registry under the Alien Acts that he has been naturalized. If the allegations were sufficient to cause me to entertain doubts, then it would be proper that I should afford an opportunity to the relator to answer—but on examination of the

affidavits, I see no reason to postpone the matter for such investigation. It appears that the relator voted at the Municipal Elections some years ago, and it is said that it was a subject of remark, that he had then taken an oath before a Returning Officer or Magistrate to qualify him, and that it was an easy way of doing it. He again voted at the last Municipal Election, and no objection was raised that he was an alien. All the affidavits show that if the relator was liable to be objected to on that ground, the parties knew it before the Election and at the time. They could easily have tested the fact by requiring the elector to swear he was either a natural born subject or he had become naturalized. The 122nd Sec. of 12 Vic. ch. 81 provides for this. It appears to me that the objection should have then been made, and not ask me now, after it is apparent he has been exercising the right of a subject for several years to try the question as a collateral issue, to determine whether he shall complain of the Election. It appears that the relator voted for the defendant Stewart at the Retcheson Ward Election. That fact disqualifies him to complain of Stewart's election. He was himself, as well as Stewart, a shareholder in the Gas Company. This writ, as against Stewart, must therefore be quashed, with costs to Stewart.

As against Hambly, there is nothing to prevent the relator from making good his complaint, and the single question is, whether the case discloses a legal disqualification by reason of Hambly being a shareholder in the Gas Company, which Company has borrowed £2,000 from the Town Council, and secured the payment by mortgage. It is not said whether this Company has any contract with the Town Council for supplying the town with Gas. The Imperial Statute 5 and 6 Vic. ch. 104, defined the meaning of the word contract as used in 5 and 6 Wm. 4th ch. 76. The present case is whether a shareholder in an incorporated Company which has a contract with the Town Council to repay it a sum of money loaned, is disqualified. If the defendant Hambly had entered into such a contract personally, there could be no doubt, for though the English Act declares that the word contract shall not be construed to extend to a security for the payment of money only, yet our Legislature has not declared any meaning to be put upon the word, but has left it to its ordinary signification; and the interpretation which would have, before the passing of 5 and 6 Vic. ch. 104, been placed upon the word in England, must be that it extended to a mortgage given to secure the loan of money. Does this same rule extend to the shareholders of the Gas Company, when the Corporation has entered into the contract to repay the loan? The 25th Sec. of 16 Vic. ch. 181 extends to those having by himself or partner any interest in a contract. The Gas Company is incorporated under Statute 16 Vic. ch. 173. The 24th Sec. authorizes the Municipality to take stock in such Company, and that the Mayor for the time shall be *Ex-officio*, a director of the Company. In the present case the Town Council has taken £3,000 in stock of the Company, besides the loan. The 36th Section authorizes the Company to borrow more and to secure the same by mortgage, and to assign not only the rents, revenues, &c., of the Company, but also future calls on the shareholders of the Company.

We cannot fail to see—that by an Election of a person, a member of a Company with which the town has a contract, a very great influence may be exerted in the Town Council in the dealings of the town with the Company; and that every individual shareholder has an interest in the contract which the Company has entered into with the Town Council. It is true the Company would only transact his business through the voice of its Directors; but if it be open to a person to become a Director of the one Corporation and a Town Councillor of the other, or a Councillor of the latter without being a Director of the former, we must see it is also open to him to use his influence and vote upon a subject affecting his individual interest. It appears to me, therefore, that being a member of a

Corporation, which Corporation is again divided into or composed of individual interests, such as trading or manufacturing Corporations, is within the spirit and meaning of the Act. I am strengthened in this view, I think, on reference to the English Corporations Act 5 and 6 Wm. 4 ch. 76. In the 28th Sec., immediately after disqualifying persons on the ground of being interested in a contract, this provision is contained: "Provided that no person shall be disqualified from being a Councillor or Alderman of any borough as aforesaid, by reason of his being a proprietor or shareholder of any Company which shall contract with the Council of such borough for lighting or supplying with water or insuring against fire, any part of such borough." This provision, it appears to me, assumes that a proprietor or shareholder of a Company having such a contract has an interest, and that but for the exception of the proprietor or shareholders would be disqualified from being Councillor or Alderman. It does not appear to me there is any difference or distinction between incorporated and unincorporated Companies with respect to the disqualification, as it was suggested there perhaps might be. The relator sustains his complaint, therefore, against Hambly, and there should thereupon be a new election for a councillor for the Retcheson Ward in his place, and the relator must have his costs—that is, such proportion as the master shall tax and allow.

With regard to the remaining three defendants, a question is presented, which so far as I am able to ascertain, is quite new. The relator is a voter of Retcheson Ward, and he complains of the want of qualification of two of the Councillors for Baldwin Ward, and of one for Samson Ward; and the question is whether he is a good relator for that purpose. After much consideration of the subject, I have arrived at the conclusion that he has no right in this form to complain against these defendants. In the English Corporation Acts there is no provision for a summary trial similar to ours. The ordinary rule for a *quo warranto* must be moved in Court, and the discussion arises whether it is proper to grant the writ upon the application for the rule. *Rex. vs. Parry 6 A. and E. 510*, and *Regina vs. Quayle 11 A. and E. 508* shew that a relator residing in and voting in one ward might complain of a Councillor elected for another ward. I am of opinion that any rate payer in the town of Belleville might, in a similar manner, complain of a Councillor holding a seat, if he were disqualified to hold it; but then, in such case, the complainant would have to resort to the ordinary mode of obtaining the *quo warranto*, and could not take the personal method. I look upon the provisions of the 25th Sec. of 16 Vic. ch. 181 as being twofold; first, that no one who is interested in a contract &c., shall be qualified to be a Councillor; that is whether he were so at the time of the election or became so afterwards, and as to him the objection exists as the Court says in *Regina vs. Francis 21 Law J. Q. B. 304 de die in diem* and any rate payer might complain—and secondly, that no one so interested shall be qualified to be elected for any ward of the town in which case it is the election which is complained against on the ground of disqualification. It is the election which is complained against in the present case; and as to the jurisdiction of the writ to issue and the authority of a Judge to try that in a summary mode, it all depends upon the 146th Sec. of 12 Vic. ch. 81 as amended by 13 and 14 Vic. ch. 64. The writ may issue on the complaint of any relator having an interest as a Municipal voter, or having an interest as a Candidate. If a person were to be proposed as a candidate at two or more ward elections, it might, I suppose, sustain, if he found it necessary to do so, a writ against the successful candidates in more wards than one. A voter must vote in the ward in which he resides, if rated in that ward; and in case the election is contested by a voter, it must be done in the Ward in which the voter has the right to, or by law is, compelled to vote. It appears to me the intention of the Legislature is that when the election is attacked in the summary mode, it shall only be done by the two

classes of persons, viz., candidates or persons having votes at the election which is questioned.

The writ issued, and the statement in support of it, would support an application on the ground that the defendants are disqualified, independent of questioning the election on the ground that the disqualification is one existing *de die in diem* and liable to be questioned by any rate payer of the town; but then if the case be just upon that ground, it is one over which a Judge has no jurisdiction to order a writ to issue or any authority to try in the summary mode provided for in the act. The two cases are distinct, as I view the provisions of our statute. If the election be questioned, it may be done by a candidate or a voter who has the right to vote at the election questioned, in the summary mode provided for; but if the right to be Councillor be questioned by any other than the two classes mentioned then it must be done in the ordinary way proceeding to obtain a writ of *quo warranto* by application to the point for a Rule for that purpose.

For these reasons the writ as against these three defendants must be quashed, and with costs.

HONGSON V. THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF YORK AND PEEL, AND THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ONTARIO.

By-law establishing a road—Insufficient description—Discretion in quashing by-laws.

The statute does not make it strictly imperative upon the court to quash defective by-laws; and this case—where the road established by the by-law was not sufficiently described, but it appeared that it was clearly defined and marked by fences on each side, and had been travelled for eight years—they refused to interfere.

Wilson, Q. C., obtained, last term, a rule *nisi* to shew cause why a by-law (No. 53) for opening a road across lots 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, & 20, in the 8th concession of Whitby, should not be quashed, on the ground that it does not sufficiently describe the line of road.

The by-law was passed on the 14th of August, 1845, by the District Council of the Home District, and it enacted "that a new line of road, surveyed, laid out, and reported by John Farquharson, Esq., a road surveyor, across lots 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, & 20, in 8th concession of the township of Whitby, by his report bearing date the 1st day of August, 1845, be established and confirmed as a public road or highway."

