

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XLIV.

DECEMBER 1.

No. 23.

LOCAL OPTION BY-LAWS IN ONTARIO.

At the present time many municipalities are proposing to submit local option by-laws to the electors. If carried, these by-laws may be attacked for faults either antecedent to, or during the vote, or before the final passage by the council. If the by-law is apparently defeated there is machinery provided by which the courts can compel the passing by the council of the by-law, provided there has, in fact, been a majority of three-fifths of the votes in its favour. But if there is a failure to reach that majority local option is dead for three years. It is in the interests of the community that such a measure should be so adopted or rejected as to leave no loophole for attack. Nothing can do more harm than a victory or a defeat gained in such a manner as to lead to a suspicion that the apparent result is not the real will of the electors.

The most important legislation on the subject is that passed in 1906 (6 Edw. VII. c. 24, as amended by 7 Edw. VII. c. 46, s. 11, and by 8 Edw. VII. c. 54, ss. 10 and 11). The effect of the 1906 statute is to give 25 per cent. of the total number of persons appearing upon the last revised voters' list the power to compel the submission of the by-law. If a majority of three-fifths of the electors voting is in favour of local option, the council is bound to pass the by-law, and no by-law preceded by the petition referred to can be repealed for three years and then only by a like three-fifths majority. The petition must be presented before the 1st of November by filing it with the clerk of the municipality (7 Edw. VII. c. 46, s. 11). There is another sort of by-law, one submitted *sua sponte* by the council to the electors, as to which the power to compel its final passage does not exist, and which may be repealed with the approval of a majority of the electors. To this by-law, s. 373 is applicable

and Mr. Justice Anglin in *Re Dewar and East Williams* (1905) 10 O.L.R. 463, has expressed the opinion that this section is not imperative. That case also decides that the council may pass the by-law notwithstanding that they have refused to do so at a previous meeting. But it would seem that the final passing must be within the six weeks after its approval by the electors (s. 373, Municipal Act, 1903).

By-laws may be either for total prohibition, that is, may include both shops and taverns; or for partial prohibition, that is, may be confined either to shops or to taverns: see *Frawley and Orillia* (1907) 14 O.L.R. 99; *Re Hickey and Orillia* (1908) Divisional Court. In the opinion of one learned judge if a by-law is passed affecting shops only, no total prohibition by-law can then be passed: see *Re Hickey and Orillia*, ante, but the effect of both the Orillia cases gives an apparent majority against that view.

The day for voting on local option by-laws is now municipal election day though the polling subdivisions need not be identical, and indeed must not be, if a larger number of voters than can be conveniently accommodated is included in the municipal polling subdivision: *Wynn v. Weston* (1907) 15 O.L.R. 1, and *Re Hickey and Orillia*, ante.

If a by-law is passed by the requisite majority then notwithstanding its quashing by the court either for technical or substantial reasons, no liquor licenses can be issued without the written consent of the Provincial Secretary, and where such consent is withheld, leave to appeal against the quashing has in one case been refused apart from the merits: see *Re Hickey and Orillia* (1908), Osler, J., in Chambers, not reported.

The provisions of the Municipal Act regarding the preliminaries to the submission to the electors are found in ss. 338 et seq. of the Act: see *Sinclair v. Owen Sound* (1907) 39 S.C.R. 239.

Those preliminaries are the first and second reading of the by-law by the council, which by-law shall (1) fix the day and hour and places for taking the vote, which may now be done

by stating that they shall be the same as for the municipal elections (4 Edw. VII. c. 22, s. 8) but still having regard to the opinions expressed in *Hickey and Orillia*, ante, (2) name a deputy returning officer for each poll; (3) fix a place and time for the clerk to sum up the votes; (4) fix a time and place for the appointment of persons to attend at the various polling places and at the final summing up by the clerk on behalf of promoters and opponents of the by-law. The omission from the by-law of the time and place for summing up the votes renders the by-law invalid: *Re Bell and Elma* (1906) 13 O.L.R. 80, and see and compare *Coxwell and Henshall* (1908) not reported.

