

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXXIX.

DECEMBER 1, 1903.

NO. 23.

One of the Toronto newspapers has published a daily reminder of the number of days during which North Renfrew has been without a representative in the Provincial Legislature. The profession in the County of York, Ontario, might in a similar way be reminded that its County Court has been without a Clerk for upwards of three years. Meantime the locum tenens is, under the law, the Clerk of the Peace, who, if he be really allowed to enjoy the fees, has a very good thing. We presume from the position not being filled there is no need for the services of any one but a junior clerk. This is probably correct, but if so, why not be economical and appoint the present warming pan without extra salary. If, however, another appointment is to be made, as was intimated last Session by the Attorney General, we trust the position will be given to some member of the profession. There are many such to whom such a sinecure would be a God-send, and this is the class that are entitled to positions of this kind, and not some political hanger on of the lay species, e. g. a baker or farmer, or such like.

It has been recently decided by a Divisional Court, (Street and Britton, JJ.), on appeal from the County Court of Wentworth, in the case of *Dunn v. Malone*, that it is not possible for parties by any form of words to contract themselves out of the provisions of the Interest Act, (60 & 61 Vict. c. 8, D.), and the Act amending it (63 & 64 Vict. c. 29, D.) The principal Act requires that any written or printed contract for the loan of money on any security other than real estate, where the interest is payable at a rate per day, week, or month must also explicitly state what is the equivalent yearly rate, on pain that no more than six, (or in cases where the amended Act applies, five) per cent. per annum shall be recoverable. In the case in question the rate was five per cent. per month, but no statement of the equivalent yearly rate was mentioned, but the parties expressly agreed that the contract was a sufficient compliance with the Act, and the borrower expressly waived the benefit of the Act, but all to no purpose, as the Court held. On

first sight it may appear that this decision is an invasion of the fundamental maxim, *Quilibet potest renunciare juri pro se introducto*, for the law in question seems particularly and expressly a law for the protection of debtors, just as much as a statute of limitations, which any debtor is competent to waive, or that protection which the law throws round infants, invalidating contracts made by them during infancy, which defence they nevertheless may waive on attaining majority. Street, J., who delivered the judgment of the Court, however, adopted the reasoning of the American Court in *Mabee v. Crozier*, 22 Hun, N.Y., 264, and *Bostle v. Rheene*, 72 Pa., St. 54. These were cases in which it was held that a debtor could not waive the provisions of statutes against usury, because otherwise such acts which were founded on public policy, might thus be rendered nugatory. This may be thought an invasion of that right of freedom of contract which some persons hold so dear, but which like many other good things is capable of being used perniciously.

DISCOVERY AND PRODUCTION.

SOME CONTRASTS BETWEEN THE LAW OF DISCOVERY AND PRODUCTION IN ENGLAND AND IN ONTARIO.

The right to discovery, as it now exists, may be said to have had its origin almost entirely in the Courts of Equity. Courts of Common Law, before the passing of the Common Law Procedure Act, exercised certain very limited powers, which might be said to partake of the nature of discovery. These were not based upon any idea, such as pervaded the equitable practice of discovery. They were rather what might be termed limited rights arising, in a measure, out of the rules as to pleading, and limited to the inspection of documents. They divided themselves into three heads:—

I. The inspection under the practice of *profert* and *oyer* of a document under seal, where it was relied upon by a party in his pleading, the rule being strictly one of pleading that the party must make *profert* that he bring the document into court, the other party shall then be entitled to demand *oyer* of it.

II. The other branch of the practice consisted in the right of a party to an action to inspect documents in his adversary's posses-

sion when he had an interest therein. This practice was not founded upon any principle of discovery, as understood in equity, but upon the right or claim in the nature of ownership arising from the interest of the party in the documents.

III. The class of cases in which, at Common Law, inspection was allowed of documents of a public character, either by rule in the action itself, if they were in the possession of a party to litigation, or by mandamus, if they were in possession of a third party, depended upon a similar principle, and might not inaccurately be said to be an extension of the same principle.

Discovery, in the sense of obtaining disclosure from an opposite party of facts within his knowledge, apart from inspection of documents in the limited cases referred to above, was unknown to the Common Law. The basis of the right, as it at present exists is, as stated in the opening, to be found in the practice of the English Court of Chancery, which has descended to us.

It is far beyond the scope of this article to examine into the causes which gave rise to this exercise of jurisdiction by the Courts of Equity, a practice which, while not altogether without parallel in other systems of law, is in many respects unique in legal history.

Prior to the passing of the Judicature Act equity had arrived at what might be said to be a complete law and practice in regard to discovery. The right had been established in a party to proceedings before the civil Court, including (what was, indeed, the most common case of an action purely for discovery) of a party to an action at law to extort, on oath, from another party to the proceedings, his knowledge of facts concerning the matter in question, and the production of all documents, except certain special classes privileged from discovery in his possession, relating to such matter. The damaging nature of the disclosure to the case of the party required to make it was no answer, indeed, was considered rather a reason for the giving of discovery, and a party very frequently was compelled to give discovery which would prove the whole cause of action of his adversary.

Definite rules have been arrived at as to the circumstances under which and the character of the proceeding in aid of which discovery was given, some of which survive in our present practice. Indeed it was said by Lord Selborne in *Lyell v. Kennedy*, 8 A.C. at p. 223, that the right of discovery under existing practice at the date of that decision, since the Judicature Act, was not in principle

more extensive than it formerly was in the Court of Chancery. However this might have been at the time of the delivery of the judgment in that case, it is now reasonably clear under the rules in force in Ontario (Rules 439-462, as amended by rules recently passed and coming into effect on the 1st of September, 1903, Rules 1250-1251) that the right of discovery is, in some respects, at least wider than the right under the former practice of the Court of Chancery, a notable instance being that a party to an action of tort has as full a right to discovery, both by way of production of documents, and by way of oral examination of his adversary, as in the case of an action on a contract or a purely equitable action to enforce a trust. This was a right which did not exist under the old equity practice.

Some few restrictions upon the apparently unlimited right of discovery, given by the Judicature Act and the Rules derived from the formerly existing doctrine of the Court of Chancery still survive in our law. These will be noticed subsequently in dealing with recent cases under the various headings of privilege from discovery.

The law and practice of discovery in the Province of Ontario, while descended from, and based upon the principles and practice of the English Court of Chancery, with a few principles introduced from the practice of common law at the time of the enactment of the Common Law Procedure Act and Administration of Justice Act, following the passing of similar Acts in England, has been so far defined and regulated by statute and rules that, so far as the actual practice is concerned, it might almost be said to be completely controlled thereby.

An English practitioner, familiar only with the practice as at present existing in England under the present Order 31, upon coming to practice in this Province would find that while his knowledge of the general principles, applicable to the law of discovery, would be fully available in determining such question, for instance, as the right to refuse discovery in an action for penalties, the grounds for, or the extent of the privilege based upon legal professional communication, would, nevertheless, find that the manner in which, as a matter of practice, his discovery should be obtained, nay more, the cases and circumstances in which he had a right to discovery were very different from what was in vogue under the practice to which he had been accustomed. It would very

probably strike him that the most marked difference lay in the greater ease and facility with which discovery is obtainable in this Province, and the much greater latitude allowed therein. A few sharp contrasts would, perhaps, illustrate this :—

Under the Ontario Practice, as a matter of right, after delivery of Statement of Defence (except in certain special cases to be hereafter noticed where no right of discovery exists) he would be entitled to summon his adversary by subpoena and appointment, or by seven days' service of notice of the appointment upon his solicitor to appear before a special examiner, and conduct a practically unlimited cross-examination of him upon oral question and answer, an examination the scope of which would be wider than could be conducted at a trial, as discovery is not limited strictly to what is evidence, but may extend to anything which may, in itself, lead to the obtaining of evidence. In England he would have no such right. At the same stage of action, or similar in this to the Ontario practice, in special cases at an earlier stage, he may make an application to the court or a judge for leave to deliver interrogatories in writing for the examination of his adversary. Before he can make this application he must give security for costs. (Order 31, Rules 25 and 26.) This security being first in the sum of five pounds, with an additional sum of ten shillings for every folio by which the number of folios in the interrogatories exceed five. Then, upon the application before the judge, the giving of leave to administer interrogatories is not a matter of course. The interrogatories have to be submitted to the judge, and the leave is given as to such only of the interrogatories submitted as the court or judge shall consider necessary for disposing fairly of the cause or matter, or to save costs. The practice, as followed, is strictly in accordance with the rules, and it is safe to say that the practice in this matter affords the most marked contrast at present existing between the practice in England and the practice in Ontario, which is emphasized by the obvious consideration, that in England the answers to these interrogatories are carefully framed by the solicitor for the party, after full consultation and consideration, as against the practice in Ontario, which requires the party to go to examination without any knowledge of what specific questions will be asked of him, the form in which they will be put and compelled to answer, as in court, upon the questions as then imme-

diately presented without any opportunity of either consultation or consideration in regard to any question or point arising.

The practice as to discovery of documents affords a very similar contrast. In Ontario the order to produce issues as a matter of course upon *præcipe* upon the application of the party immediately after settlement of defence is due or has been filed. In England, under the provisions of Order 31, Rules 12, 13 and 14, just as in the case of administering interrogatories, the party has to obtain the leave of the court or judge for the issue of the order. The granting of the application is by no means a matter of course. The judge may either refuse or adjourn the application if satisfied that the discovery asked for is not necessary, or not necessary at that stage of the proceedings, or he may limit the discovery to certain classes of documents as may be thought fit. There is a proviso added at the end of the rule, apparently to emphasize the discretionary nature of the proceeding, "provided the discovery shall not be ordered when and so far as the court or judge shall be of opinion that it is not necessary either for fairly disposing of the cause or matter, or for saving costs." This initial difference, it will be at once seen, colors the whole of the subsequent practice as to discovery of documents. The principles applicable in Ontario and England may, generally speaking, be said to be the opposite of one another. In England the right is, in most instances, a limited right sharply defined by the terms of the order. In Ontario the right is a general right to have production of every document in any way relevant. In the one case the right to a further affidavit depends altogether on the convincing the court, not merely that a document or documents relating to the matter are in existence, but also of the fact that these are necessary to the case of the party applying. In Ontario all that has to be shewn is the existence of a relevant document.

The contrast between the Ontario practice and the English practice, not only on the question of the right to discovery, but as to the attitude of the judges in regard thereto in dealing with the every-day practice, is well illustrated by reference to the case of *Kennedy v. Dodson*, L.R. (1895) 1 Chy. 334, an action brought for a declaration that the defendant and the bankrupt, of whom the plaintiff was trustee in bankruptcy, had purchased a certain piece of land as co-partners and for partnership accounts. The plaintiff delivered interrogatories to the defendant, enquiring as to list of

properties purchased by himself and the bankrupt, jointly, prior to the particular transaction in question, and a number of interrogatories following that as to terms and conditions of the purchase, proportion of the purchase money, etc. In disallowing these interrogatories Lord Herschell, at page 338, after dealing with the suggestion that if it could be proved that in prior transactions the bankrupt and the defendant had been purchasing lands on partnership terms that would render it probable that such was the nature of the transaction in this case, proceeds: "But that is not relevant evidence. Cases of this description are not determined upon probabilities, but upon evidence of what happened upon the particular occasion. It is said that many of these questions might be put to the defendant in cross-examination, but that could not be for the purpose of proving what the particular transaction had been, except only to the extent of shewing that the defendant's evidence as to this particular transaction was not to be credited because of the admissions made by him in regard to the other transactions, but because those questions might be put to the defendant in cross-examination it by no means follows that evidence of such transaction would be relevant evidence to be given in chief at the trial. I entertain a strong opinion that interrogatories of this description, unless strictly relevant to the question at issue in this action, ought to be rigorously excluded; they cause a great amount of hardship and oppression; they cast upon the defendant, merely because a writ has been served upon him, the burden of a considerable amount of trouble and annoyance, and if he refuses to answer he may be sent to prison. Here the defendant is asked to give a list of all the properties prior to 1873 in which he and the bankrupt were jointly interested, and to state the terms and conditions upon which such properties were purchased. In order to answer that question he must rake up all these transactions for a period of twenty years before 1873. It is said that he may have diaries relating to these transactions—so much the worse for him. He will be a lucky man if he has destroyed them. Nothing shews better than this the wisdom of destroying books and papers relating to transactions which are done with. In my opinion there has sometimes been great laxity in times past in allowing interrogatories. It is a system which has made the very name of law stink in the nostrils of many sensible men of business. They state that they would rather pay the claim than

take the trouble necessary to answer interrogatories of this description, which causes a vast amount of trouble and difficulty unless they are clearly relevant to the issue."

In the same case Mr. Justice Lindley, referring to the same interrogatories, says :—

"They are opposed to the fundamental principles of discovery which are stated in Sir J. Wigram's Treatise on Discovery :—

'The second proposition stated is as follows It is the right, as a general rule, of a plaintiff in equity to exact from the defendant a discovery upon oath as to all matters and facts which, being well pleaded in the bill, are material to the plaintiff's case about to come on for trial and which the defendant does not, by his form of pleading, admit. That renders it necessary to say a few words as to what are matters of fact, which, being well pleaded in the bill, are material to the plaintiff's case. What ought a properly drawn bill to contain? It ought to contain a statement of those facts, and those facts only, which, if proven, will entitle the plaintiff to relief.' And again in the same judgment, 'I doubt whether this information would be admissible in evidence, but, suppose it would, it does not follow that the plaintiff would be entitled to discovery of it. Examining witnesses at a trial and obtaining discovery before the trial are two totally different matters.'"

A not inconsiderable experience in practice motions in regard to discovery in our own courts leads the writer to venture the opinion that if the precise point decided in *Kennedy v. Dodson* were to arise in our courts upon a motion to compel answer to such questions, certainly prior to the decision of that case, a considerable number of the questions which might have been framed upon the examination for discovery relating to the matters covered by the interrogatories there refused would have been ordered to be answered, and, even with the authority of that case (which would of course be treated with all the respect that a decision of the Court of Appeal in England commands in our courts, it is not improbable that upon an argument based upon the language of Rule 439 "a party may be compelled to attend and testify in the same manner, upon the same terms and subject to the same rules of examination as a witness," helped out with the provisions of Rule 448, providing for the production on the examination of all

books, papers and documents which would be bound to be produced at the trial under a subpoena duces tecum—the plaintiff in that action, if in Ontario, would have been enabled to compel the discovery there sought. Reference may be had, too, to the language of Lord Justice Lindley in *Wills Trade Marks* (1892) 3 Chy., at page 207. "There is nothing in modern times which requires greater care than making orders for discovery and inspection of document." Contrast such decisions and language of judges in English courts with the decision of the King's Bench Division in *Evans v. Jaffray*, 3 O.L.R., at page 327, a case which was very fully argued and in which the court, at page 342, practically confesses its inability under our practice to deal with such questions other than by the indirect method of disallowing costs, Mr. Justice Street, in delivering the judgment of the court, saying:—"Several of the questions mentioned in the examinations were clearly irrelevant. Others were so loosely framed as to make it impossible to deal with them. The examinations of both defendants were frequently rambling and vague, and were unnecessarily prolonged by the repetition of the same questions in different forms. This is a growing evil and adds much useless expense to litigation as well as to the labour, both of judges and counsel. It can only be checked by entirely disallowing the costs of an examination, which is unnecessarily long."

Similarly, in regard to discovery of documents, the language of Order 31, Rule 12 of the English rules of the Supreme Court (particularly the last clause thereof) "provided that discovery shall not be ordered when and so far as the court or judge shall be of opinion that it is not necessary either for disposing fairly of the cause or matter, or for saving costs" is to the same effect as the concluding language of Order 31, Rule 2, with reference to interrogatories and the decisions have followed very much along the same line. See *Downing v. Falmouth Local Board* (1887), 37 Chy. Div., on page 242, where Lord Justice Cotton, in delivering the judgment of the Court of Appeal, says: "The tendency to extend the power of the court to order discovery ought to be very carefully checked and certainly not encouraged." And see also *Attorney-General v. North Metropolitan Railway* (1892) 3 Chy., at page 370, where Mr. Justice North declined altogether to order an affidavit of documents or the general inspection of the defendant's books, the relators in the action being trade rivals, and dealing with the

question as to the extent to which interrogatories should be allowed, says, at page 74: "I think they are entitled to some information, but only of a very limited character, and one must be very careful not to give any information to the plaintiffs, which is not necessary for the purpose of enabling them to prosecute their own case when it may be most unfavorable to the defendants for general purposes that their rivals in trade should have that information."

Had this case been in our courts the ordinary order for discovery would have been issued upon *præcipe* and the ground upon which that judgment proceeds would not have afforded any ground whatever for privileging the documents from production and inspection. The sole question upon any motion in reference to the affidavit would have been, "Do entries in the books in question relate to the matter in question in the action? If so they must have been produced. It may be that the entries would not be evidence and could not be used at the trial; even that would make no difference provided they referred in any way to the matters in issue.

Another marked contrast in the provisions of the rules between the Ontario and the English practice is in regard to the time and place of production of documents, although in actual practice no difference exists upon this point. Technically, under the form of our order to produce, a party fails to comply with the whole order unless he deposits the documents with the office from which the order issues. Under the form of the order it is the right of the party issuing same to insist upon this being done in this Province. In England this is a matter left to be fixed when the order to produce is issued, and the office of the court is, except in very rare instances, not the selected place.

Another marked contrast between the Ontario practice and that in this province at present is in regard to the conclusive effect given to the affidavit on production. The law in England, down to the passing of what is now Order 31, Rule 19 (a), sub-sec. 3 which was first passed in November of 1893, was the same as that in Ontario—the affidavit was treated as conclusive. No contradictory affidavit could be received, nor would an interrogatory, looking to cross-examination upon the affidavit on production, be allowed.

The only ground upon which a motion for further and better affidavit on production could succeed was on admission of the party himself, either in pleading in answer to interrogatories or in some other document emanating from himself, perhaps the most common source being some reference in documents already produced by him to other documents not produced. The opposite party was practically limited to these items as his only basis for getting further production; otherwise the affidavit filed was conclusive. Since the passing of the rule above referred to in England a practice has grown up to make application for a further affidavit on production based upon affidavits of the party referring to specific documents which, in the belief of the deponent, either are or have at some time been in the possession or power of the opposite party. This practice has been narrowly, not to say jealously restricted, as will be seen by reference to such cases as *White v. Spafford*, 2 K.B. 24, *Graves v. Hindman*, 18 T.L.R. 115. In Ontario, however, there is no such practice. No rule such as Order 31, Rule 19 (a), sub-s. 3, of the English rules has been passed or adopted in our courts, and the law is still in Ontario as it was in England prior to the passing of that rule — the affidavit is conclusive unless further affidavit can be obtained on some of the grounds referred to above. Indeed, in this regard recent alterations of the Ontario rules have been in the direction of restricting any right to challenge the affidavit.