The by-law did not refer to the surveyor's report as being annexed to it, and it was not shewn that there was or had been a report on the same sheet of paper with the by-law, or in any manner annexed to it; but on the same sheet of paper which contained the copy of the by-law duly certified by the clerk, as the foundation of this application, there was a copy of a report purporting to be addressed, on the 12th of August, 1845, by John Farquharson, surveyor, to the District Council of the Home District, in which he recommended a new line of road to be established, of which the field notes, he said, "are as follows, viz., commencing," &c., and describing a line intended to be the centre line of the new road by courses and distances.

On the back of this copy the clerk certified that it was a copy of a report purporting to be made by J. Farquharson, a surveyor, being the report referred to in the by-law.

He did not state whether the report itself was annexed to the by-law, or whether he found it among the records and papers of his office.

On the part of the Council it was shewn, in answer to this rule, that the road in question was clearly defined and marked with fences on each side of it; that it had been established and travelled by the public for eight years, and connected with other roads leading through Whitby; and there had been

statute labour or grants of public money expended on it, and that it was of great use to the inhabitants in its vicinity.

M. C. Cameron shewed cause and cited 11 East, 375, note a; *Regina v. Spence et al.*, 11 U. C. R. 31.

Wilson, Q. C. contra, cited *Mcflyre v. Municipal Council of Bismarquet*, 11 U. C. R. 460; *Dennis v. Hughes et al.*, 7 U. C. R. 444; *Brown v. Municipal Council of York*, 8 U. C. R. 596; 5 Q. R. 94; *Rex v. Trevenen*, 2 B. & A. 339; *Rex v. Symmons*, 4 T. R. 223; *Rex v. Slythe*, 6 B. & C. 240.

Robinson, C. J. delivered the judgment of the Court.

For all that appears, this applicant may have purchased the land long after the road was opened and in use. What is complained of in this by-law is not so much an illegality as a defect; by which I mean, that in passing it the municipality were doing nothing beyond their powers, and were committing no wrong. But they have not made their by-law so complete in itself as to guard against the objection of uncertainty and informality.

In such case we think it not unreasonable to hold, that a party seeking to set it aside directly, by the summary intervention of this court, should not delay as many years as he chooses, but should come within a reasonable time. Here nine years or more have elapsed; public expense has been incurred in improving and maintaining this road, the intended bounds of which seem to have been well marked out on the ground, and to have been so long acquiesced in by the defendants that there might be ground for contending that the road could be supported on the footing of a dedication.

The inconvenience to the public might be very serious, of allowing a party interested to lie by for so many years, and then to claim as of right to have the road abolished, which he had most probably been using himself in common with the public, and upon which, in the mean time, a valuable bridge may have been erected, or other costly improvements made.

The statute makes it lawful for the court to set aside a by-law where they see sufficient grounds, but it does not make it strictly imperative. We therefore discharge this rule but not with costs; and in taking this course we are not determining whether this is or is not a legally established highway.

Rule discharged.

TILT vs. THE MUNICIPALITY OF THE TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO.

(Reported by C. Robinson, Esq., Barrister at Law.)

[Q. B. Michaelmas Term, 13 Vic.]

Mr. Dempsey obtained a rule last term upon the Municipality of the Township of Toronto, to show cause why their by-law No. 71, passed on the 2nd of April, 1855, should not be quashed on the ground that the Municipal Council in passing it, exceeded their powers, and that the by-law is therefore illegal.

The By-law is entitled a by-law to alter and amend by-laws 53 and 62, and it enacts that so much of those by-laws passed respectively on the 19th of June, 1853, and the 8th of May, 1854 as relates to the sums to be paid in lieu of Statute Labor, shall be repealed. Sec. 2—that the Port Credit, and Hurontario Street, and Streetsville Plank Road Companies shall have the right to claim in terms of their charters (in so far as the Municipality may have acquired any control in or over the same) at the rate of five shillings for each day's statute labor that each person shall be liable to perform according to the terms of their respective charters.

3rd. That all persons liable to perform Statute labor, under the control of this Municipality, may compound for such duties by paying the Overseer for their division five shillings for every day they may be required to work at any time before the 1st

day of June, and every Overseer is required to accept the same in lieu of such Statute labor.

The Municipality maintain their authority to pass the by-law under the Assessment Consolidation Act 16 Vic. ch. 182, and they show that at the present increased price of labor, five shillings per day is a very reasonable and low rate, and that laborers cannot be hired for less.

Robinson, C. J. delivered the judgment of the Court.

I see nothing which bears upon the question raised in this case besides the Statutes 12 Vic. ch. 81 Sec. 31—sub-sections 27 and 27 and 16 Vic. ch. 182, Sec. 35 and 33, and reading these enactments in connection I am of opinion that, however low a rate two shillings and six pence may be for a day's labor at the present time, there is no authority given to the Municipal Councils to go beyond it in fixing the terms of commutation.

The only effect of the latter Statute is, that it leaves to non-resident proprietors no option as to commuting, but provides that they shall commute by paying at the rate of two shillings and six pence a day, or such other sum as may have been determined by the Municipal Council as the rate of commutation for residents.

Now the former Act authorises the Municipal Councils to pass by-laws "for empowering the landholders in any township to compound for the Statute labor by them respectively, performable for any time not exceeding at any rate not exceeding two shillings and six pence for each day's labor." Now whether this provision extends to any but residents in the township or not, there can be no doubt it does embrace them, and that as to them no more than two shillings and six pence can be fixed under that Act as the rate for the day's labor, and that being so, the rate of two shillings and six pence cannot under the latter Statute be exceeded in respect to non-residents, unless we could hold that the 36th clause of the same Statute gives authority to the Councils to impose whatever rate they please, and relieves from the restriction contained in the 12th Vic. ch. 81. It does not appear to me that it does, for I think that clause is not to be looked upon as conferring authority at all in this respect, it only refers to what may have been done in any township under the former Statute, which it does not, as regards the rate of commutation, profess to alter or repeal.

The words in the 36th clause, or such other sum must be taken, I think, to mean as has been argued, any less sum at which the Council may have fixed the commutation rate for resident proprietors. That there would otherwise be no limit, is an argument no doubt in favor of this construction, though not a conclusive one, since the Legislature has in some instances forbore to limit the power of the Municipalities in regard to taxation; I mean as respects the amount.

We are of opinion that the by-law must be quashed, with costs.

REGINA EX REL. SWAN V. ROWAT.

Contested election—Costs.

This was a *quo warranto* case, tried before *Mr. Justice Richards*, to determine the right of defendant to hold his seat as a township councillor, to which he had been returned as duly elected. The learned judge determined that the defendant was entitled to retain his seat, but conceiving that he had a discretion to withhold costs, and that there were circumstances in the case which made it proper to do so, he gave judgment in favor of the defendant, but did not give him his costs against the relator.

Hellieuell, for the defendant, obtained a rule nisi, in Easter term, to amend the order of *Mr. Justice Richards*, by giving to the defendant his costs of defence. He contended that the

relator having failed, must be ordered to pay costs, and that there was no discretion to adjudge otherwise.

On the return of the rule this term, *Eccles* showed cause, and affidavits were filed, shewing that the relator died on the 6th of July last; that is, after this rule nisi had issued, and before its return.

Cosens supported the rule, citing 16 Vic. ch. 181, sec. 27, *Doe ex dem Hay v. Hunt*, 12 U. C. R. 626; 2 Saund. 101, *l. v.*

Robinson, C. J.—It appears that most of the judges in cases before them in Chambers have acted upon the provision respecting costs in the statute as if it were discretionary to the full extent of withholding costs from the successful party. This being so, we shall not reverse this order, under the circumstances of the relator, against whom we are desired to give costs, being no longer living. Upon reference to the judges of both courts, we find that a majority of them place the same construction upon the clause in question as was placed by *Mr. Justice Richards*.

DRAPER, J.—The first statute on the subject (12 Vic. ch. 81, sec. 146) provided, with reference to the adjudication of these elections, that the cases should be decided on a writ of summons in the nature of a *quo warranto*, by the judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, upon statement and answer, and without formal pleadings, "and that the judge shall have power to hear and determine the validity of such election, and to award costs against the relator or defendant on such writ, as he shall deem just."

This was amended by 13 and 14 Vic. ch. 64, Sched. A., No. 23, which, with regard to costs, contains the following provision: "And it shall and may be lawful for such judge, and he is hereby required, in the disposing of every such case, to award costs for or against the relator or defendant upon such writ, or for or against the returning officer, when he shall be so made a party to such proceedings as aforesaid, as to such judge shall seem just." There is a proviso, "that no costs shall be awarded against any person against whom any such writ of summons in the nature of a *quo warranto* shall be brought, who shall, within one week after being served with such writ," disclaim the offer in the mode pointed out, "unless it shall have been proved to the satisfaction of such court or judge that such person had been a consenting party to being put in nomination as candidate for such election, in which latter case such costs shall be in the discretion of such court or judge;" and there is a further proviso enabling an intervention and defence to be made, notwithstanding such disclaimer, either by the municipal corporation, or a municipal voter, in every which case such intervening party shall be liable and entitled to as any other party to such proceeding.

The 153rd section of 12 Vic. ch. 81 gives authority to the Court of Queen's Bench by rules to settle forms of writs, &c., to regulate the practice respecting the suing out and execution of such writs, the punishment of those guilty of contempt in disobeying the same, and generally for the regulation of the practice, as well at Chambers as in Banc, in hearing and determining the validity of such elections, and the allowance of costs thereupon. The power is extended by 13 and 14 Vic. ch. 64, to the judges of the two Superior Courts of Common Law at Toronto, or the majority of them.

The 16 Vic. ch. 181, sec. 1 repeals the 146th sec. of 12 Vic. ch. 81, and its amendments as made by 13 and 14 Vic. ch. 64. This Act was passed on the 14th of June, 1853, and came into force on the 1st of July, 1853. Section 27 of this latter act authorises the issue of the writ of summons in the nature of a *quo warranto* out of either of the Superior Courts of Common Law at Toronto, on an order of such court in term time, or on the fiat of a judge of either such courts, or of the judge of the county court having jurisdiction over the municipality within which such election has taken place, in vacation. The relator must enter into a recognizance with two sureties, con-

ditioned to prosecute the writ with effect, or to pay to the opposite party all such costs as shall be adjudged to him against such relator. The writ may be returnable before any judge of the superior courts, or before the judge of such county court. The judge is to "proceed in a summary manner, upon statement and answer, without formal pleadings, to hear and determine, &c. * * and it shall and may be lawful for such judge, and he is hereby required, in disposing of every such case, to award costs for or against the relator or defendant upon such writ, or for or against the returning officer, when he shall be so made a party to such proceedings as aforesaid, as to such judge shall seem just,—thus following the words of 13 and 14 Vic. ch. 64. There is precisely a similar proviso as to disclaimer, placing, under the same circumstances, the power of giving or withholding costs in the discretion of the judge; and a similar proviso as to parties being allowed to intervene in case of disclaimer,

I have not been able to satisfy my own mind that a judge who is "required, in disposing of every such case, to award costs for or against the relator or defendant, or for or against the returning officer when he is made a party," obeys that requisition, and fulfils the intention of the legislature, although the words "as to such judge shall seem just" complete the sentence containing the requisition, by either omitting in his disposal of the case to say anything about costs, or by adjudging that he will not give costs to or against any of the parties before him on the writ.

Confining attention for the moment to this last act, and being called upon to construe it, so as if possible to give effect to every word of the enactment, I think the words "as to such judge shall seem just," taken in connection with what goes before, might be held to give the judge a discretion, not to withhold costs altogether, but to award them to or against some, and not all, of the parties brought before him; as if the relator, the defendant, and the returning officer were before the judge, and the relator failed, the award of costs against the relator might be either the costs of the defendant, or of the returning officer, or from both; thus the direction to award costs would be obeyed, and the discretion in regard to them would be exercised. Against this construction, however, it might well be answered that the words "as he shall deem just" are to be found at the end of the 146th section of 12 Vic. ch. 81, in reference to the judges, how to award costs, and that in that statute no provision is contained for making the returning officer a party to the proceeding, or for disclaimer and intervention by other parties having an interest. Admitting the full force of this consideration, it must also be remembered, that in this act it is provided that the judge "shall have power, and he is hereby required to proceed in a summary manner, &c. &c., and to award costs against the relator or defendant upon such writ as he shall deem just;" while the later act, as well as that of 13 & 14 Vic., enact that the judge "is hereby required to proceed in a summary manner," &c., and in the latter part "that it shall and may be lawful for such judge "and he is hereby required in disposing of every case to award costs, &c., as to such judge shall seem just." The repetition of the phrase "and he is hereby required" may be deemed intentional, and designed to remove any doubt which the use of the words "shall seem just" might give rise to; while on the other hand some discretion must be presumed to be conferred on the judge by this phrase, and it may be strongly urged that, whatever that discretion may be, it must be the same under the first and the last act.

But it does not appear to me that the only construction of which the first act is susceptible is that of giving the judge a discretion whether costs shall or shall not follow the decision. The 153rd section of the same act has given extensive power to the court, to be exercised by rules made in term time, regarding the practice to be followed in determining the validity of such municipal elections, and the

allowance of costs thereon ; and until such rules were made the quantum of costs to be given for the necessary proceeding in the trial of such elections would be unsettled, unless the legislature gave an intermediate power to the judge before whom any case was brought ; and the power to award costs against the relator or defendant as the judge shall deem just, might be considered as a power to fix what amount of costs should be awarded until the court settled it by rule. The statute may be read thus, " which judge shall have power, upon proof by affidavit of such personal or other service, and he is hereby required, to proceed in a summary manner upon statement and answer, and without formal pleadings, to hear and determine the validity of such election, and to award costs against the relator or defendant upon such writ, as (i e., in such manner as) he shall deem just." The judge is required to determine the validity of the election, and to award costs to one party or to the other, in such manner as he shall deem just. Whatever power the judge has in reference to costs, whether it be as to giving or withholding them, or as to the amount only, it is clearly in either case subordinate to the authority of the court, as given in the 153rd section ; and in this particular, the words used being "the allowance of costs" it might be contended much more clearly that they gave authority to withhold them, than the phrase used in the statute can be said to do, for by it the judge is "required, in disposing of every such a case, to award costs for or against, &c., as to such judge shall seem just"—showing, I think, that he is as much required to award costs as he is to determine the validity of the election.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

T O READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

All Communications on Editorial matters to be addressed to
 "The Editors of the Law Journal,"
 Barrie, U. C.
 Remittances and Letters on business matters to be addressed (prepaid)
 The Publishers of the Law Journal,"
 Barrie, U. C.

Whatever is intended for publication must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of his good faith.
 Matters for publication should be in the Editors' hands three weeks prior to the publication of the number for which they are intended.

N O T I C E .

The Upper Canada Law Journal is not liable to postage. The terms are 20s. per annum, if paid before the 1st of March in each year—if paid after that period 25s. The Scale of Charges for

A D V E R T I S E M E N T S .

Card for one year, not exceeding four lines	£1	0	0
One Column, (30 lines) per Issue	1	0	0
Half a Column, (15 lines) per Issue	0	12	6
Quarter Column, (7 1/2 lines) per Issue	0	7	6
Eighth of a Column (10 lines) per Issue	0	5	0

Advertisements should reach the office not later than the 25th of each month. The Upper Canada Law Journal is published at the Barrie Herald Office, Dunlop-Street, Barrie.

T H E L A W J O U R N A L .

JANUARY, 1856.

It is specially requested that Correspondents and Contributors will be particular to address their communications thus—"The Editors of the Law Journal, Barrie"—er where the matter is mailed in Toronto it may be added thus, "The Toronto Editor of the Law Journal."

At the commencement of a new volume, it appears necessary to give a brief general idea of what we have been doing during the last year in fulfilment of the promises made in the first number of this Journal : and that parties, whose names are not yet on our subscription list, may be able to judge from what has appeared what may be expected in the present volume.