Prior to the 1st of September, 1894, the rule which then existed as Rule No. 512 provided, "The deponent in every affidavit on production shall be subject to cross-examination," and under this rule, cross-examination on affidavit on production with a view to obtaining further and better production was not an infrequent proceeding. That rule was rescinded by rule which came into force on the 1st of September, 1894, and by the same set of rules an exception of the affidavit on production was introduced into the rule which is at present Rule 490, allowing cross-examination of a person who has made affidavit to be used in any action or proceeding. The rule so rescinding was passed along with a number of others, notably the rules dealing with the question of costs of examinations for discovery, making costs of such examination to be borne in any event by the party taking same unless otherwise ordered by the trial judge, which latter rule subsisted for a com-

paratively short time when it was repealed, and the present rule, leaving this in the discretion of the taxing officer, substituted.

It was conceived by many practitioners that the only purpose of the rescission of the former Rule 512 was to put an end to the practice of separate cross-examinations upon affidavit on production for the purpose of saving costs, and that, notwithstanding the rescinding of this rule, it was still open to the party either upon examination for discovery or by way, for instance, of examination as witness upon motion, to interrogate him as to other documents in addition to those referred to in his affidavit on production.

An attempt was made in *Dryden v. Smith*, 17 P.R. 500, to examine the party who had made the affidavit on production as witness upon a motion made for further and better affidavit on production referring to specific documents, or, rather, classes of documents. It was held by the present Master in Chambers (then sitting as referee for the Master in Chambers) and by the present Chief Justice of Ontario (then Mr. Justice Moss) that that procedure amounted in effect to an attempt to cross-examine on the affidavit on production, and could not be done. The language used by Mr. Justice Moss in the concluding passages of his judgment at pages 504-505 left open the question as to whether or not upon the examination of the party for discovery questions designed to extract admissions as to the existence of other documents than those mentioned in the affidavit on production, and thus, in effect, a cross-examination upon the affidavit might not have been permitted, and this question was not definitely settled by any authority in our courts until October, 1902, when, in a case of *Standard v. Seybold*, Chief Justice Meredith, delivering the judgment of the Divisional Court (Common Pleas Division), held that an opposite party might not indirectly, by means of an examination for discovery, do what he could not do directly—cross-examine upon an affidavit on production.

This case may be regarded, for the present at any rate, as settling the point that we are now in Ontario in the same position as parties were in England under the old practice before the passing of the amended rule, and the right to obtain a further and better affidavit on production is limited to the cases in which it can be obtained upon some documentary admission of the party making the affidavit as above set out.

Our practice of discovery, both by examination for discovery and production of documents, is a most useful and valuable one ; one which, in many instances, is a most valuable instrument in enabling parties to get at evidence of facts, and thus in the result enabling courts to do justice between parties. It is also a means of very greatly shortening trials, thus effecting a considerable saving of time and expense, but in its present form it is also a practice capable of great abuses, and being an instrument of much oppression. Many solicitors of experience can give curious instances where actions have been brought largely for the purpose of getting at an examination of the parties, or discovery of documents in regard to business transactions in reference to which the plaintiff was anxious to enquire sometimes for ulterior business purposes, sometimes with a view to further, or other litigation, against, perhaps, different parties ; numbers of instances also in which parties have been added and pleadings have been framed in an action designed to procure relief for the express purpose of obtaining also discovery and production in regard to ulterior matters can be given.

As illustrating the occasionally oppressive nature of the Ontario practice, a case occurred in the writer's own experience in which the defendant, an English gentleman residing and domiciled in England, made a party to a litigation in Ontario and held as party therein (for no other reason than that relief was sought against and writ had been served in Ontario upon other parties domiciled here) was compelled to make no less than four successive affidavits on production, scheduling a vast mass of correspondence and also to submit to a very lengthy and much drawn out examination upon commission, all in an action which was nothing but a fishing excursion from its inception, as was shewn by the fact that when the plaintiff was forced to trial therewith he abandoned his action without the case being even called in court. The expense to the one defendant of the proceedings in regard to discovery and production alone of his solicitors in Ontario, exceeded \$600. The writer is not informed as to what his expenses in England (where his own solicitors were acting in the matter) were, but it is safe to say they must have been very nearly, if not quite, equal to those of the Ontario solicitors. One can imagine that it is such instances as these that Lord Herschell had in mind in the passage above

cited when he said: "It is that system which had made the very name of law stink in the nostrils of many sensible men of business."

Practically all the recently reported cases in Ontario on the question of discovery have to do with some one or other of the various grounds of privilege and in regard to this branch of the law the cases illustrate that there is no contrast between the law of Ontario and the law of England on any of these points, but rather that the cases are based upon and follow the principles enunciated in the English cases.

One well known ground of privilege from discovery is that the discovery sought from the party will criminate him or expose him to penalty. In reference to this the decision in *Lamb v. Munster*, L.R. (1882), 10 Q.B.D. p. 110, has always been followed in this province, holding that "I decline to answer upon the ground that my answer might tend to criminate me" is a sufficient claim of the privilege. The belief that it would tend to criminate need not be asserted. This is an absolute privilege and has always been given full effect to in our Court as may be illustrated by the case of *Van Sicke v. Axon*, 17 P.R. 535, where an affidavit on production stated "I have in my possession or power a certain document relating to the matter in question in this action. I object to produce the said document, the naming and production of which said document might tend to criminate me or might tend to bring a criminal prosecution against me for a crime of which in fact I am innocent, and for which I might be criminally prosecuted" and proceeded following the ordinary form to negative the possession of any other document. This was held to be sufficient and a motion against the affidavit upon the ground that the document was not sufficiently described failed before the local Judge, the present Chief Justice Moss, (then Mr. Justice Moss), in Chambers, and the Divisional Court of the Common Pleas Division. It appears to have been thought by some that when the present Criminal Code was enacted in 1892 this privilege would disappear from our law. In this view it was obvious that the fact that the privilege in civil cases depended upon the Ontario statutes had been overlooked.

The question came up very shortly after the passing of the Code and was settled upon the appeal in *Wiser v. Heintsman*, 15 P.R. p. 407, that the formerly existing law had not been altered by the passing of the Dominion statute. For

recent illustrations of effect being given to this ground of privilege see *De Iery v. The World*, 17 P.R. p. 387, where, in an action of libel, it was held that the party to be protected against answering any questions not only that has a direct tendency to criminate him but that forms one step towards doing so, and upon the officer of the Corporation pledging his oath to the belief that such would or might be the effect of his answer, he was entitled to the privilege.

This question also arose when this ground of privilege was set up in the case of *Hopkins v. Smith*, 1 O.L.R. at p. 659, where the action being for maintenance, upon an order for production being issued by the plaintiff and appointment to examine the defendants motion was made to set aside the order and appointment upon the ground that the statement of claim charged them with a criminal offence and they were entitled to refuse to answer any question tending to criminate them. The question really in issue was whether or not maintenance was a criminal offence, and it being held that it was, the motion was upheld.

It is interesting to notice too that the Divisional Court adopted the view expressed by Sir William Meredith, C.J., in *Malcolm v. Race*, 16 P.R. 331, holding in effect that it was not necessary in a case such as this to put in an affidavit on production taking the objection, or to attend upon the examination and wait until the question was asked and then decline to answer same, but that "It is better to stop such examination in limine than to allow it to proceed subject to objections to questions which may be asked." This practice has been again approved and followed in *Johnston v. London & Paris Exchange* (1903), 6 O.L.R. 50.

In connection with this matter and the claiming of such privilege it is interesting to note as an illustration of how questions supposed to have been long ago settled, occasionally crop up. The case of *Nunn v. Brandon*, 24 O.R. p. 375, in which the late Mr. Justice Rose, at the trial of an action for libel following the opinion expressed by him in *Harkins v. Doney*, 17 O.R. 21, held that the refusal of the defendant upon his examination for discovery to answer as to his being the author of the libel complained of and the reason given by him "I refuse to answer for fear of incriminating myself" afforded evidence from which a jury might draw the inference that he was the author of the libel

in question. On appeal, which was heard by the Common Pleas Division, this judgment was reversed.

In penal actions the practice since the Judicature Act has expressly followed the old practice of the Courts of Equity which refuses altogether discovery in such a class of actions or in aid of a forfeiture, this notwithstanding the wide language of the rule which is perfectly general in its terms, making no distinction between classes of actions or containing any reference to any particular action or class of actions. In a recent case, in which it was sought on behalf of the plaintiff in a patent action to obtain the benefit of this rule, *Parramore v. Boston*, 4 O.L.R. 627, the attempt failed so far as this point was concerned, upon the ground that this was not an action for forfeiture but merely a case of the defendant defending himself against a right asserted on the part of the plaintiff, and that the discovery sought was not discovery as to a forfeiture, but simply a discovery of the happening of the event on which the claim or right of the plaintiff, if such had ever existed, would terminate.

A curious exception to this principle is illustrated by a case of *Regina v. Fox*, 18 P.R. 343, wherein an action for penalty under the Alien Labor Act, the plaintiff was held entitled to examine the defendant for discovery before the trial. The exception, however, is a purely statutory one, the decision proceeding upon the language of s. 2 of The Canada Evidence Act, 56 Vict. (Canada), c. 31, which was held, having regard to the provisions of s. 5 of 61 Vict. c. 53 to give the right.

The next of the most ordinary grounds of privilege is that based upon professional confidence as between solicitor and client. This is well illustrated by the recent case of *Clergue v. McKay*, 3 O.L.R. p. 63, (and in appeal at page 478), in which case Mr. Justice Street, upon appeal from the Master, notes in the course of his judgment "there has been a progressive development in the particularity required in the description of correspondence between a solicitor and his client in order that it may be held to be protected from discovery by reason of privilege; that which was formerly assumed from general statements must now be specifically set forth and sworn to, the reason being that as the affidavit cannot be contradicted, the ground upon which the privilege is claimed must be set forth explicitly and fully so that the Court may judge whether the documents so described are properly withheld from

production, and expressly stating that this decision goes beyond the decision of the case of *Hoffman v. Crehar*, 17 P.R. 404 (also a decision of Mr. Justice Street.)

It might be well to note in considering this decision the special facts of this case it being one in which the solicitors had obviously acted not merely as such, but had also acted as real estate agents in connection with the transfer of the property, and it is to be noted that the decision does not purport to go further than, indeed expressly proves the statement of the law in *Gardner v. Irwin*, 4 Ex. Div. at p. 49, in which it is indicated that it is sufficient to state that the letters are professional communications of a confidential character for the purpose of obtaining legal advice; such statement of the law being again approved in *Ainsworth v. Wilding*, 1 R. (1900), 2 Chy. at p. 315, which also, it may be noted, again settled the point which appears to crop up periodically, that if documents for which privilege can be claimed are brought into existence for the purpose of an action which is not proceeded with, the privilege does not cease, but can be claimed in a subsequent action other than that for which they were originally brought into existence. See on this point *Pearce v. Foster* (1885), 13 Q.B.D. 114; *Calcraft v. Guest*, L.R. (1898), 1 Q.B. p. 761, although it was thought that this had been conclusively settled by the language of the judgment of the Court of Appeal in *O'Shea v. Wood* (1891), Probate 286. See also *London Life v. Molson's Bank*, June 11, 1902, where Chief Justice Falconbridge followed and applied the cases of *Wheeler v. LeMarchant*, L.R. 17 Chy. D. 675; *Minet v. Morgan*, L.R. 8 Chy. 367, and *London v. Blackney*, 23 Q.B.D. 332.

Privilege on the ground of professional confidence does not extend to cases where questions of fraud are raised. This principle has been long ago settled in England and is perhaps most clearly enunciated there in the recent case of *Williams v. Quebec Railway* (1895), 2 Chy. 751, and by the case of *Bullivant v. Attorney-General* (1900) A.C. p. 196, which latter case went off upon the ground that there was no proof of fraud. A recent case in our own Courts of *Smith v. Hunt* (1901), O.L.R. p. 334, shews that these cases have been entirely adopted and followed by our Courts.

It might be worth while for the framers of our Rules to consider whether or not some provisions should not be made to prevent an abuse of this principle. Under our system, pleadings are not sworn to. A party is at liberty to put such pleading as he may

see fit upon the record. He runs no risk except perhaps in remote instances that of costs, by placing the plea of fraud thereon. He is not even under the existing practice held strictly to what were formerly considered well settled rules of pleading, but is given very wide latitude to frame his own much as he might see fit. It is very easy when production of correspondence and documents, which would otherwise be privileged under this head, is desired, to frame a plea charging fraud so as to entitle the party to the wide latitude of discovery, which the present position of the law gives him. This is by no means a fanciful possibility of evil—it is an existing condition which has not infrequently to be dealt with. It is difficult to suggest any effectual remedy which would not involve a radical change in our present practice in the way of limiting the right to discovery as it now subsists. The obvious suggestion of requiring an affidavit from the party seeking the discovery verifying the plea of fraud would be a very crude remedy, if a remedy at all, and open to objections which are patent on the face of it. Under the English practice no such difficulty can arise, or at least if it arises is fully dealt with upon the application for leave to administer interrogatories, or for the order for production as the case may be.

There is scarcely any point in our practice which is more important to the interests of those who require to consult solicitors than that the confidential relation and privilege based upon it should subsist and be fully preserved, and to that end some limitation should be imposed upon this method of destroying the privilege by the introduction of an allegation of fraud often entirely unfounded.

Another ground of privilege which has been recently considered by our Courts and in which the English authorities have been followed, is that which arises where a party swears in his affidavit that documents relate exclusively to his own title or case, are part of the evidence supporting same, and do not support or tend to support the case of the other party and contain nothing impeaching his own case. A recent authority establishing and illustrating this proposition in England, was the case of *Frankenstein v. Gavin Cycle Co.*, (1897), L.R. 2 Q.B. p. 62, following *Attorney-General v. Emerson*, (1882), 10 Q.B.D. p. 191. This case was followed in our own Courts in a case of *Griffin v. Fawkes*, 17 P.R. p. 540.

It may be noted that the statement in the affidavit in order to effectually make the claim of privilege must be a positive statement. "To the best of the knowledge, information and belief" of the party will not do. See *Diamond Match Co. v. Hawkesbury Lumber Co.* (1901) 1 O.L.R. p. 577, which case followed the old case of *Coombe v. Corporation of London* (1842) 1 Y. & C. 621, and also *Quilter v. Heatley* (1883) 23 Chy. Div. p. 42.

English authority was again followed and approved when it was held in *Platt v. Bucke*, 4 O.L.R. p. 421, that privilege on the ground of professional confidence did not exist when the client of the solicitor with whom the privileged correspondence was had, was the common grantor of both the plaintiff and defendant.

Another rather striking adoption of the English practice is illustrated by such cases as *Bedell v. Ryckman*, 5 O.L.R. at p. 670; *Graham v. Temperance*, 16 P.R. 536; *Dickerson v. Radcliffe* (1897) 17 P.R. 576; *Sidney Cheese & Butter Factory v. Brover* (1900) 19 P.R. p. 152; *Evans v. Jaffray*, 3 O.L.R. p. 341, where following English decisions discovery with regard to matters of account has been refused until the plaintiff shall have established his right to the account, a practice which has arisen in our law solely through the following of English decisions. So far as the language of the rules is concerned the right is absolute, subject to no such limitations as imposed by these cases. The cases, however, have clearly defined and settled the rule; any subsequent cases that may arise can only determine its applicability to particular facts and circumstances.

It is scarcely to be expected that any further limitations upon the right of discovery will come into our practice through the influence of English decisions so long as our rules remain in their present condition, although the cases last referred to may be taken as indicating that it is not impossible.

ROBT. MCKAY.

Toronto.

KILLING NO MURDER.

We, on this side of the line, favoured with a polity which distinctions of colour and race do not bind to the observance of diverse canons of law for their treatment, instead of being amazed by its recurrence, take, as a matter of course—with the experience of a quarter of a century before us—any prostitution of justice in the Southern States, where the life or limb of a negro is at stake. We have been encouraged to fancy, however, that in so far as dealings in those communities between whites are concerned, they had crept from the sombre recesses of barbarism into the clear sunlight of civilization. A recent affair in South Carolina robs us of the comforting assurance.

One Gonzales, editor of a newspaper in Charleston, had, by allusions printed in his columns—all of them condemning political actions merely of the State's executive, and none of them exceptionally bitter—given umbrage to the individual chosen for his target. Meeting, not long afterwards, the presumptuous journalist in one of the city's thoroughfares, he, without the least warning, drew his revolver and shot him dead.

Indicted and brought to trial for the offence, his counsel offered and maintained on his behalf a plea which every one learning of it will, I venture to say, regard as unexampled in tenor. The discussion of its character may be forestalled by the remark that it was submitted by the trial Judge to the jury and upheld by them, and the prisoner acquitted. He set up the astonishing claim that the killer was exonerated because his victim and he having entered into an agreement whereby one might shoot the other on sight, he, on the occasion of their meeting, construing a movement of Gonzales in the direction of his pocket as an attempt to produce his weapon, anticipated the latter's design by the discharge of his own first.

Should not the Court have declined at once to entertain the plea by reason of its constituting in law no answer to the indictment, and have prevented disclosure of any facts which might have gone to support it. For, supposing a deliberate compact to have been formed, as contended—the engagement to have represented something more, on both sides, than mere bravado—on what principle could it relieve the prisoner of accountability? Consent by the deceased that his life should be taken would afford no justification.

The reasoning in the old case of *Rex v. Sawyer*, Old Bailey, 1815, has never yet been impugned. There, it was determined, that "he who kills another upon his desire or command is, in the judgment of the law, as much a murderer as if he had done it merely of his own head." So, in *Rex v. Alison*, 8 C. & P. 418, there, upon an indictment for the murder of a woman, it appeared that the prisoner and the deceased, who passed as husband and wife, being in very great distress, agreed to take poison, and each took a quantity of laudanum, in the presence of the other, and both lay down in the same bed together, wishing to die in each other's arms, and the woman died, but the prisoner recovered; Patteson, J., told the jury that, supposing the parties mutually agreed to commit suicide, and one only accomplished that object, the survivor was guilty of murder in point of law.

The celebrated case of *Reg. v. Dudley*, 14 Q.B.D. 273, 15 Cox C.C. 624; where a man, who, in order to escape death from hunger, killed another for the purpose of eating his flesh, though he had the fullest ground for believing that it afforded the only chance of preserving his life, might, also, be referred to.

Duelling—odious in conception, vengeful in practice as it is—appears, in contrast with the invention for destroying your enemy, of which Governor Tillman boasts the patent, a correct, even laudable, institution; for by that process of settling differences, each adversary has an equal chance of life.

But, if in addition to the existence of the understanding alleged to have been come to, the prisoner had been required to furnish reasonable evidence that Gonzales sought to carry it out—and it is hard to conceive how the original agreement, if sufficient, would be strengthened by its production—is anything to be found here which fulfils the requirement? A pedestrian, who is about to pass another carrying, without a suggestion of menace, a walking-stick, might just as fairly see danger in posse of an assault in his possession of that ordinary, and quite lawful accompaniment, and prevent its occurrence by setting upon its owner.

The South Carolina jury which allowed this brutal murderer to escape are entitled to the satisfaction that the civilized world is revolted by their action.

J. B. MACKENZIE.

REPORTS AND NOTES OF CASES.

Province of Ontario.

COURT OF APPEAL.

From MacMahon, J.

[Sept. 14.]

MIDLAND NAVIGATION CO. v. DOMINION ELEVATOR CO.

Maritime law—Custom of port—Arrival of vessel—In port or at point of loading (elevators)—Awaiting turn—Not loaded in time—Departure without cargo to save insurance—Freight.

The plaintiff company being the owners of a vessel called the "Midland Queen," agreed by telegram with the defendant company to carry a cargo of wheat from F. W. to G. at four and a half cents a bushel, confirming same as follows: "We confirm Midland Queen four and half G. load F. W. on or before noon fifth December." The wheat was in the elevators of the C.P.R. at F.W., and the Midland Queen arrived in that harbour on December 3rd, but as several vessels had arrived before her and she had to take her turn to get to the elevators according to the regulations of the C.P.R., the owners of the elevators there, of which all parties were aware, she was not loaded by the time fixed and had to leave for home without a cargo in order to save her insurance. In an action for the freight,

Held, that the defendants' duty was to furnish a cargo at the elevators which was the only place of loading at F. W., and the contract should be read as if the words "at the usual place" were inserted and that the plaintiffs' contract was to proceed to the usual place of loading, receive the cargo and carry it to the point of destination; that the loading was to be done by noon of the fifth; that the defendants not having done anything to obstruct the vessel in getting to the elevators, and the plaintiffs having failed to show that the defendants were in default their action should be dismissed, and that the vessel not having arrived sufficiently in advance to secure her turn in time, the defendants were entitled to such damages as fairly resulted from the breach of contract and as were in contemplation of the parties.

Judgment of MACMAHON, J., at the trial reversed, MACLENNAN, J.A., dissenting.

Per MACLENNAN, J.A., when the contract contains an unqualified time limit for loading on the part of the charterer, and the ship has arrived at the designated port in sufficient time, the charterer is answerable for

not loading within the time, whatever be the nature of the impediment which prevents him from performing it.

Aylesworth, K.C., and *C. A. Moss*, for the appeal. *C. Robinson*, K.C., and *F. E. Hodgins*, K.C., contra.

From MacMahon, J.] STEWART v. WALKER. [Nov. 16.

Will—Probate—Lost will—Evidence—Solicitor—Privilege—Declarations.

The doctrine of privileged communications as between solicitor and client exists for the benefit of the client and his representatives in interest, not for that of the solicitor, and in an action to establish the lost will of a testator who was illegitimate and had died without issue statements of the testator to his solicitor in reference to the making of and provisions in the will were held against the objection of those who claimed under the lost will to be admissible in evidence.

Statements of a testator as to the provisions of his will are admissible in evidence in an action to establish it, and statements of this kind were in this case held to be sufficient corroboration of the evidence of the plaintiff, who had drawn and was claiming large benefits under the will in question, which, it was alleged, had been lost or stolen.

The facts that the testator was aware that unless he made a will his property would go to the Crown; that he was an experienced man of business possessed of a large estate; that he had, after the will had been made, several times spoken of it as in existence and had mentioned some of its provisions; and that during his last illness, of some days' duration, he had expressed no wish to make a will, were held sufficient to rebut the presumption of destruction of the will by the testator.

Judgment of MACMAHON, J., affirmed.

Aylesworth, K.C., and *Shepley*, K.C., for Attorney-General of Ontario. *Watson*, K.C., and *Grayson Smith*, for plaintiff. *S. H. Blake*, K.C., *Riddell*, K.C., and *Lorn McDougall*, for other respondents.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Boyd, C.] FAWKES v. ATTORNEY-GENERAL. [Feb. 20.

Lands Title Act, R.S.O. 1897, c. 138—Transfer of owner—Induced by fraud—Forged conveyance by transferee—Subsequent purchaser for value without notice—Assurance Fund—Claim on.

Plaintiff, being the owner of land registered under the Land Titles Act, R. S. O. 1897, c. 138, was, by the fraud of two persons, G. & H., induced to transfer her land to one D. Subsequently a transfer to McD.,

purporting to be signed by D., was registered, but D.'s signature was forged. McD. then transferred to O'M. and O'M. to B., both being parties to the fraud with G. & H., when B. transferred to C., an innocent purchaser, for value, without notice. All the transfers were duly registered. None of the parties to the fraud being financially responsible an action was brought for compensation for the loss of the land out of the Assurance Fund under sections 130 and 132 of the Act.

Held, that the plaintiff was not "wrongfully deprived" under s. 132 and that she could not recover.

Roswell, K.C., and *S. C. Wood*, for plaintiff. *Clute*, K.C., and *McGregor Young*, for defendant.

Britton, J.]

[Oct. 19.

CENTRAL TRUST CO. OF NEW YORK v. ALGOMA STEEL CO.

District Courts—Jurisdiction—Recovery of land—Mortgages—Injunction—High Court action—Multiplicity.

The plaintiffs, being mortgagees of land, issued out of the District Court for the district in which the land was situated a writ of summons endorsed with a claim to "recover possession of the land, and for an order that the defendants do forthwith deliver up possession" thereof, describing the land.

Held, that the endorsement was one under Con. Rule 138, and that it was for "the recovery of land situate in the district," within the meaning of R.S.O. 1897, c. 109, s. 9, sub-s. 2 (d).

Independent Order of Foresters v. Pegg, 19 P.R. 80, distinguished.

The fact that the plaintiffs had also brought an action in the High Court for a declaration of right in regard to the same land, in which they might have claimed the same relief as in the other action, was not a ground for enjoining the plaintiffs from proceeding in the District Court.

Shepley, K.C., and *Middleton*, for the defendants. *Ritchie*, K.C., and *J. Bicknell*, K.C., for plaintiffs.

MacMahon, J.]

IN RE KINNY.

[Oct. 22.

Will—Charitable devises and bequests—Designation of beneficiaries—Perpetuities—Mortmain Acts.

Testator bequeathed all his property "to that Presbyterian congregation where I belong to and had my first communion, Churchtown . . . Ireland. The presiding clergyman, committee and elders to have full control of all after me. They shall have the power to sell or rent to the best advantage. . . . The minister and committee and ruling elders shall give me a decent funeral monument, not to exceed £100 sterling, and then the widow and the orphan and neglected children to be seen after by

the minister, committee and ruling elders, having succeeding authority to remember the poor of the church at Christmas every year, and to cheer the poor and the broken-hearted with the joy of Christ's death and suffering together with the presents presented by the minister, committee and ruling elders at the Christmas time every year." By a codicil he appointed two persons, executors and trustees, and vested all his property in them as trustees for the purposes mentioned in the will. He died within six months after making the will and codicil, leaving both real and personal property.

Held, that the beneficiaries, namely, the widows and neglected children and the poor, were sufficiently designated, and came within the meaning of sec. 6 of the Mortmain and Charitable Uses Act, 2 Edw. VII., c. 2; and, the gifts being charitable, the rule against perpetuities did not apply to them. The minister, committee and elders were the almoners named for the purpose of carrying the charitable design into effect.

Held, also, that the word "assurance" in sub-s. 6 of s. 7 of that Act refers to a deed, not to a will, and therefore leaves s. 4 of R.S.O. 1897, c. 112, untouched, and under that section a devise in favour of a charity is good though made within six months before testator's death.

Mickle, for executors. *Armour*, K.C., for the Presbyterian congregation. *A. W. Holmsted*, for the heirs-at-law and next of kin.

Maclaren, J.A]

ATRINSON & PLIMPTON.

[Oct. 27.

Writ of summons—Service out of jurisdiction—Sale of goods—Breach of contract—Place of performance—Property passing—Order for service—Affidavit—Non-disclosure—Discretion as to forum.

The defendants lived in England. One of them, being in Ontario, saw the plaintiffs, who lived in Ontario, and it was agreed that the plaintiffs should send samples of their goods to the defendants, which they did. The defendants, after inspection, ordered goods from the plaintiffs, to be shipped to Liverpool, via Leyland line from Boston, delivered f.o.b. vessel, and they were shipped accordingly. There was no evidence as to whether the goods were insured, or if so, by whom, in whose name, and for whose benefit. A second order was given and the goods shipped in the same way. Before this order was filled the defendants were sued in England for infringement of copyright in respect of a part of the goods, and in consequence returned the goods covered by the second order, and refused to pay for what they so returned.

Held, 1. The property in the goods passed to the purchasers on the delivery on board the vessel at Boston, and that an action would thereupon lie in Ontario, which was the place for payment for goods sold and delivered. The purchasers were entitled to inspect before accepting, but, even in case of a sale by sample, prima facie the place of delivery is the place for inspection, and there was nothing in the contract to rebut the

presumption. Therefore the action came within Rule 162 (1) (e), being for a breach within Ontario of a contract to be performed within Ontario; and service of the writ of summons on the defendants out of Ontario was properly allowed.

2. It was not necessary for the plaintiffs, in obtaining an ex parte order allowing them to serve the defendants abroad, to disclose the facts that the defendants had refused to receive the goods and returned them to plaintiffs, and that they were in Ontario at the time of the application, or the facts regarding the copyright, or that the defendants had paid for all the goods which they retained.

3. A proper discretion had been exercised in favour of an Ontario action; it was not a case in which the plaintiffs should be compelled to sue the defendants in England.

Lopez v. Chavarri, [1901] W.N. 115, distinguished.

J. T. Small, for defendants. *Middleton*, for plaintiffs.

Street, J.]

GRAHAM v. BOURQUE.

[Nov. 2.

Chose in action—Assignment of money payable in respect of contract—Damages for interference with the work—Attachment of debts.

A contractor for the construction of a drain assigned to a bank as security for advances "all and every sum or sums of money now due or to become due and payable to me by (the employer) in respect of a certain contract existing between myself and the said (employer) for the construction of section three of the drain," describing it. The cost of doing the work was increased owing to the employer negligently allowing water to flow into the drain, and the contractor obtained a judgment against the employer for damages for the negligence. ;

Held, that the amount payable under this judgment passed to the bank as money payable in respect of the contract and was not attachable by a judgment creditor of the contractor.

Middleton, for the bank. *J. H. Moss*, for the judgment creditor. *W. N. Ferguson*, for the garnishees.

Meredith, C. J. MacMahon, J. Teetzel, J.]

[Nov. 4.

IN RE CONFEDERATION LIFE AND CLARKSON.

Will—Power to sell—Power to exchange.

A testator devised her real estate to be equally divided between her children when the youngest of them should attain twenty-one, with a power to the executor "to sell or dispose of any or all of the above real estate should he think it to the interest of my children to do so, and should he pay off any debt or debts now standing against such real estate, the same to be deducted from such sale or sales."

Held, that the executor had no authority to exchange the lands of the testatrix for other lands.

C. P. Smith, for vendors. *Ludwig*, for purchaser.

Divisional Court.]

[Nov. 11.]

IN RE WARBRICK AND RUTHERFORD.

Landlord and tenant.—Overholding tenant—Writ of possession—Prohibition to County Judge and Sheriff—Certiorari—R.S.O. 1897, c. 171, s. 6.

After an order had been made on the landlord's application under the Overholding Tenants' Act for the issue of a writ of possession, but before the writ had been issued the tenant applied for an order for the removal of the proceedings into the High Court and for prohibition to the Judge of the County Court and the Sheriff;

Held, per STREET, J., that proceedings under the Overholding Tenants' Act can be removed into the High Court only when s. 6 of that Act applies; that that section does not apply until a writ of possession has been issued; and therefore that the applicant was not entitled to relief.

Per BRITTON, J., that whether s. 6 is exclusive or not, it at least amply protects the tenant's rights and that the applicant was not entitled to relief either under that section or under the general jurisdiction of the Court.

Judgment of MACMAHON, J., affirmed.

Robert McKay, for tenant. *W. T. J. Lee*, for landlord.

Divisional Court.]

[Nov. 12.]

IN RE JELLY, UNION TRUST CO. v. GAMON.

Executors and administrators—Evidence—Corroboration—R.S.O. 1897, c. 73, s. 10.

Upon a claim in an administration action by a tenant against the estate of his deceased landlord for a balance due to him in respect of alleged advances, and for goods supplied, the books of the tenant, in which the transactions were set out, and cheques made by him in favour of the landlord, were held to be sufficient corroboration of his evidence, although the cheques did not shew on their face whether they had been given on account of rent or in respect of advances.

Judgment of the Master-in-Ordinary affirmed.

Bicknell, K.C., for the appellants. *J. H. Moss*, for respondent.

Divisional Court.]

IN RE McDONALD.

[Nov. 12.]

Will—Construction—"Dying without heirs."

A testator gave and devised to his daughter all his real and personal property, subject to the payment of certain legacies and charges, and "in the event of her dying without heirs" then to the testator's brothers and sisters:

Held, that the ulterior devisees being related to the first devisee the "heirs" of the first devisee must be construed to be "heirs of the body" and therefore that as to the realty the daughter took an estate tail, and as to the personalty an absolute estate.

Judgment of FALCONBRIDGE, C.J., varied.

H. J. Wright, for executors. *J. H. Moss*, for daughter. *F. W. Harcourt*, *J. H. Spence*, and *A. W. Holmsted*, for brothers and sisters and their children.

Divisional Court.] MOONEY v. GROUT. [Nov. 13.
Contract—Services by near relations—Implied right to remuneration—Presumption.

The presumption against an implied right to remuneration for services rendered by near relations arises only when the persons rendering the services, and those to whom they are rendered are in effect living together as members of the same household, but even where this is not the case the implied right to remuneration may in the case of near relations be negatived on very slight grounds.

The Court held on the facts in this case that the plaintiff, a married woman who left her own home to nurse her sister, was not entitled to remuneration for her services.

Judgment of MEREDITH, C.J., affirmed.

Clute, K.C., and *J. A. MacInnes*, for appellant. *Marsh*, K.C., and *Thistlethwaite*, for respondent.

Meredith, C.J.C.P.] COUTTS v. WIARTON BEET SUGAR CO. [Nov. 14.
Unorganized territory—R.S.O. c. 109, s. 9, sub-s. 3—Setting down appeal.

Motion by defendants to the Divisional Court by way of appeal from a judgment of the District Court of the District of Manitoulin for an amount exceeding \$200.

Held, that under sub-s. 3 of s. 9, c. 109 R.S.O.: Such an appeal may be set down for hearing in the same manner as if it had been an appeal from a judgment of the High Court.

Middleton, for applicants.

Divisional Court.] DUNN v. MALONE. [Nov. 21.
Interest—Contract—Chattel mortgage—Statement of rate—Interest Act, 1897—60 & 61 Vict., c. 8 (D)—Statutes—Waiver.

A chattel mortgage provided for the payment of \$125, the principal money, in consecutive monthly instalments of \$5 each, and for payment of \$5 more with each instalment for interest. The yearly rate to which this

was equivalent was not stated, but there was a clause in the mortgage waiving in explicit terms the necessity for stating the yearly rate and waiving also the benefit of the Interest Act, 1897.

Held, that this being an Act passed on grounds of public policy for the benefit of borrowers its application could not be waived and that the mortgagee was entitled to interest only at the legal rate.

Judgment of SNIDER, Co. J., affirmed.

McBrayne and Martin Malone, for appellant. *D'Arcy Martin*, for respondent.

Province of Nova Scotia.

SUPREME COURT.

Ritchie, J.] THE QUEEN v. MURRANS. [Oct. 20, 1893.

Liquor License Act of 1886—Conviction for third offence set aside—Form of conviction.

On June 15, 1893, L. M. was convicted of an offence against the Liquor License Act of 1886, committed on June 3, 1893. On July 14 he was convicted of another offence, committed on July 5. On September 22 he was convicted of another offence, committed on June 3, the latter conviction being made as for a third offence and involving an increased penalty, viz., loss of the license and disqualification from holding a license for the period of three years.

Held, quashing the conviction and allowing a writ of certiorari, that the accused could not be adjudged guilty of a third offence against the Act, carrying an increased penalty, unless it was proved that the offence took place on a different day from the days on which the previous offences were committed, and after the information on which the first conviction proceeded was laid.

(This old case has been handed to us with a request for publication.)

Full Court.] REX v. BURNS. [March 10.

Criminal law—Breaking and entering with intent to commit assault—Raising window left partly open not a "breaking"—Misdirection—Crim. Code, s. 410.

Defendant was convicted under s. 410 of the Crim. Code for breaking and entering the dwelling house of D., with intent to commit an assault upon W. The only evidence of the breaking was that, immediately after

the accused left the house, a window in the dining room and one in the back porch were found wide open, sufficient to allow a person to pass through, that when the family retired, on the previous night, the window in the dining room was entirely closed, and the window in the porch open only a few inches, and resting upon a can, and that plants growing below the porch window, which had not been disturbed the previous evening, were broken as if they had been trodden upon. Apart from this evidence, it was left uncertain by which window the accused entered. The trial judge directed the jury that the lifting of the porch window from where it rested, as well as the lifting of the dining room window, was, under the Code, a "breaking" of the dwelling house.

Held, 1. The direction as to the lifting of the porch window was erroneous, and that the conviction must be set aside.

2. The prisoner should not be discharged, but there should be a new trial.

Per MEAGHER, J., dissenting. The conviction should be affirmed.

(This case was considered and decided without argument on either side.)

Full Court]

REX v. HILL.

[March 10.

Criminal law—Shooting with intent to kill—Comment upon failure to call wife of accused—Conviction set aside—New trial ordered.

On the trial of a charge of shooting with intent to kill, counsel for the Crown in closing commented upon the fact that prisoner's wife, who had been a witness on the preliminary examination before the magistrate, was not called. On a Crown case reserved,

Held, that the comment in question was not justified by the fact that it was made in reply to an explanation offered by counsel for the defendant to account for the omission to call the wife, and that the conviction must be set aside. The defendant should not be discharged, but that there should be a new trial.