The first to enter on the publication of a Law Periodical in Upper Canada, adapted to many and varied interests, and designed for the information of all, we have doubtless hitherto needed indulgence in our progress over an unbeaten path ; with additional exertion and outlay, as well as more experience on our parts, we hope from this time to make the *Law Journal* more than ever acceptable to our present subscribers and better deserving of general support. We refer officers and suitors of Division Courts to another page of this number for an outline view of what has appeared with special reference to their interests and information ; and as it is erroneously supposed that the object of the *Law Journal* embraces only the doings of Division Courts, we must take the liberty of correcting that error by referring to our files for the last year. With respect to the local administration of the Criminal Laws in this Province, we have presented our readers with Notes containing the principles involved in a number of late Criminal law cases decided by the Judges in England, and the summary jurisdiction of Magistrates has been examined at length. In this last work, all important as it is to Justices of the Peace in consequence of the statutory alterations lately made in their duties, has already been treated of, the Office of Justices of the peace—their powers generally ministerial and judicial—matters generally antecedent to the information—the information or complaint, its form and requisites, and when, how, and before whom laid—are examined in detail : also the mode of compelling the appearance of parties and the proper choice of process to be used—the summons, its requisities, when preferable to other process and how and when to be served, &c. &c : further, the bearing of the late acts are carefully noted, and every important position sustained by reference to authorities and adjudged cases—and the work will be continued in the present volume. The Law of Coroners has also been treated of at length ; viz The office of Coroners—their appointment, their

powers and duties in relation to Inquests; their judicial duties generally—summoning jury—charging jury—viewing the body—the authority to examine witnesses—the mode of conducting an Inquest—the adjournment thereof—proceedings after the adjournment—the form of inquisition—including a great variety of forms suited to every state of the proceedings, and many varied circumstances as to the mode of death.

With respect to Municipal Law, more than ordinary attention was given to the subject, with the object of presenting full and accurate information to the numerous and important Municipal bodies, Councilmen and others, which it affected. Owing to the kindness of Mr. Robinson, the Reporter of the Court of Queen's Bench, we have been able to lay before our readers, in advance of the regular Reports, a number of cases reported in full on the Law, as to the legality of Elections and Bye-Laws, the duties responsibilities, and powers of Municipal Corporations: and it is due to that gentleman to state that he has gratuitously given to us, for the early information of the public, all the decided cases in our Courts reported in the Queen's Bench and Common Pleas Reports from the 12 Vic: c. 18—the Act forming the foundation of our present Municipal Law—to the present time, has been digested under two divisions—the first embracing the decisions as to Elections—the second as to Bye-Laws; and both are brought down to the latest cases: it is hoped that they may form some guide to Municipal Corporations in their deliberations.

Clerks of the Peace, Sheriffs and other local officers, will have found in our pages matters interesting to them discussed, as well as cases and information respecting their duties—nor will practitioners find that we have failed in allotting to them a fair share of matter.

In addition to the subjects and cases already referred to, we give notes of about fifty Chancery and eighty Common Law recent English cases applicable to our laws, serving in some measure to keep the practitioners "posted in the law as it is," besides decisions of our County Judges on many important points. In other particulars it will have been noticed that their interests have been attended to, and their honorable and responsible position enlarged upon. Their just

interests will ever find advocates in us. We trust to make the *Law Journal* more deserving of their favor, and we naturally look to them for a liberal support.

Our views and tendencies on general subjects are sufficiently unfolded in the *Law Journal*: we do not wish for alterations in the Law, merely for the sake of a change: we do not belong to the school of selfish and presumptuous innovators; but the improvement of the Law "by cautious, gradual, and permanent reform, for the love of excellence," we would earnestly desire.

We cannot conclude without expressing our thanks to those gentlemen, who have interested themselves for this Publication, by extending its circulation and contributing to its pages—we solicit a continuance of their support. Our advertising columns (page 3.) will show that we are disposed to expend liberally in procuring suitable treatises and essays; and should our expectations of increased circulation be sustained, we will, instead of three hundred pounds now offered, be enabled to tender six hundred pounds before the year is over, for like matter for the benefit of our readers. We would make the *Law Journal* not merely a permanent publication, but would fain enlarge and render it equal to any similar periodical elsewhere; believing that there is sufficient available talent in Upper Canada to enable us to accomplish this end. A large edition of this number has been struck off: We send copies to those to whom there is reason to believe the work will be acceptable and useful, and to those whose support we would on broader grounds claim. If refused, the party will be pleased to return the copy sent, in an open cover marked with his name and address—we will assume that those who do not promptly return the number are desirous of becoming subscribers and will accordingly enter their names on our subscription list.

COUNTY ATTORNEYS. THE PROSECUTION OF OFFENDERS.

In the February number of last year, we asserted that the management of the Criminal business of the Courts of Quarter Sessions should be specially intrusted to a qualified and responsible agent in order to the due administration of Justice—and the more efficient restraint and punishment of crime.

Moreover, that by such an institution, the criminal business of the Courts of Assize would be placed on a better and more economical footing.

On that occasion we endeavored to show that a Crown Counsel or County Attorney, to conduct the criminal business, was more necessary at the Sessions than at the Assizes—that the practice of allowing complainants to shape and manage prosecutions as they thought fit, thus in effect dealing with an offence as if wholly of a private nature affecting only the party injured, led to abortive prosecutions—gave impunity to crime—was an anomaly in the administration of the Criminal Law, and irreconcilable with justice and sound policy.

We recur again to this subject, desiring to bring before our readers, the views of others who have considered the subject, and we would ask those who feel an interest in the administration of justice, to read what we formerly said. Our observations and suggestions then made, nearly a year ago, have been since, as it were, reiterated; and the fact that other minds brought to bear upon the subject, have arrived at the same conclusion, fortifies our position.

In England, prosecutions are not in general managed by Public Agents. The practice, we believe, to be otherwise in Scotland and Ireland; but with few exceptions, the prosecuting party is allowed to select his own attorney and counsel, who are entitled to payment for their services out of public monies. This practice, long objected to, has latterly been vigorously assailed: public attention was aroused, and the subject came before Parliament. "A Select Committee on Public Prosecutors" made a report containing the evidence taken before them, which was published in a book of some six hundred pages—we believe in November last. In the evidence by Mr. A. Compton, (the Treasurer by whom the Costs of Prosecution are paid in Liverpool) the evils of the present system of managing prosecutions are thus described:—

I think that the scrambling for prosecutions to get them out of the hands of Constables, who are bound over to prosecute; the multiplication of indictments against the same prisoner or prisoners, where there is no chance of any evidence being offered in those additional indictments, for the sake of costs; the presenting of indictments to the Grand Jury, without a previous enquiry before a Magistrate, and even in cases that have been examined and dismissed by a Magistrate, for the

sake of getting costs, from motives of revenge, or for the purpose of prejudicing a witness in a case at *Nisi Prius*, are all evils resulting from the want of a responsible person to manage criminal prosecutions.

This refers chiefly to the evils resulting from the wish on the part of Attorneys to put monies in their pockets, and would not apply in Upper Canada as respects public monies: for private prosecutors pay the Counsel they employ. Yet the want of an authorised Minister of Justice, paid by the public, is a no less evil. Motives of revenge, or a desire to shield crime by a "lenient prosecution" are every where concomitants of human passion and weakness. We would here beg permission to repeat what we on another occasion advanced. *First*, on the want of a public servant to manage criminal business. *Secondly*, on the conduct of prosecutions being entrusted to private hands.

An offence is committed, and public justice—the safety of the community—demand that the offender should be proceeded against and punished; but the party injured reasons thus:—"To have the prosecution properly conducted at the Sessions, I will be compelled to employ Counsel and pay him out of my own pocket; and this too in addition to my personal expenses, loss of time, &c., in attending the Court. It may be my duty to lend my aid in punishing a criminal act, but it will be better for me to put up with the injury done than subject myself to the annoyance of a cross-examination by defendant's Counsel, and be at such trouble and expense—the public are as much interested in the prosecution as I am: the county will be the gainer, I cannot be."* The matter is then allowed to drop. Even where willing to engage Counsel, parties are not always able to do so—and yet the law professes to shed its protection over all: Criminals are thus allowed to escape, and emboldened by impunity to persevere in crime. But sometimes the complainant will retain Counsel: why should he do so? it is not a proceeding to give satisfaction to him, but to vindicate public justice? He has but expense and trouble—the fruits of the conviction, when the criminal has any property, go to the county or the crown. With Counsel so retained, the matter is not bettered: he is disposed to identify himself with the complainant, and to look on his client as the prosecutor, instead of considering himself acting for the crown. Will he not be moved to handle the case just as he would an action of trespass, giving an exaggerated view to the jury, and using all his ability to secure a conviction against the accused—in whose favor the benevolent principle of the English Law has made all exception, and commands the very Judge to be his Counsel. Any one familiar with the proceedings at Quarter Sessions must have been struck with the contrast between a Counsel commissioned by, and acting for the Crown at the Assizes, and the Barrister employed by the complainant at the Session; the former an officer of the Crown who feels that his duty is not to fight for a conviction, but to

lay the facts and the Law bearing upon the matter calmly and deliberately before the Court and Jury—his aim is to bring under review all that tends to throw light upon the charge, his only wish is that the supremacy of the Law may not be defeated from the omission of proper evidence, or through any inaccuracy in the proceeding: whether examining witnesses or addressing the Court or Jury he *feels his position*; and being specially appointed to aid the administration of justice, he is free from that bias which he might not be able to divest himself of, *the paid advocate of the party directly aggrieved*. How is it with the latter? Does he not identify himself with his *Client*, and while professedly acting for the Crown, does he not in reality bring all the tact and ability he is master of to advocate his *employer's views*?

Hear an American who saw and studied the English system of trials at the Criminal Courts:

There is no public prosecutor; the complainant is bound over to prosecute the charge, and the witnesses to testify. The complainant selects the Attorney for prosecution, and the Attorney selects the Barrister. This practice is obviously open to great abuse. It may make the prosecution too lax or too severe according to the disposition of the prosecutor or of the Attorney he employs. The appointment of officers analogous to our District Attorneys, and the French *procureurs du roi* has been recently and strongly urged, but it encounters a vigorous opposition from the young Barristers, to whom the straggling criminal business often affords the first, and for years the only opportunity of making their appearance on the forensic stage. It seems to me clear, however, on principle, that the criminal functions of the Government should never be intrusted to private hands—that, as on the one hand, the sword of justice should never be whetted by private rancor, so, on the other, it should never be blunted by private indifference or personal favor. Such are the objections which struck me, and struck me forcibly on the present English system. In times of public excitement, when party spirit ran high, or worse still, when, as so frequently happens in our age, class rivalries and social animosities are stirred up, I should think the English system might lead to frequent injustice: but I saw many cases tried of all grades, from petty larcenies up to capital felonies, and they were all not only well but fairly tried, humanly tried, carefully tried. The Judges were patient, attentive in the last degree; the summing-up was full, laborious, and just, in the strongest sense of the words; and the prosecuting Barrister was kept under strict and constant surveillance.

In the report before referred to, appears some very interesting evidence by Mr. W. Foote, of Swindon, who submitted to the Committee a scheme for the conduct of prosecutions from which we make the extracts following, viz.:

In every County or in such County or place, as may be deemed expedient, appoint a competent person to be Crown

Attorney or public prosecutor for the whole County or division of a County.

The duties of the Crown Attorney might at the commencement be rather difficult to define, as such officer would have to combine and exercise great caution, skill, vigilance, forbearance, promptitude and determination, great knowledge of human nature and an aptitude for business.

It would be his duty to investigate all criminal cases for trial, to see that prosecutions at Assizes and Sessions did not fail from not being properly conducted, to undertake and watch over the conduct of a case, but not unnecessarily to interfere with private individuals who wish to prosecute, but nevertheless to possess the necessary power so to do, and generally to attend to all criminal business: also, to take up and conduct any prosecution, either in criminal courts or in petty sessions, when required to do so, or of his own authority upon special occasion; and when the case is of such a nature as to require the interference of the Crown officer: and it is in this respect that all the caution and judgment of such an officer would have to be exercised: for it is not every case in which for the reason that there is no apparent prosecutor, he is to be called upon: for if such was the case, he might be continually running about to every part of his county on some unimportant matters, which might otherwise have been dealt with. He must necessarily have great latitude allowed to him for the exercise of his discretion in such cases.

The Crown Attorney must understand thoroughly his position, that he is not to act as mere prosecutor for the Crown, but that he must also see that justice is done towards the accused; and whilst protecting the public, must stand as it were, a mediator between the accuser and the accused, and see that strict justice is done to either party.

The Public Prosecutor or Crown Attorney must not be a public informer. He will, for his own sake, and the safety of individuals, require certain conditions to be complied with previous to his services being called into action: in some cases a complaint in writing by a party: in others, a request in writing from a Justice. Again, a similar request from a public board or authority, but in all cases the Crown Attorney must have ample power to act upon his own responsibility, with such formal requisition in cases wherein he considers that his office ought to be exercised.

The Crown Attorney to be appointed by the Crown, to be subject to the control of the Home Secretary, who is to have power to make regulations touching the office.

In examining the adaptability of such a scheme as this, it must be borne in mind that the offices of Attorney and Counsel are not in the same person as it is with us. And it would be more easy to effect the desired alteration here, as the County Crown Prosecutor would be able to discharge the duties both of Attorney and Counsel. The principle embodied in Mr. Foote's scheme is the same in substance as that advocated by us a year ago, which was shortly this: that in every County or union of

Counties, a Barrister should be appointed by the Government or the Attorney General to conduct the criminal business with a small salary, in the nature of a retainer from the Crown and certain fees attached to the office. His duties to act for the Crown at the Courts of Quarter Sessions, to receive from the Magistrates and Coroners the "Criminal papers," to examine into the character and sufficiency of the evidence, to secure the needful documents for proof, and the attendance of necessary witnesses; in a word to get up the evidence and to arrange all things necessary for the Trial. To attend also at the Assizes and assist the Attorney or Solicitor General or Queen's Counsel, and in the absence of such an officer to conduct the business himself. Further, to assist Magistrates when advisable, in their preliminary investigations of serious felonies and other important cases. To see to the enforcement of forfeited recognizances, to appear for the Crown on applications to bail prisoners, and to have charge of prosecutions connected with the revenues or public domain.

It appears that the evidence before the Committee discloses a difference of opinion as to the propriety of public prosecutors in England, though defects in the present system are not denied. The reasons urged against the scheme are, that it would practically destroy the Criminal Court Bar—"I am jealous, I confess (says the Recorder of London) of the inroad it would make upon the honorable competition of the Bar." That the Criminal Courts would be attended only by the Public Prosecutor and one or two defenders of prisoners, in many places by the public prosecutor only, so that the prisoner would in effect be deprived of his right of defence by Counsel.

These reasons have no application to us—the state of things is very different here—a Crown prosecutor is part of the machinery of our Superior Criminal Courts; an extension to the Inferior Courts by giving them such an officer is all that is urged. The expenses of prosecutions do not come from the public purse. The Bar has no Attorney patronage to look for. In every County there is a local Bar in attendance at the Courts, (Quarter Sessions and County Courts both held together) and the cases in which parties employ Counsel on the prosecution

are few as compared with those in which Counsel are retained by prisoners on the defence. So that the appointment of a Local Crown prosecutor would not prejudice the Bar. But if it did, what then? Is not the due administration of Justice a matter of paramount importance, and are not minor considerations to give way before it?

The tenor of the evidence taken before the Committee *as applied to things as they are in Upper Canada*, is wholly in favor of the Institution, and we reiterate that Local Crown prosecutors are an absolute necessity in our Inferior Tribunals—that Criminal proceedings in these Courts cannot be conducted with due regard to the public interests on the one hand, and what is due to the accused on the other, while prosecutions are left to take care of themselves (unless indeed the Judge assumes the anomalous position of Judge and Crown prosecutor) more especially with Counsel on the defence—that compelling parties to pay for conducting a trial for a public offence is not reconcilable with the spirit of Justice, and attention to individual rights, and leads to unwillingness to prosecute or to private compromise in defeat of Justice: and we appeal to every one conversant with the practice of the Courts in proof of our assertions.

NEW TRIAL IN THE DIVISION COURTS: LATE ENGLISH CASE.

Of late very few cases have been decided on the English County Courts Act. *Messop vs. G. T. Railway Co.* (the Report of which appears in another page) is the first which has occurred for a long time. In considering its bearing on our Division Court Law, the difference between the English Statute and ours should be noticed.

The 89th Sec. of the County Courts act, so far as it bears on the question, is quoted by Counsel in support of the demurrer in the case referred to. Our statutory regulation is more stringent and specific: the 72d. Sec. of the D. C. Act provides that it shall be "lawful for the Judge in his discretion to grant a new trial upon application, if either party shall apply for the same within fourteen days after the trial of any case; "and the 84th Sec., which was evidently borrowed from the 89th Sec., of the English Act, has a proviso, which

the clause, from which it is taken, does not contain, viz. "provided such new trial, be applied for at furthest within fourteen days, and good grounds be shown therefor by the party so applying."