Morse, for the prisoner. *Longley*, K.C., Attorney-General for the Crown.

Full Court.]

REX v. COHN.

[March 10.

Criminal law—Perjury in connection with affidavit—Duty of court to consider statements as a whole—Charge preferred without consent of judge dismissed—Crim. Code, s. 773—Case improperly stated—Pendency of civil action.

Defendant was convicted in the County Court on several charges of perjury alleged to have been committed in connection with an affidavit sworn to in a cause pending in the Supreme Court. One of the charges was not contained in the information in the magistrate's court, but was

preferred by the Crown prosecutor before the judge of the County Court without the latter having in any way expressed his consent to the preferring of the charge, as required by the Code, s. 773. Another charge was that defendant falsely swore that a sum of money was not received by him, "whereas said sum was received by the defendant firm." There was no allegation that the defendant, knowing that the money had been received, "corruptly swore, etc.," and the statement as sworn to appeared to have been literally true.

Held, 1. Both convictions were bad and must be set aside.

2. The different allegations being contained in the one affidavit, the judge was wrong in considering each charge separately without reference to the other allegations in the affidavit, and that he was bound to weigh the statements as a whole in arriving at a conclusion as to the guilt or innocence of the prisoner.

3. It was not competent for the judge to submit a question as to whether there was legal evidence to sustain the conviction and send up the evidence for review, but that he must state the effect of the evidence to support a certain charge and reserve the question as to its sufficiency in point of law.

Semble. The charge of perjury should not have been brought during the pendency of the civil action in the Supreme Court.

C. S. Harrington, K.C., *Power* and *O'Connor*, for defendant. *Ciuney* and *H. McInnes*, K.C., for the Crown.

Full Court.]

REX v. PHINNEY (No. 1.)

[March 10.

Criminal law—Theft—Defence of insanity—Evidence—Acquittal—Crown case reserved—Motion to quash dismissed—Crim. Code, ss. 305 (a), 706.

Defendant was indicted for theft under s. 305 (a) of the Criminal Code. The act of theft was admitted, but it was contended that there was evidence of insanity at the time the act was committed. The trial judge charged the jury that there was no such evidence and that the case did not come within s. 736 of the Code. The jury, having found the prisoner not guilty, two questions were reserved for the opinion of the court:

- (1) Whether there was evidence of insanity as required by s. 736, and
- (2) If not, whether there should be a new trial.

The court was moved to quash the case reserved on the ground that where there had been an acquittal the Crown could not have a case reserved or on appeal.

Held, MEAGHER, J., dissenting, that the motion must be dismissed and the reserved case proceeded with to ascertain whether there was evidence of insanity sufficient in law for submission to the jury.

J. J. Ritchie, K.C., for prisoner. *Longlev*, K.C., Attorney-General, for the Crown.

Townshend, J.]

REX v. McIVER.

[April 7.

Canada Temperance Act—Imprisonment with hard labour to enforce penalty—Jurisdiction—Amendment—Affidavit of plaintiff's solicitor—Sufficient under R.S.N.S. 1900, c. 181.

A warrant of commitment for a first offence against the provisions of the second part of the Canada Temperance Act authorized the detention of defendant for a specified term "at hard labour" as a means of enforcing the payment of the pecuniary penalty enforced.

Held, 1. The warrant was bad for excess of jurisdiction. Code, s. 872 (a) and (b).

2. No amendment could be allowed under ss. 117 and 118 of the Canada Temperance Act, the penalty imposed being greater than that authorized by the Act.

3. An affidavit of the prisoner's solicitor was sufficient to found the proceedings upon, the language of the statute (R.S.N.S., 1900, c. 181) "of securing the liberty of the subject" being "upon sufficient cause shown by or on behalf of any person, etc."

T. R. Robertson, for the prisoner. *W. R. Tobin*, contra.

Ritchie, J.]

PICKLES v. SINFIELD.

[Nov. 4.

Slander—Findings in favour of plaintiff—Nominal verdict—Costs.

Action for slander, for words spoken imputing unchastity to the plaintiff, and the commission of an indecent act by her in a public place under s. 177 of the Criminal Code, without claim for special damage. Defence: (1) Denial of words spoken. (2) That they did not bear the meaning put on them by the plaintiff. (3) Mere words of abuse spoken in an altercation provoked by the plaintiff. The action was tried before a jury, who gave the plaintiff a verdict of \$1.00 damages. The defendants moved to deprive the plaintiff of costs.

RITCHIE, J.—The defendant denied the speaking of the words, and the only other defence was, that it was mere abuse spoken in the course of a quarrel between the parties. The jury by their verdict have found both these questions in plaintiff's favour, and I see no reason of depriving her of the costs of the action, in which she was successful.

J. Power, for plaintiff. *H. Mellish* and *J. M. Davison*, for defendants.

Full Court.]

WATSON v. LEUKTEN.

[Nov. 15.

Seaman's wages—Jurisdiction in amounts under \$200—Merchants' Shipping Act, 1894 s. 165.

On July 2, 1903, *W. B. A. Ritchie*, K.C., moved in Chambers to strike out a claim for seaman's wages on the ground that it disclosed no reasonable cause of action, and as being frivolous and vexatious. The plaintiff, a seaman and British subject residing at Halifax, brought an action against the defendant, the Master of the British Steamship "Dahome", who at the

time of the bringing of the suit, was then at the Port of Halifax, for \$39.67 for wages due the plaintiff, under articles terminable at Halifax, for services performed as a seaman on such steamship. The defendant was arrested under an order in the nature of a writ of Capias. The point raised by the motion was, whether s. 165 of The Imperial Merchants' Shipping Act, 1894 excluded the plaintiffs' right to bring an action in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia instead of a Court of summary jurisdiction for an amount under \$200.00, when the Master was at Halifax (though not residing there,) at the time of the bringing of the action.

John J. Power, contra.

GRAHAM, E. J. The plaintiff, a seaman, has brought an action for wages against the Master of the "Dahome" claiming a sum less than £50 or \$200. This is an application to strike out the claim for wages on the ground that the Court had not jurisdiction. No doubt for the benefit of the seaman, the statute gives him for any claim under £50 or \$200 the right to sue for the same before any Court of summary jurisdiction at any place in which any person on whom the claim is made "is or resides." Then it provides negatively that he shall not sue in a Superior Court except where neither the owner nor the Master "is or resides" within twenty miles of the place of discharge or of being put on shore.

Here the Master not only was in the place but he was arrested upon an order of arrest in the nature of a capias by the plaintiff. The plaintiff's counsel contends that I am to read the word "or" as if it was "and." This construction would prevent a seaman from getting a speedy recovery of the sum due him under £50 in a Court of summary jurisdiction unless the person against whom the claim was made both was there, and hence could be served with process, and also resided there.

In my opinion, as service may be made under the Act at the place of residence as well as personally, the Master or owner might be reached in many more cases by the Court of summary jurisdiction by constructing the word "or" in its ordinary sense.

The Legislature had an object when it used the expression "is or resides." The point is so clear that I have no hesitation in striking out the claim because there is no reasonable cause of action. The Court has no jurisdiction to entertain it.

The plaintiff appealed from the above judgment and order to the Supreme Court in Banco (RITCHIE, TOWNSEND and MEAGHER, J.J.) and on Nov. 16, the appeal was heard and by oral judgment dismissed with costs and the above judgment affirmed.

Full Court.] MUNRO v. TOWN OF WESTVILLE. [May 4.
*Building contract—Time for completion—Delay in giving possession—
 Extras—"Written order"—Damages.*

A building contract contained a provision that the work should be completed by the contractor by a specified date with a penalty of \$5 a day

as liquidated damages for each day that the work should remain unfinished after that date. It was agreed on the part of defendant that the contractor should be put in possession of the premises and should be furnished with the lines and levels by another fixed date and that for every day thereafter he should be entitled to have two days added to the time for the completion of his contract. It was further agreed that the contractor should have no action for damages or otherwise against the town by reason of said delay.

Held, 1. Affirming the judgment appealed from, that the clause of the contract denying plaintiff's right to an action for damages applied to the giving possession of the premises only, and not to the delay in furnishing lines and levels, and that plaintiff was entitled to recover for extra work resulting from the latter delay.

2. The delay in putting plaintiff in possession of the premises and in furnishing lines and levels, and delay caused by extra work which he was called upon to do, relieved plaintiff from the obligation to complete his work by the date agreed, and that defendant was debarred from enforcing payment of the penalty agreed upon.

One of the clauses of the contract provided that if alterations were required in the work, a fair, a reasonable valuation of work added or omitted should be made by the architect, and that the sum payable to plaintiff should be increased or diminished by such amount, provided that where the amount was not agreed upon the contractor should proceed with the work on the written order of the architect, and that the amount payable therefor should be fixed as further provided.

Held, 1. Alterations under this clause only required a written order where the architect and contractor differed as to the valuation.

2. The furnishing of plans by the architect, showing additional work was a "written order" within the meaning of the contract; and the burden was upon plaintiff of showing that work claimed for as extra was ordered by the architect.

3. In determining the amount to which plaintiff was entitled for extra work the trial judge had the assistance of an assessor, but the court on appeal were not furnished with the assessor's report, or with the reasons for allowing plaintiff different items claimed by him.

Held, MEAGHER, J., dissenting, that the court could not adopt the views of the trial judge and the assessor as to disputed items under these circumstances, but must consider the different items and the evidence bearing upon them.

Harrington, K.C., for appellant. *W. B. A. Ritchie*, K.C., and *Jennison*, for respondent.

Full Court.] BARRY v. ALLAN STEAMSHIP CO. [May 4.
Contract—Uncertainty.

The findings of a trial judge on questions of fact will not be disturbed unless it appears clearly that such findings are erroneous.

In an action on a contract to furnish supplies to be used in floating one of the defendants' steamships, where the evidence was of a contradictory character, the trial judge, as to certain amounts claimed, found in favour of defendant on the ground that if plaintiff wished to make a contract under which he would be fully paid, whether the services were or were not performed, that should have been clearly expressed in his tender and not left in doubt.

Held, that his decision ought not to be disturbed.
Harris, K.C., for plaintiff. *McInnes*, K.C., for defendant.

Full Court.] DOMINION COAL CO. v. DRYSDALE. [May 4.
Mines and minerals—Mandamus to compel commissioner to decide application.

Plaintiff company applied to C., the Commissioner of Mines for the Province of Nova Scotia, for a coal mining lease, covering an area adjacent to an area previously leased to M. A dispute having arisen in relation to the application the commissioner held an investigation and announced as the result of his enquiry that the lease granted to M. was not to be considered as in any way void or uncertain, but was to be and remain the evidence of the contract between the Crown, represented by the Commissioner, and M.

Held, affirming the judgment of RITCHIE, J., that plaintiff's application was not disposed of by this decision, but that plaintiff was entitled to a mandamus, requiring defendant, as Commissioner of Mines, to consider plaintiff's application and give a decision thereon.

Ritchie, K.C., for appellant. *W. B. Ross*, K.C., and *Pearson*, for respondent.

Full Court.] REX EX REL. CORBIN v. PEVERIL. [May 4.
*Certiorari will not lie to remove proceedings of ministerial character—
 Power of court to set aside process improvidently issued—Procedure
 —Questions excluded under.*

A writ of certiorari was directed to the road commissioners of District 17 in the municipality of Halifax to remove the record of the assessment roll of said district, assessing the inhabitants for road taxes, and the return made to the county treasurer of persons who had made default. A writ

was also directed to the Stipendiary Magistrate for the county to remove the record of a return of defaulters who had not paid or commuted their taxes, and the warrant of distress issued by him thereon. There was a motion to quash or set aside the assessment roll, the warrant of distress, etc. It appeared that the allowance of the writs had not been opposed and there was no motion to set aside the orders or to quash the writs or either of them. The amount of the tax was fixed by law, the value of the property by the county assessors, the rate of assessment by the county council, and the Stipendiary Magistrate, in issuing his warrant of distress against defaulters, was not called upon to exercise any judicial function.

Held, 1. The proceedings were of a purely ministerial character and not a proper subject for certiorari.

2. The process having improvidently issued, the court had power of its own motion to set it aside, and that under the circumstances appearing in this case the writs should be superseded and the returns thereto taken off the files of the court.

The affidavits filed shewed an intention to attack the legality of the formation of the district under Acts of 1900, c. 23, and the appointment of the commissioners.

Held, that this could not be done in this form of proceeding.

Kenny, in support of motion. *Ritchie*, K.C., and *J. T. Ross*, contra.

Full Court.] REX ex p. RAMSEY v. MEIKLE. [Aug. 5.

Seaman—Withholding wages and refusing discharge—Seamans' Act of Canada, R.S.C., c. 74, s. 261, sub-s. (d)—Imperial Shipping Act, Part 2—Not applicable to ship registered and being in Canada.

J. M., the master of the "Wobun," a British ship of Canadian register, was convicted before the Stipendiary Magistrate, in and for the County of Cape Breton, for that he, the said J. M., wrongfully and unlawfully refused to pay R., a seaman serving on board said ship, a sum of money claimed to be due him for wages, and further, for refusing to discharge said M., he being then entitled to his discharge.

Held, 1. The refusal to pay M. his wages or to give him his discharge was not a criminal offence, and the proceedings taken were not warranted by the Seamans' Act of Canada, s. 74.

2. The ship being at the time the proceedings were instituted within the jurisdiction of the Government of the British possession in which she was registered the case was within the exception mentioned in sub-s. (d) of s. 261, and Part 2 of the Imperial Shipping Act was not applicable.

Semble, that if the magistrate had power to rescind the contract and had undertaken to do so the judgment would require to be in a different form.

Henry and *G. A. R. Rowlings*, for defendant, in support of motion. *O'Connor*, for the informant and magistrate, contra.

Full Court.]

[Aug. 5.

OVERSEERS OF POOR, DISTRICT 7, PICTOU v. OVERSEERS OF POOR,
DISTRICT 6.

Pauper—Proceedings to determine place of settlement—Order by Stipendiary Magistrate held bad—Remedy by appeal or certiorari.

Proceedings were taken by the plaintiff district before a justice of the peace with a view to having a pauper made chargeable to Poor District No. 5 in the County of Pictou. Subsequently and without notice to District No. 5 discontinuing proceedings against that district. Proceedings were commenced before another justice with a view of having the pauper made chargeable to the defendant district. On the depositions taken before the magistrate applied to in the second instance the Stipendiary Magistrate for the county (who was also County Treasurer) took further depositions and made an adjudication that the pauper was legally chargeable to the defendant district.

Held, that the adjudication so made was bad, both because of the failure to give notice of discontinuance of the original proceedings, and because the Stipendiary Magistrate, as County Treasurer, was a party to the proceedings and should not have acted.

Held, that the order made under the circumstances mentioned was open to attack either by certiorari or by appeal.

W. B. A. Ritchie, K.C., and *J. U. Ross*, for appellants. *H. McEllish* and *E. M. McDonald*, for respondents.

Full Court.]

LAKEVIEW MINING CO. v. MOORE.

[Aug. 5.

Action to recover land—Title under Crown grant—Party in possession by permission—Estoppel—Non-disclosure of fact in petition—Objection based upon—How raised.

In an action to recover land plaintiffs relied upon a grant from the Crown dated March 14, 1897. Defendants limited their defence to a portion of the land claimed and as to that portion depended upon title acquired in 1893 from H. who entered as a servant of plaintiffs, and by their permission erected a house on the land in 1890.

Held, 1. The possession of H. was not sufficient to prevent the Crown from granting to plaintiffs.

2. H. having entered by plaintiffs' permission, both defendants and H. were estopped from denying plaintiffs' title.

3. If the Crown was misled by the omission of plaintiffs to disclose in their petition that the land was in the occupation of H. that objection could not be raised by a third party in collateral proceedings, but must be raised in a proceeding to be taken before the Governor in Council to have the grant vacated.

4. The case was not within the provisions of R.S. (5th series) c. 9, and that the occupancy being that of a person in possession by permission of plaintiff did not require to be disclosed.

T. J. Wallace, for appellant. *D. McNeil*, for respondent.

Ritchie, J.]

WATSON *v.* LEUKTEN.

[Nov. 24.

Bail bond—Motion to deliver up for cancellation refused—Practice—Exoneretur.

Motion on behalf of the defendant for an order that the bond on the defendant's arrest, dated the 16th of May, A. D., 1903, be delivered up to the defendant's solicitor herein to be cancelled, the plaintiff's action having been dismissed.

Held, following *Allison v. Desbrisay*, 4 N.S.R. 21 (Cochran) and *Beam v. Reatty*, 2 O.L.R. 362, that the proper practice was for the Prothonotary to enter an exoneretur on the bail bond, which was a record of the court, and the same was ordered to be done accordingly.

J. A. Chisholm, for motion. *John J. Power*, contra.

Province of Manitoba.

KING'S BENCH.

Perdue, J.] CANADIAN PACIFIC R. W. CO. *v.* LECHTZIER. [Oct. 10.

Landlord and tenant—Overholding tenant—Landlords and tenants Act, R.S.M., 1902, c. 93, s. 15—Colour of right—Summary proceedings.

This was a summary proceeding under the Landlords and Tenants Act, R.S.M., 1902, c. 93, to recover possession of the premises in question which were held under a written lease creating a tenancy from week to week.

The tenant gave evidence tending to shew that agents of the landlord had, prior to and at the time of the execution of the lease, agreed and promised verbally that the tenant would not be required to give up possession until the landlords would build on the land. This was denied by one of the agents and the tenant admitted that said agent had refused to put such a term in the lease although asked to do so.

Held, that such promise, if proved, was of too indefinite a character to support the contention of the tenant that he was not holding over without color of right, and that an order for a writ of possession should issue as the landlord had proved a demand of possession and service of a regular notice to quit under the Act.

To constitute a color of right there must be some bona fide question of right to be tried: *Price v. Guinane*, 16 O. R. 264; *Gilbert v. Doyle*, 24 U. C. C. P. 71. Whether there is colour of right or not, and what constitutes colour of right are matters of law to be determined by the judge: *Wright v. Mathison*, 519 U. S. S. C. R. 50. If effect were given to the contention set up by the tenant he might in case the company sold the land or did not build on it be entitled to hold it in perpetuity.

Robson, for landlords. *Andrews*, for tenant.

Bain, J.]

IN RE STALKER.

[Nov. 2.]

Infant—Custody of—Right of mother of illegitimate child to his custody.

Application on return to a writ of habeas corpus by the mother for the custody of an illegitimate child, a boy twelve years of age. The mother who was only seventeen years old when the child was born was unable to support him and arranged with one Setter to take the child and a formal document was drawn up and executed by which the mother released and abandoned the child and all her right and title as his mother to the custody, control and possession of the child to Setter forever, and Setter on his part agreed to maintain, care for and educate the child. The mother married in 1893 and there are now five children of the marriage. She never interfered with the control of the child by Setter and his wife, or manifested any interest in him until a few weeks before the application when she made a demand upon Setter for his custody. He had in the meantime been maintained and brought up by Setter and his wife as their own. They had no other children and were in fairly comfortable circumstances. The reasons given by the mother for now wanting to take back the child were that he was made to do work too hard for his age and that Setter had not educated him; but the judge found that although the boy had never attended any school it was because there was no school near enough, and that Mrs. Setter had herself taught him and his education had not been neglected, also that there was no foundation for the charge of his being overworked. The judge also found that the Setters had brought up the child with the same care and affection that they would have bestowed on a child of their own, and expressed himself as satisfied that if he had a discretion to exercise in the matter it would be in the best interests of the child to leave him with the Setters.

Held, following *Reg. v. Nash*, 10 Q. B. D. 454, and *Barnardo v. McHugh*, (1891) A. C. 388, that although the mother of an illegitimate child has prima facie a right to his custody notwithstanding any agreement she may have made to the contrary, yet the court has a discretion to refuse to accede to her wishes if it is shewn that it would be detrimental to the interests of the child to return him to her control, and that under the circumstances in this case such discretion should be exercised by leaving the child with the Setters.

The husband of the applicant had expressed his willingness that his wife should have the child and said that he would bring him up as one of his own family, but there would be a great risk that were the child to be taken into the husband's family he would soon find himself in an uncomfortable and unhappy position and might be a cause of dissension and trouble there.

A. J. Andrews, for applicant. *Hancy*, for Setter.

Province of British Columbia.

SUPREME COURT.

Full Court.]

ROSS *v.* THOMPSON.

[Nov. 4

Water rights — Decision of Gold Commissioner — Appeal from — Evidence on.

Appeal from decision of FORIN, Co. J., refusing to hear new evidence on an appeal before him under s. 36 of the Water Clauses Consolidation Act. Sec. 36 of the said Act provided that the appeal should be in the form of a petition setting forth the facts and law relied on, which petition, along with an affidavit verifying it, should be filed and served and to which the respondents should file and serve their answer.

Held, that the fact that there was to be a petition and an answer contemplated the raising of issues and that the appeal should be a trial de novo. Appeal allowed with costs.

Taylor, K.C., for appellant. *Wilson*, K.C., for respondent.

UNITED STATES DECISIONS.

COMPANY—PUBLIC PURPOSES.—A corporation authorized to develop and use the water power of a river, and generate electric or other power light or heat, and utilize, transmit, and distribute it for its own use or the use of other individuals or corporations, is held in *Fallsburg Power & Mfg. Co. v. Alexander* (Va.) 61 L.R.A. 129, to be for a private, and not a public purpose, and therefore not entitled to exercise the right of eminent domain.

STREET RAILWAY.—A chartered street railroad is held, in Savannah, *T. & I. of H. R. Co. v. Williams* (Ga.) 61 L.R.A. 249, to be a "railroad company," within the meaning of a statute making railroad companies liable to one servant for injuries inflicted by the negligence of a fellow servant.

ANALYTICAL INDEX.

Of the Contents of this Volume.

Accident—

Definition of, 750

See Damages—Master and servant—Negligence—Railway.

Accord and satisfaction—

Payment—Mistake—Principal and agent, 158

Payment of lesser sum in discharge of debt, 652

Action—

Cause of—Alternative Claims—Trover—New trial, 254

See Damages—Foreign Sovereign—Parties.

Ademption—

See Will.

Administration—

Intestacy—Death of sole legatee and executrix before testator—Advancement—Hotchpot, 65

Of estate moneys in Court, 77

Marshalling assets—Pecuniary legatees and specific devises, 185

With will annexed—Limited grant, 353

Sureties dispensed with, 353

Will of domiciled foreigner—Grant to foreign administrator, 616

Special circumstances—Grant to other than next of kin, 747

Corroboratory evidence—See Corroboration.

See Annuity.

Administration of justice—

Petition to prevent pardon of a criminal, 722

Admiralty law—

See Maritime law.

Advertising—

Using photog. of person without consent, 721

Agricultural fairs—

Horse racing at—Unfair competition, 631

Alaska Boundary Commission—

Newspaper comments in United States, 4, 339

British Commissioners and counsel, 169

Statement of the question in dispute and consideration thereof, 170

Appointment of Mr. Aylesworth as commissioner, 457

Liness of Hon. E. Blake, 497

Protest of Canadian Commissioners, 684

Reasons of Lord Alverstone as to Portland channel, 687

Alien—

See Treason.

Alien enemy—

See Insurance.

Algoma Central R. W. Co.—

P. wers of, 166

Alteration—

See Bills and notes—Club law.

Amendment—

See Criminal law—Division Court—Pleading—Practice.

Annuity—

In possession and in remainder, 744

Power to mortgage corpus to raise—Apportionment—Hotchpot, 744

Appeal—

To Privy Council—

Question of testamentary capacity and undue influence, 106

None as to costs, 522

Petition for leave in forma pauperis, 523

To Supreme Court—

What is a "final judgment," 32

Jurisdiction—From Yukon, 69, 257

Extension of time—Intention, 72

New points not taken in court below, 109

Findings of fact—Right to appeal, 109

Special leave—Error in judgment—Concurrent jurisdiction, 110

Jurisdiction—Removal of executor, 288

To Court of Appeal—

Late entry—Mutual delays, 73

From Yukon—Extension of time—Jurisdiction—Amendment, 69, 257

From Unorganized territory—Setting down appeal, 788

Producing fresh evidence, 84

Costs—Forma pauperis.

See Practice—Stay of proceedings.

Appointment—

See Power of appointment.

Apportionment—

See Annuity—Tenant for life.

Appropriation of payments—

Voluntary payment, 82

Option of creditor, 708

Set-off—Statute barring debt, 708

Arbitration—

Extension of time for award, 35

Appointment of third arbitrator, 35

Of sole arbitrator on failure of party to appoint, 447

Making award a judgment, 121

Arbitrator delegating duty to third person, 121

Disputed accounts—Interest on award, 197

Directing special case—Question of law arising on reference, 206

Agreement to refer to foreign Court—Staying action, 346

Order for leave to enforce award—Time—Setting aside award, 363

Withdrawal from—Ex parte hearing by arbitrator—Misconduct, 523

Misconduct of arbitrator—Waiver, 639

Armour, Mr. Justice—

Death of, 458

Arrest—

See Attachment—False imprisonment.

Army Act, English—

Is it applicable to civilians in Canada, 703

Assessment—

- Valuation of improvements— Court of Revision— Appeal, 168
- C.P.R. Co. lands, 334
- Rolling stock plant and appliances — Electrical companies—Ejusdem generis, 598
- See Tax sale.

Assessor—

- Judicial advice to, 90

Assignment—

- See Chose in action—Money in Court.

Assignments and Preferences—

- Bill of sale—Validity—Execution—" Action or proceeding," 118
- Effect of Exemption Act—Registered judgment, 123
- Assignment within 60 days—Presumption—Evidence, 412
- Deed of arrangement—Fraud—Delaying creditors, 440
- See Division Courts.

Attachment—

- Release of prisoner by mistake—Re-arrest, 238
- See Contempt of Court.

Attachment of debts—

- Rent garnished, 74
- Married man's wages—Evidence of marriage, 111
- Interest of residuary legatee, 404
- Assignment of money payable in respect of contract, 786

Attorney-General—

- See Municipal law—Nuisance.

Auctioneer—

- Advertising property for sale—Slander of title—Liability of principal, 348
- Contract—Wrong date, 400

Author—

- See Copyright.

Bail—

- Motion to estreat—Forms in Code, 414

Ball bond—

- Delivering up for cancellation—Exoneretur, 798

Banker—

- Transfer by customer to another account, 105
- Right of, to hold securities against creditor—Compromise—Possession, 117
- Certified cheque fraudulently altered, 326
- Cheque—Conversion—Crossed cheque—Effect of, 707
- Credit given customer for, before payment, 707
- See Bill of Exchange—Cheque—Interest.

Bench, The—

- Independence of, and objections to extra-judicial work discussed, 19, 217, 339, 419, 497, 539
- See Bench and Bar.

Bench and Bar—

- County judges appointed in Ontario, 1, 257, 461, 601
- Commission to revise Dominion statutes, 1
- Elective Bench—Defects and advantages, 2, 49
- Election trials and the Bench, 29
- The selection of judges, 29, 30

Bench and Bar—Continued.

- Criticising judges—County judge refusing to hear counsel, 51, 154
- County judges appointed in Nova Scotia and Manitoba, 66
- Duty of Governments as to judicial appointments, 89
- Professional costume in Division Courts, 91
- Mr. Hodgins appointed Judge in Admiralty, 92
- Judicial salaries, 94, 194
- The Bribery commission, 195, 217, 419
- The independence of the Bench—Extra judicial work, 195, 217, 339, 419, 497, 539
- Deficiency of judicial power at Osgoode Hall, 50, 217, 419, 537
 - Divisional Court sitting with only two judges, 217
- Slips by lawyers in House of Commons, 241
- Appointments at Osgoode Hall, 258
- Judicial matters at Calcutta, 297
- Retirement of Judge Robertson, 337
- Appointment of Judge Teetzel, 337
- Lawyers advertising for business, 377
- Quasi judicial positions given to non-professional men, 457
- Court declining to hear suits in person, 465
- Illness of Hon. E. Blake, 497
- Appointment of Chief Justice Killam to Supreme Court, 497
- Appointment of Dubuc, J., as Chief Justice of Manitoba, 537
- Appointment of Mr. Justice Perdue, 537
- Sir Frederick Pollock, 537
- Death of C. S. Harrington, K.C.,
- Proposition to change constitution of Courts in British Columbia, 601.
- Status of the Bench, 602
- Two great judges—Cairns and Jessel, 729
- Vacant clerkship in the County Court, York, 761

Benefit society—

See Insurance, life.

Benevolent society—

See Insurance, life.

Bicycle—

- Used for business in a "waggon or vehicle," 128
- Not a "carriage" liable for toll, 358, 464
- Not a "sledge or drag," or such like carriage, 464

Bigamy—

Dissolution of former marriage—Foreign Court—Domicile, 479

Bill of Exchange—

See Bills and Notes.

Bill of lading—

See Maritime law—Railway.

Bill of sale—

Absolute in form, intended as security, 345

See Assignments and preferences.

Bills and notes—

- Intention of Bills of Exchange Act, 533
- Note signed under duress—Verdict, 68
- Notice of dishonour, 326
- Accommodation maker—Renewal note obtained by fraud, 330
 - Right to sue on original note, 330
- Joint and several—Provision, as to giving time, 396
- Material alteration—Negligence, 597

Bills and notes—Continued.

- Alteration—Materiality, 630
- Innocent holder, 680
- Dominion and Provincial legislation—Joint contract, 755
- Bill of Exchange—Definition of—Its nature and properties, 726
- Distinguished from cheque, 726
- See Cheque—Liquor License Act.

Book reviews—

- Wills on Circumstantial evidence—
Law Quarterly Review, 48—760
- The yearly Supreme Court practice, 48
- Armour on the Devolution of estates, 87
- Conditional sales and bailment, by W. W. Morrill, 373
- Sociologic studies, by L. J. Rosenberg, 373
- Armour on Titles, 336
- Street service railways, by A. J. Nellis, 336
- Stevens' Mercantile law, 535
- Beven on Employers' Liability, 535
- Dacey on the Constitution, 536
- Manual of Medical Jurisprudence, by H. C. Chapman, 640
- Legal Medicine and Toxicology, by Peterson and Haines, 640
- Fish and Game laws of Ontario, by A. H. O'Brien, 678
- The law of Meetings, by G. A. Blackwell, 760

Bribery Commission—

See Bench and Bar.

B. N. A. Act—

- Ferry—Jura regalia, 165
- Dominion and Provincial rights—Ultra vires, 165
- Public harbor—River improvements, 165
- Proprietary rights in minerals—Indian lands surrendered, 325
- Aggregate population of Canada—Representation of Canada, 474
- Naturalization—Aliens—Extent of Provincial jurisdiction, 523

Building contract—

See Contract.

Building scheme—

Restrictive covenants, 60, 663, 710, 749

Building Society—

Mortgager becoming shareholder—Liability, 362

Camera—

Hearing cause in, 617

Canada Temperance Act—

Third offence—Committal prior to conviction for second offence, 415

Commitment—Hard labour to enforce penalty—Jurisdiction, 792

Canadian Pacific R. W. Co.—

Lands of—Exemption from taxation, 334

Taxation by Dominion, 334

Grant from Crown—Meaning of, 334

Cairns, Lord Chancellor—

Character sketch of, 729

Carrier—

- Damage to goods—Inherent defect in goods, 466
- Exemption of liability for losses which can be covered by insurance, 441
- Negligence of servant of, 441

Certiorari—

- To remove proceedings of ministerial character, 795
- Setting aside proceedings improvidently issued, 795
- See Pauper.

Cheque—

- Definition of—Difference between cheque and bill of exchange, 726
- Stopping payment of, discussed, 726, 746
- Given in part payment—Payment stopped—Rights of parties, 746
- See Banker.

Charging order—

- Enforcing by sale—Action to enforce—Jurisdiction, 397

Charity—

- Bequest not defining objects—Disposition by warrant under sign manual, 236
- Gift for benefit of institution for general benefit not strictly charitable, 286
- Devise of proceeds of realty and personalty for use of church, 368
 - Of income of land to, 434
- Sale of land devised to, 434
- Failure of objects of charitable trusts—Right of Crown to impeach grant, 611
- Designation of beneficiaries—Perpetuity, 784
- Meaning of "assurance," 784

Charter party—

- See Maritime law.

Child—

- See Criminal law—Parent and child

Chose in action—

- Double assignment—Notice—Priority, 282
- Not included in "all testator's property," 361
- Assignment—Notice, 482, 664
 - Right of assignee to sue for damages, 439
 - Money payable in respect of contract—Attachment, 786

Christian Scientist—

- Criminally liable for not providing medical treatment for child, 598

Civil code—

- Discovery of the oldest, 169

Clark, W. M., K.C.—

- Appointment as Lieut.-Governor of Ontario, 338

Class action—

- See Debenture holder.

Clay—

- Not a mineral, 437

Club law—

- Increasing subscription without consent of members, 233
- Alteration of rules—Dissentient minority, 518
- Liability of trustees and of members, 522

Codification—

- Advantages of, 51

Collections Act, Nova Scotia—

Disqualification of Commissioner—Prohibition, 486

Commission—

See Master and servant—Principal and agent.

Common carrier—

See Carrier.

Company—

Prospectus—Omission—Nondisclosure—Director—Waiver clause, 26, 66, 468

Promoter—Non-disclosure—Secret profit—Damages, 184

Fraudulent—Shareholder's rights—Damages, 443

Directors—Qualification—Holding shares in his own right, 26

Allotment of shares for purpose of, 60

Election of—Agreement amongst promoters, 108

Transfer of company's money to his own account, 105

Liability of—Fraudulent prospectus, 443

Appointment of manager without by-law or seal—Services rendered, 73

Statutory powers—Power to charge surplus land to secure existing debt, 284

Increase of capital—Restrictions—Payments to directors, 364

Dividend—Reserve fund—Investments, 364

Gas company—Reduction in price of gas—Audit—Depreciation, 364

Contract not under seal—Executed consideration—Acceptance of benefit, 463

Works for general advantage of Canada, 480, 800

Unincorporated association, 329, 418, 452, 753

Necessity to enquire as to regularity of proceedings, 677

Sale of business to—Sham contract, 472, 703

Shares—Forged transfer of—Innocent holder—Implied covenant to indemnify, 186

Forfeiture of—Rescinding forfeiture, 512

Floating charge, 704-711

Right of debtor of company to set off against, 711

Public purposes—Eminent domain, 480, 800

Winding up—Contributory—Set-off, 235

Leave to bring action—Secured creditors—Proving claims, 295

Final order—Appealable order—Dissolving company—Order rescinding, 362

Compromise by liquidator—Resolution sanctioning, 306

Insolvency as to liabilities to creditors, not to shareholders, 493

Action by liquidator for debts due company, 611

Liability of liquidator for costs, 677

Allotment of fully paid shares as a gift, 472, 703

Costs—Appeal—Practice, 714

Staying proceedings in another Province—Setting aside sale, 717

See Debenture holder—Labour union.

Compromise—

See Company, winding up.

Computation of time—

See Time, computation of.

Conflict of laws—

British subject dying abroad—Domicil, 470.

Power of appointment—Will of domiciled foreigner, 517

Scotch settlement—Husband and wife—Domicile—Englishman, 518

Agreement to stifle foreign prosecution—Validity, 614

Conspiracy—

Combination in restraint of trade—Agreement to boycott plaintiff, 674

See Criminal law—Labour union.

Constitutional law—

Works for general advantage of Canada—Public purposes, 480, 800
 Work connecting provinces—Jurisdiction of Dominion of Parliament, 668.
 Ontario Liquor Act—Intra vires—Delegation of legislative authority, 751.
See B. N. A. Act—Bills and notes—Ferry.

Contempt of court—

Attachment—Service of order, 236
 Rights of parties in, 367
 Newspaper—Article reflecting on revising officer, 532
 Tending to prejudice fair trial, 714
 Jurisdiction of High Court, 714
See Stay of proceedings.

Contingent remainder—

See Remoteness—Will.

Contract—

Common law theory of, discussed, 379
 Origin of, in Roman law, discussed, 498
 Building—Arbitration, 121
 Plant and material to be property of owner, 511
 Time for completion—Delay, 793
 Extras—Written order—Damages, 793
 Assignability of—Increase of burden upon contractor, 155
 Public work—Abandonment and substitution of work, 159
 Implied, 159, 752.
 Sale by sample—Evidence, 360
 To pay, implied from acceptance of benefit, 463
 Not under seal—Undisclosed principal, 476
 For fixed time—Implied agreement to continue, 700
 Performance—Implied condition, 700
 Prevented by accident, 746
 Services by near relations—Presumption, 788
 Uncertainty, 795
See Auctioneer—Company—Injunction—Labour union—Sale of goods—
 Statute of frauds.

Contributory negligence—

See Negligence.

Conviction—

See Criminal law.

Conveyancers—

Some illiterate ones, 538.