A point, therefore, similar to that in the case under review, could not for a moment be supported under the D. C. enactment—but in other respects the case has its bearing. In the Division Court proceeding, the time within which a new trial must be applied for is not a directory rule of practice, but a positive statutory regulation.

To enable the Courts to grant a new trial a statutory power was required; and being the only foundation for action, it must be strictly pursued. The D. C. rule No. 50 only makes provision for the *mode* in which application is to be made and the *manner* in which the "good grounds" spoken of in the statute must be shown. It is probable that the D. C. Judge might in furtherance of justice be authorised to exercise a discretion in dispensing with some requirement of the rule, but not so with any statutory regulation. It will be observed, in looking to our rule, that the application is considered as made when the necessary papers are delivered to the Clerk of the Court; but that, according to the requirement in the 84th. Sec., must be at furthest within fourteen days after the trial of the cause.

THE COMMON LAW PROCEDURE ACT.

A great change the Common Law Procedure Act made in the administration of the Law in England, sweeping away what was superfluous, supplying what was deficient, and enabling the Courts of Justice to grasp at once the real and substantial questions to be disposed of, unincumbered by refined subtleties which only obstructed the road to justice. It may in truth be said of this Act that it placed procedure on its proper footing, by making substantial justice paramount to merely technical rules: nor is its least favorable feature this, that it obviated the necessity of wheeling about from one jurisdiction to another (for a discovery, &c.) on pretence of more suitable machinery—in reality only in delay of justice: a necessity which in a late case, Lord Campbell declared *brought great scandal on the administration of justice.*

This Act has been in force some time in England,

and has undergone a searching judicial examination. It seriously interfered with a variety of interests, and as might be expected the *measure* met with great opposition when introduced, and a very busy throng have since been actively at work to discover weak points in the *law*. It has stood the test—it has been found to answer the purpose for which it was designed. We do not by any means say that it is perfect in all particulars, but with the light thrown upon it by judicial construction, it forms a model for imitation upon which men of learning and genius may improve. Has the time arrived when we should seek to profit by the lesson it teaches? Have we amongst us minds capable of grasping the matter?

The subject is fraught with grave consideration and should only be approached with the firm step of an enlightened statesman, conscious alike of power and responsibility, and animated by a spirit of true patriotism.

We think it is Lord Campbell who says that great alterations in the course of the administration of justice ought to be sparingly made and by degrees, and rather by the Court than the Legislature: but there may be evils that all the exertions of the Court cannot cure; and if on examining our system, inert and impassable obstacles are found to clog and fetter the due administration of justice, the remedy which the Courts *cannot* apply, should be invoked from the highest Power in the Province.

Whatever move may be made, anxiously, fervently we hope may originate with some one equal to the weighty task: one who will not be above seeking light wherever it may be found: "Scientific skill is required to know causes: the quack in curing one evil creates another." A writer in the *Westminster Review* says all men fancy that they know how to poke a fire or boil potatoes—so they all seem to fancy that they know how to *make all kinds of Laws*. Of Acts of special kind which simply relate to the administration of the Law, practitioners alone are fully qualified to judge of the fitness. With this we leave the subject for the present.

THE "ATTACHMENT" LAWS.

Our attention has been called to the state of the Law on the subject of attachments in the case of absconding debtors. It is said that "no portion or

our jurisprudence more requires revision"; and we are disposed to agree with a valued correspondent who argues that the Legislature, at its approaching Session, should be moved to revise it. This article will, no doubt, be seen by some of those whose duty it is to improve existing enactments, as well as to make new laws, and we regard the subject as possessing sufficient intrinsic importance to command attention.

The Acts still in force which were passed previously to the D. C. Act of 1850, only provide a remedy for Creditors against the estate (real and personal) of Debtors, who either have absconded out of Upper Canada, or remain concealed therein, with intent to avoid arrest or service of process—and any remedy against their property is reserved exclusively for the benefit of those creditors who may place writs of attachment in the Sheriff's hands within six months—unless (as is very seldom the case) there be property enough seized to satisfy all, besides payment of expenses: the effect of this is, that attaching creditors in the Division Courts are obliged (no matter that the aggregate of their claims may quadruple those in the Superior Courts,) to wait until the Sheriff's processes are satisfied, and then to divide the residue, which frequently amounts to "Nil!"

On the other hand, attachments may issue from the Division Courts against the personal estate of debtors for demands within the jurisdiction of these tribunals, where the debtor has absconded, provided he has left "personal" property liable to seizure under execution for debt," or has attempted to remove his said "personal" property either out of Upper Canada or from one county to another, or from Upper to Lower Canada,—or keeps himself concealed in some county in Upper Canada, to avoid service of process; and all creditors issuing attachments from the Division Courts within one month are entitled to share in the proceeds of the sale of such personal estate, to the exclusion (as some of the C. C. Judges maintain with some reason) of all attaching creditors in the Superior Courts until such D. C. creditors are satisfied. So that a creditor may see his debtor quietly and fraudulently selling off his personal estate and preparing for a movement to parts unknown, and yet cannot attach the property if his claim be above £25, unless he abandons all over that sum—or he

waits until the debtor has actually gone and the remedy is lost. If the claim be for £25 or under, the proceeding by service of process in the ordinary way is open with a view to judgment and sale of the debtor's lands in satisfaction; still, if he absconds before the service of process—leaving no goods (personal property) behind, there is nothing to ground substitutional service, and the creditor is without remedy, although the debtor may have lands amply sufficient to satisfy every claim.

We think the basis upon which these attachments issue, should be reduced to one and the same footing in all the Courts—and the fraudulent conduct of the debtor be met in every court upon the same suggestions of fraud verified by affidavit: that the Sheriff of the County should hold the estate attached for the benefit of all creditors, no matter whether the process be placed in his hands for execution or not—that all attachments issuing from the Division Courts should be notified to him, and the property seized by the bailiffs of the D. C., or the securities or bonds given therefor, should be taken in his name and handed over to him to be dealt with for the benefit of all; and that he should alone be responsible for what he actually seizes or receives, and should hold the same in trust for the payment ratably of all the creditors attaching within a specific time—that the useless expense of advertising in the *Official Gazette* (which very few read) should be abandoned for the like benefit of the creditors! and that the Clerks of the D. C. should cease to have the custody of the property attached.

The granting orders for attachments in the Superior and Inferior Courts are regulated by the same principles and subject to the same rules—and the Judges of the County Courts are as competent to fiat attachments in the Superior Courts as in their own, the necessary papers being in both cases alike, and we think that it would conduce to both security and economy if power was given to the County Judges in the outer counties to grant fiats for attachment from the Courts of Q. B. and C. P. It would only be adding one additional item to their many unrequited labors, and County Judges are really such convenient functionaries for these odd jobs that our bowels of compassion have no yearning to spare them, in this particular at least.

The Reports in another part of this number will be found interesting to *Municipal Authorities*, and to the profession, they will not appear in the usual way for some time yet. We have made arrangements by which we will be enabled to continue to lay before our readers the decisions in Chambers of sufficient general interest for publication, and we trust to accomplish the same thing in respect to those decisions in Chancery which bear on the Equity Jurisdiction of the County Courts. Under the head of *Our Monthly Repertory*, it may be necessary to explain to our new subscribers, is set down matters more especially interesting to the profession, but at the same time useful to Magistrates and others engaged in the administration of the Criminal Law. The leading feature in the Repertory is notes of important recent English decisions in General Law, and the practice of the Courts so far as may be applicable to Upper Canada.

Correspondence has so accumulated upon us that at present we find it impossible to answer those who have written to us. We have many thanks to express to friends, which must be accepted generally for the present; and we would ask those who look for replies to spare us for a while.

A JUDGE'S ADVICE TO COUNSEL.

During a late trial in the Court of Common Pleas, Mr. Hawkins, counsel for the defendant, having commenced his address to the jury with the words "I regret to say my client insists upon going into the witness box," Mr. Justice Cresswell said, "Oh, don't say a word upon what your client insists upon. I used, when I was at the Bar, to say to my client, 'Either let me manage your case for you or conduct it yourself.' It is becoming too much the fashion to say, 'My client insisted;' and it looks as if you were going to do something wrong. At all events, keep your own counsel, whatever pressure you may be subjected to."