Copyright—

Imperial statute 39 & 40 Vict. not in force, 154.
 Foreign reprint—Notice to commissioners—Wrong date of expiration
 37, 112.
 Newspaper—First publication, 78
 Author and publisher—Encyclopædia articles—354

Corroboration—

Administration action—Evidence of books and cheques, 787
See Criminal law—Donatio mortis causa—Executor and administrator—
 Evidence—Limitation of actions.

Costs—

Detinue—Return of subject of action pendente lite—Tort, 192
 Scale—Payment into court of \$1, accepted by plaintiff, 208
 Amount claimed reduced by trial judge, 248
 Third party—Discretion—Appeal 329

Costs—Continued.

- Two defendants represented by same solicitors—Judgment for one and against others, 348
- To abide event—Success divided—Discretion, 352
- Of witnesses summoned but not called, 435
- Further evidence on appeal—View by counsel, 435
- Lien of solicitor—Lis pendens on lands subject of action, 448
- Discretion of trial judge not reviewed, 633
- Security for—
 - Præcipe order—Increase—Discretion, 74
 - By Crown—Limited company, 198
 - Præcipe order—Waiver, 249
 - Plaintiff out of jurisdiction, 449, 483, 718
 - Additional, 74, 754
 - See County Court, Ontario—Crown—Solicitor—Solicitor and client.

Counsel—

- Power to compromise action—Client's right to disavow, 103
- Judge refusing to hear, 51, 154
- Stating individual opinion to jury, 233
- See Suitor in person.

County Court, British Columbia—

- Jurisdiction—Waiver of objections to—False imprisonment, 415

County Court, Manitoba—

- Defendant outside county—Jurisdiction—Judgment by default, 296

County Court, New Brunswick—

- See Practice, New Brunswick.

County Court, Ontario—

- Order for costs without right of set off, 408
- Equitable jurisdiction of, 408

Courts, Ontario—

- Constitution of a fourth Division, 422

Covenant—

- Double—Severable—Waiver of part, 452
- Restrictive—See Building scheme.
- See Landlord and tenant—Contract.

Criminal Law—

- Recognizance to keep the peace—Imposing and collecting costs, 42
- Commitment of boy over 17 to reformatory and two years to central prison—Sentence, 76
- Juvenile offender—Theft—Defective commitment—Amendment, 119
- Conviction insufficiently describing offence—Conspiracy to injure property, 188
- Omission from—When an irregularity or fatal, 166
- Jurisdiction—De facto proceeding—Perjury, 288
- Crown case reserved—Application—Grounds—Misapprehension of jurors—Statements by, 364
- Information—Warrant differing from, 368
- Read to prisoner, but not resworn, 368
- Trial without objection—Fine—Commitment—Conviction—Distress, 368
- Plea of not guilty—Summary trial—Jurisdiction—Habeas corpus, 412
- Amendment of proceedings, 448
- Variance in names, 448
- Advertising medicine intended to prevent conception—Evidence, 478
- Functions of judge and jury, 478
- After acquittal application should be for leave to appeal, 478
- Common assault—Summary trial—Penalty, 488
- Magistrate's clerk acting for magistrate, 488

Criminal Law—Continued.

- Not providing medical treatment for child, 598
- Personation at election—Procuring, 621, 622
- Indecent assault—Evidence as to similar acts not charged, 639
- Corroborative evidence, 639
- Trial—Right to re-examine, 669
- Private prosecutor—Right to conduct proceedings, 672
- Preparatory acts for commission of a crime, 679
- Peace officer acting without warrant, 680
- Petition to executive not to interfere with death sentence, 722
- Breaking and entering with intent to assault—Evidence, 789
- Comment of counsel that prisoner's wife not called, 790
- Defence of insanity, 791
- Acquittal—Crown case reserved, 791
- See Attachment—Bail—Bigamy—Disorderly house—Forgery—Gaming—Husband and wife—Liquor Act—Murder—Perjury—Recognizance—Summary conviction.

Criminals—

- Reclamation of, in France, 378

Crown—

- Solicitor for—Direction to appear for subject in matter where Crown interested—Costs, 349
- See Charity—Costs—Criminal law—Crown grant.

Crown grant—

- For services—Estate tail—Reversion in Crown, 516
- See Canadian Pacific R.W. Co.

Customs Duties—

- Interest on, improperly levied, 68

Damages—

- Death by accident—Apportionment between widow and children, 331
- Setting aside verdicts giving excessive, 721
- Measure of—Sale of article having no market value, 58
 - Company—Secret profit by promoter, 184
 - Defective machine, 409
 - See Sale of goods.
- See Carrier Company—Employers' Liability Act—Injunction—Landlord and tenant—Maritime law—Master and servant—Mental suffering—Negligence—Nuisance—Railway timber.

Debenture-holder—

- Action by—Stay of proceedings—Class action, 285

Debtor and Creditor—

- See Accord and satisfaction—Assignments and preferences.

Deed—

- Uncertainty—Statute of uses, 62
- Estate of freehold to commence in futuro—Perpetuity, 62
- Obtained by fraud and forgery—Subsequent purchaser—Notice, 783

Defamation—

- See Libel and slander.

Delivery—

- See Donatio mortis causa—Maritime law—Sale of goods—Telegraph company.

Deposit receipt—

- See Donatio mortis causa.

Devolution of estates—

Sale by administrator—Non-concurring adult heirs—Approval of official guardian, 672
See Mortgage.

Director—

See Company.

Discovery—

Officer of company—Engine driver, 34
Agent of unincorporated association, 528
Infant, 38
Examination of party — Attendance — Absenting himself — Attendance again, 209
Postponement of till prior questions disposed of, 331
Disclosure of name of witness, 214
Question not relating to issues to be tried, 214
Inspection—Production, 294
Action for penalty—Præcipe order, 481
Identification—Description in affidavit, 483
Non materiality, 483
Documents abroad, 483
Examination for, is in nature of cross examination, 535
Some contrasts between law of, in England and Ontario discussed, 762.
Privileges from, discussed, 774

Disorderly house—

Inmate of—Excessive penalty— Material omission, 39
Statement of charge—Duty of magistrate before proceeding to try summarily, 41

Dissenting judgments—

Delivery of, 423

Distress—

See Landlord and tenant.

District Court, Ontario—

Jurisdiction—Recovery of land, 784
Multiplicity of actions—Injunction, 784

Division Courts—

Jurisdiction—Assignments and preferences, 38
Amendment of plaintiff's claim, 330
Dividing cause of action, 527
Professional costume in, 91
See Solicitor.

Domestic purposes—

Water supply for swimming bath for school is not for, 157

Domicile—

See Bigamy.

Dominion Land Act—

See Mines and minerals.

Dominion official—

Salary—Receiver, 85

Dominion statutes—

See Revised statutes, Canada.

Donatio mortis causa—

- Solicitor and client—Independent advice, 200
- Deposit receipt—Cheques and orders, 244
- Delivery for beneficiaries—Corroboration, 244
- Money and notes in cash box—Delivery of keys, 625
- Savings bank deposit—Delivery, 754
- See Succession duty.

Dower—

- Equitable estate—Voluntary conveyance by husband, 162, 620
- Bar of by infant wife—Purchaser for value, 626

Drainage—

- Qualification of petitioner—Costs, 67
- Referee, not an official referee, 78

Duress—

- See Bills and notes.

Easement—

- Of necessity—Right of support—Severance, 64
- Implied grant—Derogation from—Light, 471
- Prescription—Payment of annual sum—Inference therefrom, 706
- See Light—Railway—Right of way—Will.

Editorials—

- Bench and Bar. See same.
- Elective judges—Results of system, 249
- Ice and accidents, 3
- The Alaska Boundary—International courtesies, 4
- Employers' Liability Act—Liability for injuries by negligence of the person whom the injured servant is bound to obey, 6
- Delay of business owing to want of judges, 50, 217, 419
- Privilege of counsel to criticise judges, 52
- Title to moneys derived from a void policy, 54
- Measure of damages—Sale of article having no market value, 58
- Choosing best men for judicial preferment, 89
- Duties of assessors, and county judge's supervision, 90
- Professional costume in Division Courts, 91
- The Surrogate Court, County of York, 92
- Judicial salaries, 94
- Implied covenant for quiet enjoyment, 91
- Increased punishment for crime of perjury, 98
- Employers' Liability Act—Special cases of service—Notice—Death of employer or servant, 129
- The Alaska Boundary Commission—British commissioners, 169, 457
- The oldest civil code, 169
- The Alaska Boundary Commission—Its constitution—Comments on the Treaty and questions for adjudication, 170
- The Divisional Courts, Ontario, 217
- The Judicial Committee—Its past, present and future, 218
- Judicial discretion as to summary judgment—The English practice, 259
- Employers' Liability Act—Persons entitled to sue—Damages—Trial practice, 298
- Appointment of judges to extra judicial work, 339, 420, 497, 539, 602
- Revised Statutes of Canada—Notes of decided cases, 340
- Mr. Justice Mills—Notice of death of, 340
- Authority of Parliament, 342
- Boards of commissioners in municipal government, 377
- Reclaiming young criminals, 378
- The common law theory of contract, 379
- International amenities, 417

Editorials—Continued.

- Police powers of continental and English governments contrasted, 418
- Trades unions—Development of law as to, 418
- Ontario High Court Bench—Criticisms and suggestions, 419
- Independence of the bench, 420, 539
- Dissenting judgments—Objections to delivery of, 423
- The Privy Council and New Zealand, 425
- Equitable estoppel, 428
- Mr. Justice Armour—Death of—Sketch of his career, 458
- Sunday observance—The Ontario Lord's Day Act—Recent decision, 459, 648
- The development of mobocracy in the United States, 461, 544
- Mr. Justice Killam—Sketch of his career, 497
- Origin of contract in Roman law, 499
- Damages for mental suffering, 503
- Summary judgment after appearance to specially endorsed writ, 545
- Returning officers and election petitions, 602
- Is the English Army Act applicable to civilians in Canada, 604
- International law—The Balkan crisis, 610
- Judicial pensions, 643
- The humorous side of legislation, 642
- Ontario legislation of 1903, 643
- Case law and text books, 658
- Professional fees, 681
- Representative law societies, 681
- Criminal statistics in United States, 682
- Legal education in South Africa, 683
- The Alaska Boundary—Protest of Canadian jurists—Altered judgment of Lord Alverstone, 684
- The maxim of mens rea discussed, 691
- Functions of judge and jury, 721
- Amendments to rules, High Court, Ontario, 721
- Petition to prevent a pardon, 722
- Rights of pedestrians, 723
- The Land Titles Act, 724
- Stopping payment of a cheque, 726
- Two great Judges—Cairns and Jessel, 729
- Contracts in derogation of Interest Act, 761
- Discovery and production—Some contrasts between law in England and Ontario, 762
- Killing no murder—Agreement to commit murder, 780

Ejusdem generis

See Assessment—Fixtures—Landlord and tenant.

Election—

See Insurance, life

Elections—

- Returning officers and election petitions—Present vicious system, 602
- Dominion—
 - Bribery—Treating—Transportation—Agency, 44
- Provincial—
 - Voters' lists—Notice of appeal—Leaving at clerk's office, 81
 - Presenting petition—Copy for R.O.—Default—Extending time, 716
 - Appeal—Settlement of case, 81
 - Particulars—Extending time for delivery—Preliminary examination, 112
 - Person voting knowing he had no right—Penalty, 164, 210
 - Without qualification—Neglect to take oath, 164, 210
 - Action for penalty will not lie until after conviction, 164, 210
 - Agency—Delegate to convention—Treating, 402
 - Disagreement of trial judges—Right of appeal, 524
- Municipal—
 - Time for holding nomination, 167

Elections—Continued.

- County councillor—Disqualification—Membership in school board, 406, 409, 410
 Status of relator—Voting for respondent, 407
 Resignation before taking office—New election, 409, 410
See Criminal law—Voters' list.

Electricity—

- Agreement for supply of power, 329
 Injuries from, on highways, discussed, 734

Eminent Domain—

- See* Company.

Employers' Liability Act—

- Liability owing to negligence of person to whose orders servant bound to conform, 6
 Liability of an employer for injuries caused by acts or omissions done or made in obedience to rules, 20
 Liability for negligence of certain specified railway employees, 130
 Death of employer or injured employee, how right of action is affected by, 150
 Notice of injury—Excuse—Evidence, 256
 Persons entitled to sue under the act, 298
 Damages recoverable, 313
 Trial—Practice, 315
 Dangerous place—Duty to warn workman, 638
 Party bound by course of trial, 676
See Workmen's Compensation Act.

Equitable execution—

- Right to attack judgment, 411
 Property to be reached—Book debts—Shares in foreign company—Insurance policy, 628

Estate—

- See* Deed.

Estate pur autre vie—

- Devise without words of limitation, 395
 Involution of, 395

Estoppel—

- Equitable, as applied to statements of intention, 428
 Representation—Solicitor and client—Title, 443
See Executor and administrator—Landlord and tenant—Possession—Settlement.

Euchre—

- Is a game of chance, 625

Evidence—

- Of marriage, by repute, 111
 To contradict—Relevancy, 167
 Corroboration—Breach of promise, 334
See also Donatio mortis causa—Executor and administrator—Limitation of actions.
 Presumption, 412
 Husband and wife—Criminal law, 473
 Workman's death without witness—Jury—New trial, 667
 Perpetuating testimony—Order for examination for—Discretion, 715
See Criminal law—Discovery—Liquor License Act—Sale of goods—Witness—Weights and measures—Maritime law.

Ewart, J.S.—

- Remarks on the independence of the Bench, 540

Examination—

See Discovery—Practice.

Execution—

Seizure of goods not property of debtor—Sale—Title, 612
See Equitable execution—Landlord and tenant.

Executor and administrator—

Liability for goods used in carrying on business for benefit of estate—Estoppel.
—Limitation, 122

Matters occurring before death of deceased—Corroboration, 201

Sale of leasehold by—Notice as to debts of testator, 235

Misappropriation by co-executor—Negligence—Limitation of action, 670

Powers of, to sell or exchange, 355, 786

De son tort—Payment by—Limitation of action, 755

Corroboration—Evidence, 201.

See Corroboration.

See Administration—Will.

Exemption Act, Manitoba—

Fraudulent conveyance—Registered judgment, 123

Things seized of a value of over \$600, 677

Expropriation—

Lands seriously affected—Restrictive covenant—Building, 60

Prospective value—Assessed, 196

Leasehold—Improvements—Expense of removal, 196

Construction of statute as to, 707

See Railway.

False Imprisonment—

Arresting without warrant—Notice of action, 414

Factories Act—

Injury to workman—Proximate cause, 160

Farm crossing—

See Railway.

Farm lease—

Covenant as to straw and manure, 670

Ferry—

Right to create and license, 165

Fiduciary relation—

See Gift—Limitation of action.

Fisheries—

Deep-sea fish in provincial foreshore waters, 253

Fixtures—

Machinery affixed to freehold, 191

— Hire and purchase agreement, 192

Mortgage—License to remove fixtures, 191

Trade—Ejusdem generis, 469

Mortgage of building and fixtures—Hiring agreement, 615

Chairs screwed to floor, 615

Mortgages in possession—Right of removal, 615

Flint, T. B.—

Appointment as Clerk of House of Commons.

Floating charge—

See Company.

Foreclosure—

See Mortgage.

Foreigner—

Importing, on labour contract—"Knowingly"—Conviction, 166

See Administration—Conflict of laws—Writ of summons.

Foreign court—

See Arbitration—Bigamy.

Foreign sovereign—

Title to sue—Parties—Contact with foreign state, 104

Foreign judgments—

Action on—Declaratory judgment—Consequential relief, 482

Foreign law—

"Distraction of costs" in Quebec—Attorney's right to recover in his own name, 208

Forgery—

Transfer of stock—Innocent holder—Implied contract to indemnify, 186

Forfeiture—

Dispose or attempt to dispose—Assignment of life estate, 512

Not liquidated damages—Relief, 453

See Company.

Forma pauperis—

Leave to appeal, 106

Franchise—

See Gas Company.

Fraud—

See Assignments and preference—Deed.

Fraudulent Conveyance—

See Assignments and preferences—Exemption Act, Manitoba.

Gaming—

Place used for betting—Bar of public house, 187, 359

Shop with automatic gaming machine, 466

Common gaming house—Evidence as to—Definition, 479

Gain—Refreshments—Profits, 479

Whist played for prizes, 713

Euchre is a game of chance, 625

Garnishee—

See Attachment of debts.

Gas company—

Sale of works to municipality—Arbitration—Franchise—Ten per cent. addition, 290

See Company.

Gift—

Confidential relations—Parent and child—Public policy, 70

By parent to child after date of will—Double portions, 193

See Charity—Solicitor and client.

Grand jury—

Constitution of—Proper number not summoned, 759

Grant—

See Easement.

Grant from Crown—

Meaning of, 334

Guarantee—

See Statute of Frauds—Warranty.

Habeas corpus—

See Liquor Act.

Harbour—

See B.N.A. Act.

Hatton, Judge—

Appointment of, 257

Highway—

Right of pedestrians to use of, 723
Injuries from electricity on, discussed, 734
See Street railway—Telephone company.

Hire and purchase—

See Bill of sale.

Hodgins, Thomas—

Appointment as Judge of Admiralty, 91

Homestead Act—

Exemption Act, Manitoba, 677

Homicide—

Justifiable—Assault in public street, 680

Hotchpot—

See Administration—Annuity.

Husband and wife—

Property purchased by husband in name of wife, 88
Wife's authority to pledge husband's credit—Joint liability—Alternative claim—Election, 189
Liability of husband for debt of wife contracted before marriage, 633
Insurance by husband for benefit of wife and children—Death of wife and re-marriage of husband, 284
Gift from husband—Change of possession—Execution creditor, 291
Purchase of land with wife's money—Conveyance to husband—Resulting trust for wife, 660
Evidence—Criminal law—Competency, 473
Divorce—Presumption as to paternity of child, 617
See Conflict of laws—Dower.

Ice—

Accidents on streets—Notice, 3

Illegitimate child—

See Infant—Will, construction.

Independence of the Bench—

See Bench and Bar.

Indian lands—

Assignment of timber—Interest in land—Registration—Actual notice, 629
See B.N.A. Act.

Infant—

Mortgage by—Voidable contract—Repudiation, 84
Contract for purchase of land by—Mortgage to secure advance, 325
Lien for money advanced to, for purchase, 325
Custody of—Right as to illegitimate child, 799.
See Christian Scientist—Discovery—Fiduciary relation—Partition—Trustee.

Insurance—

Warranty against capture—Property of alien enemy, 25, 103
 Free insurance system—Blank policies payable to bearer—Wagering contract, 209

Accident—

Intervening cause—Construction of policy, 436

Fire—

Negligence of agent—Over valuation, 43, 632
 Representations—Materiality—Value of property, 211
 Burden and interpretation of conditions in policy, 211
 Void policy, renewal also void, 242
 Mortgage clause, effect of, 242
 Condition—Arbitration before action, 367
 Agent—Liability—Gratuitous undertaking, 597
 Cancellation—Notice of, received after loss, 667

Life—

Void policy—Title to money derived from, 54
 Premium payable by instalments—Days of grace—Death of assured before expiration of, 187
 Misstatement in application—Age—Bona fides, 202
 Fraud of agent—Payment by bank—Right of insurer to recover money paid, 327
 Benevolent society—"Legal heir designated by will"—Election, 332
 Altering beneficiary—Privileged beneficiary—Statutory restrictions, 482
 Policy for wife or if dead for children—Second marriage, 513
 Wagering policy—Insurable interest, 613
 Recovery of premium paid on void policy—Pari delicto, 613
See Husband and wife—Mistake.

Marine—

Ship valued too low—General average—Salvage, 104
 Breach of warranty by owner—Seaworthiness—Negligence of Master, 357
 Constructive total loss—Value of wreck, 464

Mutual—

Principles of, discussed, 250

Interest—

Mortgage running over five years—Payment—Tender—Interest ceasing, 407
 On arrears of rent, 446
 Rate recoverable by bank when rate exceeding 7 per cent. stipulated for, 637
 On moneys improperly used and ordered to be refunded, 668
 Persons cannot contract themselves out of usury acts—Waiver, 761-788
See Arbitration—Landlord and tenant—Vendor and purchaser.

Injunction—

Peculiar use of this remedy, 182
 Damage to building by blasting operations close by, 489
 Disclosing material facts 489
 Offer to accept bond to secure damages, 489
 Breach of contract to sell goods to plaintiff only, 529
 Secret process—Workman violating contract as to, 526
 To restrain use of photographs for advertising purposes, 679
 When damages and when injunction, 704
See Municipal law—Service.

Interlocutory order—

See Practice.

International law—

Immunities to the head of a state, 417
 Intervention in affairs of one state by another, 610

Jessel, Sir George—

Character sketch of, 729

Joinder—

See Parties.

Joint tenant—

Or tenant in common, 663

Judge in Chambers—

Powers of, 36

Judgment—

Registration of Manitoba—Exemption, 123

By default—Statement of defence, 333

See Equitable execution—Summary Judgment.

Judicial Commissions—

See Bench and Bar.

Judicial Committee—

Its past, present and future discussed, 218

And New Zealand, 425

Judiciary, The

See Bench and Bar.

Jurisdiction—

See Appeal—Canada Temperance Act—Contempt of Court—County Courts
—Criminal law—Division Court—Liquor License Act.

Jury—

Respective functions of judge and, 478, 721

Answers to questions put to, 476

See Pleading.

Jury notice—

Striking out—Power of Judge in Chambers, 36

Justice of the Peace—

Taking fee not entitled to—Recovery back by action—Penalty, 624.

Labour Union—

Conspiracy to induce others to break contracts, 157, 192, 332

Mistaken belief in existence of right, 156

Voluntary association not liable to be sued—Parties, 329, 418, 452

Application of funds contrary to rules, 350

Right of individual member to restrain, 350

Service on unincorporated association, 367

Landlord and tenant—

Valuation of buildings at end of term—Extension of time for award—
Interest, 35

Assignment of reversion—Subsequent purchase of adjoining property, 100, 469

Lessee to pay "outgoings"—Reconstruction of drains, 466

Trade fixtures—General words—Ejusdem generis, 463

Merger—Mortgage by underlease—Purchase of fee by lessee, 470

Grain grown on farm leased to execution debtor, 491

Surrender of term by operation of law, 492

Damage to tenant of one part of building by defect in another part, 530

Agreement for tenancy—Present demise—Specific performance, 436

Rent payable in kind—Implied covenants, 637

Failure to raise crops on leased farm, 637

Reconstructing drain for sanitary purposes, 706

Distress—Sale of goods of lodger—Damages—Procedure, 115

Purchase by landlord, 616

Landlord and tenant—Continued.

Failure to repair—Consequent damage—Liability, 719
 Overholding—Removing proceedings to High Court, 787
 Writ of possession, 787
 Colour of right—Summary proceedings, 798

Lease—

Covenant for quiet enjoyment—Implied, 96, 346
 Breach of—Short form, 448
 Not to make alterations—Erection of clock—Trade sign, 283
 To pay taxes and repair—City lease to railway, 446
 Not to assign without leave—Unreasonable condition, 661
 Breach of—Termination of lease, 351
 Not to sublet—Forfeiture—Election—Subsequent payment of rent—
 Estoppel, 701
 Expiry of—Continuance in possession—Tenant at will, 628
 Renewal of, at cost of lessee—Arbitration, 351
 Death of lessee—Renewal to next of kin—Fiduciary relation, 659
 Power to terminate—Notice, 351
 Proviso for re-entry—Affirmative and negative covenants, 666
 For years by life tenant—Covenant as to straw and manure, 670
See Expropriation.

Land Titles' Act—

Some features of discussed, 724
 Transfer induced by fraud—Forged conveyance—Subsequent purchase—
 Notice, 783
 Right to claim on assurance fund refused, 783

Law Associations—**Meetings—**

County of York, 126
 City of Hamilton, 127
 County of Hastings, 127
 Delegates from County associations, 678
 National societies, 681
 American Law Society, 681
 English Law Society, 681

Law School—

In South Africa, 683

Lease—

See Landlord and Tenant.

Leasehold—

See Expropriation—Landlord and Tenant—Vendor and purchaser.

Legislation—

Of Province of Ontario for 1903, 643

Libel and slander—

On postal card—Innuendo—Natural significance, 77, 717
 Pleading—Setting out whole article, 203
 Producing and reading at trial—Immaterial issue—Embarrassing, 203
 Privilege—Proof of malice—Evidence—Misdirection, 288
 Publication by giving to typewriter, 370
 Special case—Damages—327
 Fair comment—Literary work—Criticism, 614
 Nominal verdict for plaintiff—Costs, 792

Lien—

Equitable charge on land—Interest on charge—Limitation of actions, 468
See Infant—Solicitor—Thresher's lien Act.

Light—

- Enjoyment by consent or agreement, 398
- Windows overlooking—Skylight, 398
- Easement—Implied grant, 471
- Injunction or damages, 704

Limitation of actions—

- Mortgage—Acknowledgment—Payment of interest—Person bound to pay, 25
- Claim against estate of deceased—Corroboration, 246
 - Special agreement—Running account—Credit—Fraud, 246
- Simple contract debt converted into specialty debt, 411
- Acknowledgment of debt, 438
- Mortgage of reversionary interest in proceeds of sale of land, 463
- Defence of, not available to persons in fiduciary capacity, 485
- Credit on execution not a payment by debtor, 486
- Order for writ of execution—New right of action, 486
- See Appropriation of payments—Executor and administrator—Lien—Possession.

Liquor License Act—

- Witness—Fees—Conviction for non-attendance, 119
- Note given for legal and illegal items—Recovery as to part, 125
- Referendum—Was it void, 239, 366
- Question to electors—Trial of offenders—Tribunal—Trial and sentence—Adjournment for sentence, 366
- Local option by-law—Application to quash, 491
 - Change: in boundaries after by-law—By-law partly bad, 635
- Removal of conviction by certiorari—Subsequent issue of commitment, 449
- Police magistrate—Voting—Personation, 621, 622
- Power of commissioner—Prohibiting game of chance, 625
- Conviction though no knowledge of offence by licensee, 625
 - Recovery of fine by distress or imprisonment—Costs, 625
 - Defects in—Habeas Corpus, 751
- Voting on—Corrupt practices—Constitutional law, 751
 - Appointing judge to conduct trial—Jurisdiction, 751
- Third offence—Form of conviction, 789
- See Canada Temperance Act.

Litigation—

- Statistics as to, in Ontario, 681

Local improvement—

- See Municipal law.

Lodger—

- See Landlord and tenant.

Logs—

- See Timber—Watercourse

Long vacation—

- Conduct of business during—New rules, 721

Lord's Day Act—

- Validity of considered, 459
- Result of recent decision discussed, 648
- Keeper of eating house supplying candies on Sunday, 672
- Barber exercising his trade, 719

Lount, Mr. Justice—

- Death of, 297

Lunatic—

- Care of estate of—Duty of commission as to, 77
 - Costs of, 77
- Costs of proving in partition suit, 599

Lynch law—

Developments of, 461, 462, 544

McDougall, Judge—

Death of, 49

McGuire, Chief Justice—

Resignation of, 49

Malice—

See Libel and slander.

Malicious prosecution—

Evidence—County Court, B.C., 415

Malpractice—

Liability—Result as good as usual, 719

Mandamus—

Application by counsel—Suitor in person, 24

Maritime law—

Bill of lading—Carriage of goods for enemy—Delay, 61

Delivery—Damages, 61

Fault in management of vessel, 192

Unseaworthiness, 712

Collision—Ship at anchor—Evidence, 107

Undue speed—Fog, 107

Evidence—On high seas, 445

Navigation—"White law"—Narrow channels, 161

Wages—Arrest on telegram—Rescue—Contempt, 290

Jurisdiction in claims under \$200—Residence, 792

Withholding, and refusing discharge, 796

Foreign vessel—Necessaries, 371

Charter party—Warranty—Supply of coal, 352

Authority of master—Liability of owner, 371

Negligence of servants, 747

Ship—Mortgage of—Possession—Freight earned but unpaid, 440

Custom of port—Loading, 782

Departure without cargo to save insurance, 782

Application of Imperial Shipping Act, 796

See Insurance, Marine.

Marriage—

See Attachment of debts—Bigamy.

Marriage settlement—

Construction—Ultimate trust of wife's property—Die "without having been married," 659

Married woman—

See Husband and wife.

Marshalling assets—

See Administration—Settlement.

Master and servant—

Workmen's Compensation Act—Judicial commission, 5

Negligence—Servant using machine for unintended purpose, 88

Common employment—Mine owner and contractor, 534

Former servant's negligence, 676

Employees' Liability Act—See same.

Contract of hiring—Termination and variation of—Assault, 673

Permanent and temporary illness—Continuing contract, 673

Dismissal—Damages—Agreement for future commissions, 716

Mechanics' lien—

Affidavit verifying claim—Particulars of plaintiff's residence, 366
 Costs—"Actual disbursements," 369
 Mining law—Jurisdiction, 676

Medical treatment—

Neglect to provide for child, 598

Mens rea—

Maxim of, discussed, 691

Mental suffering—

Damages for, discussed, 503, 679

Merger—

See Landlord and tenant.

Midland Railway Co.—

Review of statutes affecting, 450

Mills, Mr. Justice—

Death of, 340

Miners' relief society—

Right of participation in fund, 371

Mines and minerals—

Royalties—Dominion Land Act, 70
 Renewing license—Voluntary payment, 70
 Free miner—Lapsed interest—Co-owners, 107
 Placer mining—Staking claim—Prior lease, 108
 Adverse claim—Form of plan and affidavit—Condition precedent—Necessity for actual survey, 159
 Blank in jurat, 159
 Overlapping claim—Re-staking claim—Renewal, 473
 Extralateral rights, 492
 Clay not a mineral, 437
 Mandamus to compel commissioner to decide application, 795
 See B. N. A. Act—Mechanics' lien.

Misappropriation—

See Executor and administrator.

Mistake—

In paying money—Compulsion, 68
 Recovery of—Mortgage account—Estoppel, 71
 Certified cheque fraudulently altered—Negligence—Notice, 326
 Sale of life policy—Death of assured before sale—Rescission, 401, 702
 See Accord and satisfaction—Attachment—Contract—Vendor and purchaser.

Money in Court—

Equitable assignment of—Stop order—Priority, 618

Mortgage—

Mortgagee dying in possession—Title by possession—Devolution of mortgaged land—Realty or personalty, 186
 Costs—Demanding excessive—Tender by mortgagor, 107
 Mortgage clause in insurance policy, effect of, 242
 Of policies—Notice—Priority, 282
 Of reversionary interest in realty and personalty, 398
 Redemption—Clog on—Option to purchase, 27, 103, 617
 Stipulation that mortgagee shall have a position, 707
 Discharge of—Second Mortgage, 620
 Assignment of—Covenant to pay by assignor—Discharge of part of lands—Principal and surety—Release of assignor, 627
 Second mortgagee's action for receiver, 704

Mortgage—Continued.

- Foreclosure—Land titles—Consolidation, 215
- Right to sue on covenant, 215
- Judgment nisi for sale or foreclosure, 516
- Order of—No sale for want of bidder—Report, 718
- Power of sale—Service of notice—Redemption, 122
 - Exercise of, pendente lite, 516
 - With or without notice—Short form act, 634
- See Building society—Infant—Interest—Lien—Limitation of actions.

Mortmain—

See Clarity.

Motor cars—

Control over, 417

Mowat, Sir Oliver

Death of, 257

Multiplicity of actions—

See District Courts, Ontario.

Municipal law—

- Borrowing powers—Ordinary expenditure—School purposes, 76
- Local improvement—Re-construction of sidewalk—Payment for, out of general funds, 205
 - Liability of councillors sanctioning payment—Relieving statute, 205
- Plebiscite as to aid to sanitariums—Not within powers of corporation, 163
- Negligence—Non repair of bridge—Absence of railing—Notice, 370
- Railway crossing—Liability to repair, 402
- Building by-law, breach of—Action in name of Attorney-General, 467
- Demand of poll, what amounts to—Withdrawal, 439
- Procedure by-law—Subsequent by-law in disregard of it—Merits, 453
- Contract for sewers—Interference by reason of other sewers, 627
- Consent of municipality to building line on street, 745
- Debenture—Defective by-law, 755
- Resolution rescinding contract—Injunction—Intervention of Attorney-General, 756, 792
- See Elections—Gas company—Ice—Park—Public Libraries—Transient trader.

Murder—

- Self-confessed murderer—Acquittal of accomplice—Withdrawing plea of guilty, 113
- Compact to kill no defence—Gonzales case, 780

Naturalization—

See Treason.

Negligence—

- Driving timber—Vis major—Statutory duty, 67
- Horses on highway—Injury to boy, 208
- Injury to workman—Proximate cause—Factories Act, 160
- Contributory—Remote damages, Voluntary risk, 295
- Leaving carload of explosives near dwelling, 416
- Invitation, 665, 679
- Use of high explosives, 679
- Intervening act of trespasser—Effective cause of damage, 709
- Fright—Action for damages caused by, 719
- See Carrier—Damages—Executor and administrator—Insurance, fire—Maritime law—Master and servant—Mistake Municipal law—Railway—Sale of goods—Street railway.

Nesbitt, Mr. Justice—

Appointment of, 338

Newspaper—

See Contempt of Court - Copyright.

New Zealand—

Courts of, and the Privy Council, 425

New trial—

See Practice.

Notice—

See Building scheme—Chose in action—Employee's liability Act—Ice—Vendor and purchaser.

Notice of action—

See False imprisonment.

Notice of trial—

See Pleading.

Nuisance—

Trespass—Continuing damage, 159
Individual suing for interference with public right—Attorney-General—Parties, 236

Official guardian—

See Devolution of estates.

Ontario Legislation—

Summary of, for 1903, 643

Option—

See Appropriation of payments.

Overholding tenant—

See Landlord and tenant.

Parent and child—

Services by child— Remuneration—Presumption, 788
See Gift - Husband and wife - Infant - Medical treatment.

Parks—

Establishment of—By-law—Dedication—Subsequent sale of, 5-3

Parliament—

Authority of, discussed, 342

Particulars—

Of matters in opposite party's knowledge, 416
See Elections.

Parties—

Adding plaintiff, 24
Third party - Costs—Appeal, 329
Unincorporated association—Who may be sued—Status of defendants, 329,
418, 452, 753
Joinder of defendants—Alternative claim, 332
Of parties by amendment, 364
Representation, 626
See Nuisance—Partition—Patent of invention.

Partition—

Parties—Lease—Infant—Repudiation, 362
Defence of Statute of Limitations, 485

Partnership—

- Salaries of Dominion officials—Receiver—Dissolution, 85
- Principal and agent—Tortious act of partner for benefit of firm—Liability, 190
- Clerk disclosing business secrets of employer, 190
- Power of partner to nominate successor—Refusal of other partner to accept—Rights of nominee, 156.
- Assignment of share—Agreement to pay salaries to partners, 286
- Dissolution—Power of partner to complete contracts previously made, 293
- Execution against person as member of firm—Action to determine liability, 464
- Death of partner—Goods ordered before, but not delivered till after, 665

Patent—

See Grant from Crown.

Patent for invention—

- Expiry of—Foreign patent, 106
- Infringement—Parties, 120
- Manufacture—Extension of time, 162
- Action—Several patents—Separate causes—Confining claim, 399

Payment—

See Accord and satisfaction—Appropriation of payments—Easement.

Pauper—

- Proceedings to determine place of settlement—Appeal or certiorari, 797
- Leave to appeal in forma pauperis, 106

Pedestrian—

Right to use highway, 723

Penalty, action for—

See Elections.

Pensions—

Judicial, settled by act of last session, 641

Perjury—

- Increased punishment for crime, 98
- In connection with affidavit—Various statements to be considered as a whole, 790
- See Criminal law.

Perpetuity—

See Charity—Deed—Wills, construction.

Persona designata—

Officer of court—Appeal, 711

Personal estate—

Limitation of—Possibility upon a possibility, 101

Personation—

Procuring, of voter at election, 621, 622

Photograph—

See Injunction.

Pig iron—

Bounties on, 33

Pilotage Acts—

Exempted ship, 118

Plebiscite—

Question by municipal corporation, 163

Pleading—

- Amended statement of claim—Delivery—Time—Terms, 78
- Compliance with terms of order, no bar to moving against, 78
- Leave to deliver reply—Time—Jury notice—Notice of trial, 79
- Amending—Exceeding terms of order—Waiver, 86
- Striking out—Embarrassment, 534, 758
- Up to, when can apply for, 534
- See Libel and slander—Practice—Statute of Frauds.

Possession—

- Acts constituting taking—Specific performance, 248
- Evidence of—Limitation of action, 475
- As against Crown—Permission—Estoppel, 797
- See Banker—Landlord and tenant—Mortgage—Trespass.

Possession money—

- See Sheriff.

Power of appointment—

- Limitation of personality, 101
- General testamentary—Liability of appointed fund to debts, 102
 - Exercise of, by way of security for loan, 183
 - Appointed fund made assets generally, 183
- Duration of—Absolute vesting.
- Upon trust for sale and to divide proceeds, 356
- See Conflict of laws.