THE NEW JUDGE.

It is probable that ere this number is before our readers, John Hawkins Hagerty, Q.C., will have been sworn in as one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas, to fill a vacancy consequent on the resignation of that good man and upright Judge, Mr. Chief Justice Macaulay.

Dr. Hagerty had neither political connections nor party services to secure him favour: he was doubtless selected for the high and responsible office of Judge as "one in whom talent, integrity and experience, did most abound and were best united." The chastness of selection which directed his appointment will be universally appreciated, and it was a distinct recognition of the just claims of professional capacity and moral worth. Most sincerely do we hope that a long career of dignified usefulness is before him.

Dr. Hagerty is an Irishman by birth, but received his professional education in Upper Canada. We believe it was in Trinity College, Dublin, he graduated, but his degree of D.C.L. is from Trinity College, Toronto.

MONTHLY REPERTORY.

Notes of English Cases.

COMMON LAW.

Q. B. KENT v. GODTS. Nov. 9.
Contract—Deliveries at several times—Discharge.

A contract to deliver oil of first quality, five tons in October, five in November, and five in December. The purchaser refused to receive part of the oil tendered in October, as of inferior quality, and sued the vendor for breach of contract, but failed in proof that the oil was of inferior quality, and it was found that the plaintiff, the purchaser, did not intend to repudiate the contract.

Held, that the vendor was not thereby discharged from the further performance of the contract.

Q. B. SEARLES v. SARGROVE. Nov. 17.
Pleading—Tender of part—Set off as to residue.

Action for money had and received, plea of tender as to part; replication, that a large sum was due and demanded; rejoinder of set off, as to the excess beyond the amount tendered.

Held, that such rejoinder is bad if does not allege that at the time of tender of part, defendant gave notice of such set off as to residue.

EX. EX PARTE YOUNG. Nov. 20.
Custody of infant—Husband and wife.

The father is entitled in law to the custody of his child, though an infant under seven years, and the court will, in its discretion, order such child to be delivered to the custody of its father, if the court see no ground to impute any motive to the father injurious to the health or liberty of such a child.

EX. CROFTS v. VIVIAN. Nov. 20.
Sharebroker and customer, principal and agent—Variance between pleadings and evidence.

Upon a declaration for the price of certain shares sold by the plaintiff to defendant, it appeared by the evidence at the trial, that the plaintiff was employed as an agent for the defendant.

Held, that the evidence did not support the declaration, and there being no count for money paid, a nonsuit should be ordered.

B. C. REG. v. RICHARD HASLAM. Nov. 24.
Indictment—Particulars of charge.

This court has no jurisdiction to make an order for the delivery of the particulars of a charge of embezzlement to a defendant who is awaiting his trial at the assizes; such application should be made to a Judge at the assizes.

B. C. PONTING v. WATSON. Nov. 24.
Staying proceedings—Action against good faith.

In 1852 an action for libel and malicious prosecution was tried, when a verdict was returned with £5 damages for the libel, and £15 for the malicious prosecutions. Subsequently the defendant applied for a new trial, on the ground of misdirection with reference to the counts or malicious prosecution, when the court, who were prepared to make the rule absolute, intimated the propriety of an arrangement, upon which it was arranged that the rule for a new trial should be

discharged, the plaintiff undertaking to enter a *nolle prosequi* on the counts for a malicious prosecution. The costs were then taxed and paid together with the damages for the libel. In 1855 the plaintiff commenced a fresh action against the defendant for malicious prosecution upon the same facts, and upon a rule obtained by the defendant to stay all further proceedings on the ground of the action being brought against good faith, the Court made such rule absolute.

C.C.R. REG. v. SMITH. Nov. 21.
Shooting with intent to murder—Mistake as to person shot at.

If A., intending to murder B. shoots at and wounds C., supposing him to be B., he is guilty of wounding C., with intent to murder him, for he intends to kill the person at whom he shoots.

C.C.R. REG. v. DIXON. Nov. 21.
Larceny—Finding lost note—Means of discovering owner—Prisoner's belief that the owner could be traced.

Upon an indictment for stealing a note, was found by the Jury that the note was lost by the prosecutor and found by the prisoner. There was no evidence that the note had any name or other mark upon it indicating to whom it belonged, nor was there evidence of any other circumstances which would disclose to the prisoner at the time when he found it, the means of discovering the owner.

Held, that he could not be convicted of larceny, although the Jury, being asked whether at or after the time of finding, he believed that there was not a reasonable probability that the owner could be found, had answered that he did believe the owner could be traced.

Q.B. (Ireland.) HAUGHTON v. MORTON.
Contract—Statute of frauds—Constructive signature.

A sale-note for absolute delivery of the goods is made at the time of sale, but not signed by the party. The sale is referred to in a letter written before action brought, signed by the party to be bound in which he alleged that the sale was conditional.

Held, (dissentient, LEFROY, C. J.) that there was no note in writing under the Statute of Frauds.

Q.B. REG. v. COYLE. Dec. 6 & 7.
(Sittings after Term, at Westminster, before ERLE, J.)
Presumption against a prisoner from conduct of counsel at former trial between the same parties.

On the second trial of an indictment for perjury, fresh witnesses for the defence were called to prove facts confirming the prisoner's alleged false statement. A witness called by the prosecutor to contradict a fact deposed to by them, was allowed to prove that on the former trial a particular question was put to him on his cross-examination by the prisoner's counsel, in order to show that at that time the prisoner's counsel had notice of the testimony now given, but did not venture to call the witnesses.

CHANCERY CASES.

M.R. DIXON v. GAYFERE. Nov. 10 & 11.
Vendor and purchaser—Purchase in consideration of annuity—Charge on land.

Where an agreement was made for the purchase of a property in consideration partly of an annuity to be granted, payable for the life of the vendor and two other persons, and the survivor of them to be secured by bond.

Held, that the form of the agreement showed an intention to discharge the land from a lien in respect of an annuity, and that the annuity was therefore a personal annuity only.

The case of *Winter v. Lord Anson*, 3 Russ. 488, noticed.

V.C.W. WOOD v. SCARTH. Nov. 12.
Vendor and purchaser—Specific performance—Omission of a term of the stipulation—Mistake.

The owner of a public house stated in a letter to brewers that the terms of letting were at a certain rent and for a stated time. The brewers, after sending an agent to look at the house and discuss the terms, agreed to take it according to the letter. Subsequently the owner required a premium of £500. The brewers filed a bill to enforce specific performance, and the owner adduced a memorandum made by the brewers' agent to shew that the £500 formed part of the bargain, and called evidence to prove that in a previous offer to another brewer, that sum was mentioned. The former evidence failed, but the latter was confirmed. The brewers had commenced alterations in the premises.

Held, that the offer to the plaintiffs omitting the £500 was clearly a mistake, and that specific performance should not be decreed.

C. of A. MORLEY v. MORLEY. Nov. 13, 14 & 17.
Tenant for life paying off bond debts—His right to change the inheritance considered—Distinction between a tenant for life paying off bond debts and incumbrances, or charges on the inheritance considered—Costs.

F., being tenant for life of an estate with remainder to his sons in tail male, pays off bond debts created by the deviser; he takes no steps to make such payments legal charge on the inheritance. Twenty years elapse from the date of the securities. A bill filed by the personal representatives of F., seeking to have the amount of the bond debts, which he had paid, declared charges upon the estate, was, on appeal affirming the decision of the V. C., dismissed with costs.

DIVISION COURT. (Reports in relation to)

MOSSOP v. GREAT NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

C.B. Prohibition—Co. C.—Power of Judge to grant a new trial—9 & 10 Vic. ch. 95, sec. 69, and the 111st rule of practice in the Co. Courts.

The Judge of a Co. C. having refused upon the day of the hearing to grant a new trial, cannot grant one at the next court.

The plaintiff in prohibition brought an action in the Co. C. against the defendants, and obtained a verdict. Immediately after the trial the defendants applied to the Judge for a new trial; that application was opposed by the plaintiff, and the Judge refused to grant it. At the next court, the application being renewed in consequence of an intimation from the Judge himself, the Judge granted a new trial.

Held, that, the Judge having once determined the matter, and refused to grant a new trial, that judgment was final.