Power of Attorney—

- See Principal and agent.

Power of sale—

- See Mortgage.

Police magistrate—

- See Liquor License Act.

Pollock, Sir Frederick—

- Visit to Canada, 538
- Lecture at Osgoode Hall, 641

Postal card—

- See Libel and slander.

Practice—

- Stay of reference pending appeal, 39
 - Ruling of Master in Chancery, 39
- Cross appeal—Leave—Parties, 71
- Misunderstanding as to agreement between counsel—Reference back, 72
- Amending judge's notes on appeal, 86
- Action by English company—Counterclaim for breach of contract, 203
- Defence arising after action—Costs—Judge's discretion, 292
- Interlocutory order—Appeal, 333, 398, 481
- Equitable defence—Set-off of unliquidated damages due by cestui que trust, 396
- Confining claim to one of several causes of action, 399
- New trial—Examination on pending motion—Evidence, 669
- Appeals from officer of court—Persona designata, 711
- Enlarging time fixed by order, 715
- Venue—"Cause of action," 719
- Test action—Substitution, 758
- New Brunswick—
 - Injunction—Replevin—Cutting timber, 293
 - Dissolution before hearing, 632
 - Practice in County Courts—Administrator, 294

Practice—Continued.

Re-opening decree.

See Appeal - Charging order - Costs - Counsel - County Court - Judge in Chambers - Judgment - Jury - Parties - Pleading - Service - Stay of proceedings - Summary judgment - Verdict - Writ of summons.

Prescription—

See Easement—Limitation of actions.

Principal and agent—

Secret bargain as to commission, 84

Power of attorney—Implied warranty by agent of his authority, 521

Forged power—Innocent misrepresentation, 521

Contract by agent in name of principal for his own benefit, 713

See Insurance—Master and servant—Partnership.

Principal and surety—

See Mortgage.

Privilege—

See Discovery—Libel and slander.

Probate—

See Will.

Prospectus—

See Company.

Public Health Act—

Expenses of medical attendance, 81

Public libraries—

Aid by municipality—Grant for site—Assent of electors, 111

Public schools

Selection of sites—Arbitration when differences, 477

Alteration of section—Powers of arbitrators, 718

Public works—

Injurious affection—Closing streets—Compensation, 445

Quiet enjoyment—

Implied covenant for, 96

See Landlord and tenant.

Railway—

County charge—Injunction, 40

Tramway for transportation of materials—Expropriation, 69

Negligence—Omission to ring bell at highway crossing, 125

Alighting from train while in motion, 200

Assaults on passengers—Duty of conductor, 202

Engine driver killed—Disobedience—Contributory—Signals, 245

Crossing track—Contributory, 247

Passenger a licensee, 372

Setting aside verdict as no evidence, 372

Defective fencing—Cattle on highway, 405

Excursion ticket, 680

See Employers' Liability Act.

Accommodation works—Grant of easement, 157

Extent of user, 157

Highway crossing Level—Rights as to—Compensation to municipality—

"At or near," 475

Carriage of goods—Special instructions—Acceptance—Warehouseman—

Negligence, 243

Railway—Continued.

- Speed of trains—Fences—Statutory requirements, 247
- Passenger or trespasser, 296, 680
- Passenger leaving car—Injury—Rights, 296
- Farm crossing—Approaches—Repair, 526
 - Obligation to provide, 450
- Expropriation—Minerals, clay not a, 437
- Bill of lading—Condition requiring insurance—Loss—Negligence, 450
- Fare—Divided journey—Through fare—Quantum meruit, 612
- Transportation beyond company's line, 680
- Agreement to purchase land—Taking possession, 752
 - Non-payment of purchase money—Remedy—Damages, 752
- See Assessment—Expropriation—Municipal law—Street railway.

Receiver—

- Jurisdiction to appoint, 628
- See Dominion official—Equitable execution—Partnership.

Recognizance—

- Procedure to escheat, 757

Redemption—

- See Mortgage.

Referendum—

- See Liquor License Act.

Registry Act—

- Certificate of allowance of petition under Partition Act, 525
- Lien of execution creditor—Notice—Priorities, 525

Religious institution—

- "Acquisition" of land after life estate, 112

Remainderman—

- See Tenant for life—Waste—Will, construction.

Remoteness—

- Rule against perpetuities—Contingent remainder—Child in ventre sa mere, 517

Rent—

- See Attachment of debts.

Repudiation—

- See Infant.

Restraint of trade—

- See Conspiracy—Labour union.

Returning officers—

- Present vicious system criticised, 602

Revenue—

- See Succession duty

Reversionary interest—

- Double assignment—Priority—Notice, 284.

Revised statutes, Canada—

- Commission appointed, 1
- Suggestion to have cases noted, 31

Right of way—

- Agreement a —Evidence—User, 484
- See Easement

- Riparian proprietor—**
See B. N. A. Act—Watercourse.
- River improvements—**
See B. N. A. Act.
- River and Streams Act—**
Right to appeal—Party interested, 86
- Robertson, Mr. Justice—**
Retirement of, 337
- Rolling stock—**
See Assessment.
- Roman law—**
As to contracts, 379, 498
- Royalty—**
See Ferry.
- Rules of court—**
Ontario— June 20, 493
- Sale of goods—**
Having no market value—Measure of damage, 58
Condition as to acceptance—Time limit for delivery, 108.
Contract—Burden of proof, 116
Dangerous article—Negligence—Knowledge of vendor—Warranty, 282, 615
Warranty—Correspondence—Condition—Damages, 525
Article fit for consumption—Implied warranty—Breach, 439
Fitness of goods for particular purpose, 282, 615
Delivery—Place—785
- Salvage—**
See Insurance, marine.
- Salvation army—**
See Parties.
- Sawlogs—**
See Timber—Watercourse.
- School—**
See Public schools.
- Seal—**
See Company—Contract.
- Seaman—**
See Maritime law.
- Sequestration—**
Secured creditor, 613
- Servant—**
See Master and servant.
- Service—**
Out of jurisdiction—Charging order, 397
Parties—Injunction, 754
See Writ of summons.
- Set off—**
See Appropriation of payments—County Court, Ontario—Practice.

Shares—

See Company.

Shelley's case—

See Will, construction.

Sheriff—

Bond—Predecessor in office—Annuity out of revenues, 333
Wrongful seizure of property not liable to execution—Liability, 600
Fees—Poundage—Possession money, 753

Ship—

See Maritime law.

Settlement—

Voluntary—Assignment of expectancy, 511
Validity of—Mortgage of settled property—Marshalling—Estoppel, 748

Settled estate—

Power to lease, 514

Sifton, Chief Justice—

Appointment of, 49

Sign manual—

See Charity.

Slander—

See Libel and slander.

Slander of title—

See Auctioneer.

Solicitor—

Costs—Disbursements, 65
Payment by salary—Taxation 200
Parliamentary agent—Taxation, 383
Lien for costs—None in Division Court proceedings, 81
Alleged misconduct—Acquittal by Law Society—Right of complainant, 664
Disqualified person allowed to use name of, 700
See Costs.

Solicitor and client—

Absence of independent advice, 200
Gift or sale by client to solicitor—Undue influence—Independent advice, 234
Solicitor's agent—Compromise—Authority of agent, 514
Taxation—Third party—Costs payable by trustees, 749
Of trustees' costs by beneficiaries—Prospective costs, 749
See Costs.

Specific performance—

See Landlord and tenant.

Possession—

Vendor and purchaser.

Stamp Act—

Of England, not applicable to British Columbia, 533

Statement of claim—

See Pleading.

Statistics—

Litigation, 681
Criminal, 682

Statute law—

Comical side of, 642
Ontario Legislation for 1903, 642
See Construction of statutes—Revised Statutes of Canada.

Statute of Frauds—

Contract to be performed within year, 349, 359
Employment for year—Service to begin day next after date of contract, 349
Promise to answer for debt of another—Form of action, 487

Statute of Limitations—

See Limitation of actions.

Statute of uses—

See Deed.

Statutes, Construction of—

Interpretation—Use of commercial term, 33
Consumers' Gas Company. See Company.
Reference to Hansard debates, 473
Objects of a company—Recital in preamble, 480
Effect of subsequent Act, 747
Remedial enactment, 755
See Expropriation.

Statutory duty—

Neglect of—Damages—Liability to individual, 320, 745

Statutory powers—

See Company—Negligence.

Stay of proceedings—

Pending appeal, 39
Class action, 285
Party appealing in contempt, 367
Agreement to refer to arbitration—Step in proceedings, 664

Street—

See Highway—Right of way—Street railway—Telephone company.

Street railway—

Operation of—Use of streets—Powers, 360
Negligence—Car running backwards, 476
Obligation to keep surface of in good condition, 520
Neglect of statutory duty—Damages, 520
When a "railway company," 800
See Railway.

Succession duty—

Debt liable to duty—Intent to evade duty, 105
Income only payable for life or years, 163
When duty payable on corpus, 163
Dutiable property—Transfer before death, 164
Contract for valuable consideration—Survivorship, 164
Donatio mortis causa, 164
Exemption—Sale under will—Proceeds, 475
See Will.

Suitor in person—

Courts declining to hear, 465

Summary judgment—

- Judicial discretion as to discussed—The English practice, 259
- English contrasted with Ontario practice as to condition precedent to application, 545
- Leave to sign—Debt or liquidated demand, 671
- Motion for—Leave to defend on giving security—Appeal as to security, 711

Summary trial—

- See Criminal law—Disorderly house.

Summary convictions—

- Amount of costs must be stated in conviction—Amendment, 631
- See Criminal law.

Summons—

- See Writ of summons.

Sunday observance—

- See Lord's Day Act.

Surrogate Court—

- Appointment of judge for county of York, Ont., 92

Survivorship—

- See Succession duty.

Taxation—

- See Assessment.

Taxation of costs—

- See Costs.

Taxes—

- See Assessment—Tax sale.

Tax sale—

- Onus—Proof of taxes in arrear, 405
- Omission of clerk to furnish return, 405
- Action not commenced within three years—Pleading, 405

Teetzel, Mr. Justice—

- Appointment of, 337

Tenant at will—

- See Landlord and tenant—

Tenant in tail—

- In remainder. See Trustee.

Tenant for life—

- Remainderman—Loss—Appointment, 519

Tenant in common—

- Or joint tenant, 653

Tender—

- Of bank notes—Not objected to, 293
- To agent, 407
- See Interest.

Telegraph company—

- Delivery of message to hotel clerk for guest, 416
- See Mental suffering.

Telephone company—

- Work connecting Provinces, 668
- Right to construct lines in streets, 668

Theft—*See* Criminal law.**Test action—**

Substitution, 758

Threshers' Lien Act—

Bona fide purchaser—Excessive seizure—Notice of claim, 83

Timber—Cutting and removing—Damages, 34
Conveying down stream. *See* Watercourse.**Time—***See* Practice—Time, computation of.**Time, computation of—**Thirty days after arrival, 711
See Arbitration—Pleading.**Toronto Gas Company—***See* Company.**Trade mark—**Infringement—Representation of King and royal arms, 198
User before registration—Declaration signed by agent, 198
Evidence—User, 527**Trade union—***See* Labour union.**Tramway—***See* Street railway.**Transfer of shares—***See* Company.**Transient trader—**

Conviction for breach of by-law—Uncertainty of, 622

Treason—

Alien—Swearing allegiance in time of war—Naturalization, 358

Trespass—Erection of fence to protect land—Possession, 117
Compensation—Diverting water—Costs, 250
See Timber.**Trover—***See* Action.**Trustees—**Sale by—Repurchase from vendee before conveyance, 65
Power in will to retain investments—Exchange of shares in old company for new, 101
When municipal councillors entitled to relieving statute, 205
Trust for person entitled to possession or receipt of profits of settled estate—Remainderman, 237
Construction—Trust for next of kin as if she had never been married—Children excluded, 356
Altering trust property—Infants—Sanction of court, 515
Breach of trust—Unauthorised investment—Death of co-trustee—Loss—Contribution, 519
Following trust money, 705
Unauthorised change of investment—Sanction of court, 434, 454, 520
Purchase of land in breach of trust—Cestui que trust not sui juris, 705

Trustees—Continued.

- Refusal to act—Voluntary settlement, 748
- Disclaimer by grantee—Revesting in settlor, 748
- See Practice—Settlement—Solicitor and client.

Ultra vires—

- See B.N.A. Act—Constitutional law.

Uncertainty—

- See Deed—Transient trader.

Underground stream—

- See Watercourse.

Unincorporated Association—

- Rights of liabilities—Parties, 329, 418, 452, 753

Union—

- See Labour Union.

Unorganized Territory—

- Setting down appeal, 788

Valuation—

- See Landlord and tenant.

Vendor and purchaser—

- Leasehold—Legal estate outstanding, 28
- Requisitions on title—Conditions of sale—Time—Waiver, 28
- Costs of vendor's solicitor, 64
- Executory contract—Specific performance—Damages, 65
- Contract by agent of purchaser—Action by agent—Delay of purchaser—Resale by purchaser, 204
- Right of sub-purchaser to join vendor as party, 204
- Sale of leasehold by executor—Notice of debts, 235
- Leasehold house—Breach of covenant to repair, 354
- Equitable mortgage—Notice—Fraud—Forged receipt, 400
- Purchase of wrong lot—Specific performance, 400
- Common mistake—401, 702
- Offer to sell—Purchaser pendente lite—Specific performance, 528
- Wilful default by vendor—Interest, 441
- Form of conveyance, 441
- Occupation of vendor—Occupation rent, 441
- Oral contract for sale—Part performance—Statute of frauds, 621
- Possession—Delivery of deed in escrow, 621
- Sale of leasehold, subject to onerous covenant—Duty of vendor to disclose—Notice, 746
- See Auctioneer—Executor and administrator—Trustee.

Verdict—

- Setting aside, no evidence to support, 372

Vis major—

- See Watercourse.

Voters' list—

- Manitoba Election Act—Revising officer keeping office open after hour, 531
- See Elections.

Walver—

- See Arbitration Company—County Court, British Columbia—Covenant—Interest—Pleading.

Warranty—

- Defects in machine—Making good—Price, 409
- See Sale of goods.

Waste—

Charge of annuity—Life tenant and remainderman—Appointment—Damages, 249

Watercourse—

Floatable river—Riparian rights, 67, 113, 486
 Underground stream—Channel defined but not apparent, 101
 Flooding—Damages—Procedure, 486
 Dam—Tolls, 113, 486
 Conveying logs—Riparian proprietor—Vis major, 486
 Log driving—Obstruction—Recovering before motion—Costs, 599
 See Timber—Trespass.

Water rights—

British Columbia—Gold commissioner—Appeal from, 800

Way—

See Right of way.

Weights and Measures Acts—

Burden of proof of illegality, 82

Whist—

Played for prizes—Gaming, 713

Will—

Discretion of executors to withhold and accumulate income, 213
 Reasonable and desirable time—Failure of object—Scheme, 213
 Legatee predeceasing testatrix—Rights of husband and children of legatee, 164
 Ademption of legacy, 287, 704
 Residuary devise—Lapsed devise, 287
 Date of vesting, 293
 Executor—Power to sell real estate—Charge of debts, 355
 Power to grant easement, 355
 Codicils—Incorporation, 617
 Appointment of new trustees—Survivorship, 628
 Specific legacy—Succession duty, 671
 Probate—Lost will—Evidence, 783
 Power of executor to sell or exchange, 786
 Administration—Conflict of laws.
 See Gift.

Will, construction—

Annuity—Fund for—Resorting to corpus, 36
 Inconsistent bequests—Bequest of residue, 38
 Illegitimate children, 63, 285
 Nomination—Gift to next of kin, 63
 Use of house and allowance, or alternative benefit—Exercise of judgment, 75
 Speaking from death—"Now"—Stock in trade—Furniture—Books, 79
 Devise—Vested estate—Rents—Improvements, 80
 Charitable legacy—Evidence of intention, 183, 784
 Direction to keep and maintain—Sup. of sisters, 207, 630
 Devise for life—Remainder to devisee's children—Estate tail, 161
 Life estate—Power of disposition—Effect of, 115
 Remainder to heirs then surviving, 166
 Survivorship—Disentailing deed, 328
 Restraint on alienation, 242
 "All my children"—Children of predeceased child, 291
 Bearing testator's name, 328
 Double portions—"Advances on moneys"—Hotchpot, 353
 Trust for investment—Railway or other public company—Foreign company, 355
 "Dying at same time," 361
 "Dying without heirs," 787

Will, construction—Continued.

- Devise of all testator's property—Chose in action, 361
- Devise for use of church, 368
- Gift of residue to individuals in shares—Vested or contingent, 401
- Condition that devisee should take testator's name, 467
- Gift to A. and his heirs, and if he die, to one who might be heir—Estate tail
 - Contingent remainder, 513
- Estate in special tail—Rule in Shelley's case, 521
- "Survivor," 520
- Gift of residue to trustees, administrators and assigns—Realty passes, 435
- Remoteness—Invalid trust for sale, 443
- Gift to sister, niece and children, 447
- Codicil—Revocation—Annuity payable out of legacy, 632
- Gift to "wife" of a person for life—Whether second wife included, 661
- Gift to children of tenant for life, or "legal representatives," 662
- Gift after life estate to children to grandchild and issue of dead ones—joint tenant, 662
- Gift over if donee die without will or childless—Repugnancy, 710
- Perpetuity—Remoteness—Contingent remainder, 744
 - Child en ventre sa mere, 744
- Appointment to user of existing settlement or of such as are capable of taking effect, 748
- Administration—Charity—Waste. *See* Trustee.

Winchester, Judge—

Appointment of, 257

Winding up—

See Company.

Witness—

Non-attendance—Penalty, 119
See Discovery—Evidence.

Words—

Accident, 750	Knowingly, 166
Acquisition, 112	Necessaries, 598
Action or proceeding, 118	Now, 79
Assurance, 784	Ordinary expenditure, 76
At or near, 475	Outgoings, 466
Carriage, 357, 464	Party interested, 86
Days, 711	Practically, 461, 619
Domestic purposes, 157	Sealed vessel, 440
Dying at same time, 361	Survivor, 521
Exempted ship, 118	Then surviving, 166
First publication, 78	Waggon, 128
Floating charge, 704	Wife, 661

Workmen's Compensation Act—

Judicial comments on, 5
 Death of workman—Parent, "dependent," living at workhouse, 347
See Employers' Liability Act.

Workmen's Union—

See Parties.

Writ of summons—

Renewal of Grounds for, 408
 Address of defendant—Foreign defendant, 717
 Substitutional service—Setting aside, 755
 Service out of jurisdiction—Requisite for order, 785
See Service.

Yukon—

See Appeal.