This was a demurrer to a declaration in prohibition. The original action was tried in the Co. C., and a verdict was found for the plaintiff, damages £8 4s. An application was then made by the defendant's advocate for a new trial, which was opposed by the advocate for the plaintiff and refused by the Judge, and the judgment was entered and the damages and costs paid. The Judge afterwards at another place told the advocate for the defendant that he had reconsidered the matter and was dissatisfied with the verdict and his own refusal of a new trial, and that if he would apply again for a new trial at the next court for the place where the trial took place, he would grant it. The application was accordingly made, and a new trial was granted. There was then a declaration in prohibition, and issue taken as to whether the Judge refused a new trial on the first occasion, and it was found that the Judge had decided to refuse it.

Hayes in support of the demurrer.—The Judge had power, notwithstanding his prior decision, to alter his judgment and grant a new trial at the subsequent court. 9 & 10 Vic., ch. 95, sec. 89, enacts, "that every judgment of any court holden under that Act, except as therein provided, shall be final and conclusive between the parties; but the Judge shall in every case whatever have the power, if he think fit, to order a new trial to be had upon such terms as he shall think reasonable." Then the 141st rule of practice made by the Judges in pursuance of 12 & 13 Vic., ch. 101, sec. 12, says: "An application for a new trial may be made and determined on the day of hearing, if both parties are present, or may be made at the first court held next after the expiration of twelve clear days from such day of hearing." That rule being only a directory rule of practice, does not interfere with the discretion of the Judge, as has been held in the case of *Carter v. Smith*, 24 L. J. Q. B. 141. It was there decided that, notwithstanding the omission to give seven days' notice of the intended application for a new trial, as required by that rule, the Judge had a discretionary power to grant a new trial. This is like this court dispensing with the rule that a motion for a new trial must be made within four days. Can a Judge alter his mind at the same court? If he can, can he not do so afterwards? Is it to be said that he is to be taken to be infallible? He is under great difficulties, both from the press of business and the absence of a bar to call his attention to the authorities, and it is reasonable that he should be allowed to say he was mistaken: (*Jones v. Jones*, 5 Dowl. and Lownd. 698, was also cited.)

Byles, Serjt. contra.—A statutory power is required to enable an inferior court to grant a new trial. Here, the application having been once refused, it was *res-judicata*. The same party comes a second time upon the same grounds. The statutory power was gone, and the Judge was *functus officio*. I may ask, can a Judge alter his judgment after ten years? Can his successor alter it? Could he again alter his mind back to his original judgment? *Carter v. Smith* is quite a different case from this. The Judge doubtless must be allowed a discretion in some particulars, but not such an extensive discretion as this. Where the Judge is to have the power of altering his decision the power is expressly given, as in sec. 100. Is the Judge bound to hear the application again?

Hayes in reply.—The Judge is clearly not bound to hear it over again. He might say, "I have decided, and I will not dispense with the ordinary rule of practice." He might dispense with it if he liked.

Jervis, C.J.—I confess I thought the court had determined this question when the case was first brought to the notice of the court. My brothers Maule and Creswell were of opinion that this, being a statutory power, the Judge, having refused the application at the first court, was *functus officio*. I am of that opinion. In some cases there may be a new trial. Well, application is made for a new trial. It is refused, and the damages and costs are paid. The thing is at an end: it is out of court and gone. I apprehend the jurisdiction of the Judge is exhausted, and he has no right to revise his judgment, and the present plaintiff is entitled to prohibit him.

V. Williams, J.—I have arrived at the same conclusion, not without difficulty. The Judge has power to grant a new trial after execution as before. The difficulty which occurred to me is, whether the exercise of that power is not a mere matter of practice, and whether we ought not to assume that that would be done properly. My brothers Maule and Creswell having entertained a different opinion, and the rest of the court agreeing with them, I have acceded to their view.

Crowder, J.—I am of opinion that this matter was wholly decided upon the first application. It is a matter of importance that we should know when a cause is at an end. A discretion is doubtless to be allowed to the Judge; and *Carter v. Smith* is an authority for that. But it is not an authority for such an extensive discretion as that the Judge may

always grant a new trial. That would be a very dangerous thing.

Willes, J.—The object of having a court of justice is, that all litigation should be determined, and that finally. It is a long time since a reason was given why judgments should be considered final, and not opened up again, *ne lites sint immortales dum litantes mortales*. A court of justice must be suited to the lives of the persons concerned. Life is not long enough for opening up again matters that are already *res-judicatae*. Then, when the Legislature gave this power to the Judges of Co. Courts, it must be taken to have intended that those courts should have those accidents which belong to other courts. The judgment, therefore, of those courts is to be final, except where the power of granting a new trial is given. That power is to be exercised with reference to recognised principles. The judgment, therefore, is to be final, unless it comes within the power given; and therefore, when the Judge has determined that there shall not be a new trial, then the judgment must stand final.

Judgment for the plaintiff.

APPOINTMENTS TO OFFICE, &c.

QUEEN'S COUNCIL.

OLIVER MOWAT, of Osgoode Hall, Esquire, Barrister-at-Law, to be a Queen's Counsel in Upper Canada.—[Gazetted 6th January, 1856.]

NOTARIES PUBLIC IN U.C.

JOHN LEYS, of Toronto, Esquire, Attorney-at-Law, and JOSHUA ADAMS, the younger, of Port Sarnia, Esquire, Attorney-at-Law, to be Notaries Public in Upper Canada.—[Gazetted 12th January, 1856.]

ARTHUR JOHNSON KINGSTON, of Bayfield, Gentleman, to be a Notary Public in Upper Canada.—[Gazetted 19th January, 1856.]

ASSOCIATE CORONERS.

MORGAN HAMILTON, Esquire, M.D., to be an Associate Coroner for the United Counties of Huron and Bruce.

ELIAS VERNON, Esquire, M.D., to be an Associate Coroner for the County of Ontario.

JOHN STEWART, Esquire, Surgeon, to be an Associate Coroner for the City of Kingston and the United Counties of Frontenac, Lennox and Addington.

BENJAMIN SEYMOUR WILSON, Esquire, M.D., to be an Associate Coroner for the County of Hastings.—[Gazetted 12th January, 1856.]

THE DIVISION COURT DIRECTORY.

Intended to show the number, limits and extent of the several Division Courts in every County of Upper Canada, with the names and addresses of the Officers—Clerk and Bailiff,—of each Division Court.†

COUNTY OF LAMBTON.

Judge of the County and Division Courts, CHARLES ROBINSON, Port Sarnia.

First Division Court—Clerk, Thomas Forsyth, Port Sarnia; *Bailiff*, Tilton Howard, Port Sarnia; *Limits*—The Townships of Sarnia, Plympton and Enniskillen, and the eight northern concessions of Moore.

Second Division Court—Clerk, J. F. Elliott, Warwick; *Bailiff*, Robert Evans, Warwick; *Limits*—The Townships of Bosanquet, Warwick and Brooke.

Third Division Court—Clerk, G. M. Webster, Dresden; *Bailiff*, William Sixsmith, Dresden; *Limits*—The Townships of Dawn and Euphemia.

Fourth Division Court—Clerk, Ewen McMillen, Wallaceburg; *Bailiff*, James R. Maybee, Wallaceburg; *Limits*—Township of Sombra, and the four southern concessions of Moore.

COUNTY OF ESSEX.

Judge of the County and Division Courts, ALEXANDER CREWETT, Sandwich.

First Division Court—Clerk, Joseph Mercer, Sandwich; *Bailiff*, Constant Gauthier, Sandwich; *Limits*—The Townships of Sandwich and Maidstone, including the Town of Sandwich.

Second Division Court—Clerk, Alanson Botsford, Amherstburgh; *Bailiff*, Theo. Brush, Amherstburgh; *Limits*—The Townships of Anderdan and Malden, including the Town of Amherstburgh.

Third Division Court—Clerk, James King, Kingsville; *Bailiff*, Ernest Nightingale, Kingsville; *Limits*—The Township of Gosfield.

Fourth Division Court—Clerk, Gordon Buchanan, Colchester; *Bailiff*, James Waddell, Colchester; *Limits*—The Township of Colchester.

Fifth Division Court—Clerk, Jonathan Wigfield, Mersea; *Bailiff*, James Robson, Mersea; *Limits*—The Township of Mersea.

Sixth Division Court—Clerk, —Graham, Maidstone Cross; *Bailiff*, Patrick Daly, Maidstone Cross; *Limits*—The Townships of Rochester and West Tilbury.

† Vide observations ante page 106, Vol. I. on the utility and necessity for this Directory.