The by-law must be first advertised not less than three nor more than five weeks before election day: *In re Henderson and Mono* (1907) not reported, and *In re Armstrong and Toronto* (1889) 17 O.R. 766, a first publication more than five weeks before election day, when continued and adopted invalidated the by-law. In *Re Vandyke and Grimsby* (1906) 12 O.L.R. 211, a similar first publication which was abandoned was held to have no such effect. These weeks are ordinary weeks, not periods of seven days excluding Sundays and holidays: *Re Armour and Onondaga* (1907) 14 O.L.R. 606, and *Re Duncan v. Midland* (1907) 16 O.L.R. 132.

Publication must be made for three successive weeks by inserting a true copy in some public newspaper published either (1) in the municipality; (2) or in the county town; (3) or in an adjoining or neighbouring local municipality. And where it is to be published must be determined by resolution of council. A copy of the by-law must also be posted up at four or more of the most public places in the municipality. This should be done, of course, before the voting.

Care must be taken that the copy is a true copy and the clerk must append to the copy so published and posted up a certificate (1) that it is a true copy, (2) that the by-law is the one that has been taken into consideration by the council, (3) and that the same will be passed, if assented to by the electors, after one month from the first publication, (4) and giving the

date of first publication, (5) and stating the day, hour and place where the vote will be taken. Care must also be taken to see that the first publication gives room for the month to expire and yet not to be more than five weeks before the vote.

After the day for voting has been fixed the clerk must have the ballots printed in the form given in 8 Edw. VII. c. 54, s. 10. The head of the municipality must also, at the time and place named in the by-law, appoint in writing two persons to attend at the final summing up by the clerk and one person to attend on behalf of each side at each polling place. Such person must, before appointment, sign a declaration before the head of the municipality in the form given in sched. "K." to the Municipal Act that he is interested in promoting or opposing the by-law.

The taking of the vote is conducted in the usual way. The voters are those entitled to vote at municipal elections: *Re Croft and Peterboro* (1890) 17 A.R. 1, and each elector has one vote: sec. 158, and *Re Sinclair v. Owen Sound*, supra.

"Electors" are defined in the Municipal Act (3 Edw. VII. c. 19, s. 22, s.-s. 5) as the persons entitled for the time being to vote at any municipal election or in respect to any by-law, resolution or question. Those answering that description are detailed in ss. 86, 88, 89, 92, 93, while s. 355 is applicable where the ward system prevails but is not effective to give a double vote. It relates solely to voting on money by-laws: see *Sinclair v. Owen Sound* (1906) 12 O.L.R. 488, (1906) 13 O.L.R. 447. (1907) 39 S.C.R. 236.

The voters' list is the one referred to in s. 148 and following sections. The provisions of s. 348 are meaningless as they appear at present, having regard to the amendment 8 Edw. VII. c. 48, s. 4, unless they provide a list of those income voters whose names appear on the last revised assessment roll—which and possibly those who, having disfranchised themselves, may be different from that on which the voters' list is based—become entitled to vote under section 88. See views quoted and expressed in *Re McGrath and Durham* (1908) not reported.

Deputy returning officers and poll clerks may vote if they

provide themselves with a certificate under s. 347, and agents if given a certificate under s. 163.

The right of deputy returning officers to vote has been held in the negative by Riddell, J., in *Re Armour and Onondaga*, ante, and in the affirmative in *Re Saltfleet* (1908) 16 O.L.R. 293, and in *Re Joyce and Pittsburg* (1908) 16 O.L.R. 380. Ballot boxes may be used for concurrent voting for other objects: *Re Duncan v. Midland* (1907) 16 O.L.R. 132.

Voting takes place as at municipal elections (see s. 351). The provisions of the Act applied by that section include those from s. 138 to s. 206, except s. 179, "so far as the same are applicable and except so far as is herein otherwise provided." Among other things these provide for the delivery to every deputy returning officer of directions for voting which are to be posted up inside and outside of the polling place (s. 147) of certificates of the dates of the last day for making complaints to the county judge with respect to the voters' list and of the day on which the assessment roll was finally revised and corrected (s. 156).

The mode of voting is set out in s. 168, and while a voter is in the compartment provided in each polling place (see s. 145) no other person shall be allowed therein or to be in any position from which he can observe how the ballot paper is marked (s. 169). This has been held important in *Hickey v. Orillia*, ante.

The voter must leave his ballot with the deputy returning officer, but putting it in the ballot box himself is not a forfeiture of the right to vote: see *Duncan v. Midland* (1907) 16 O.L.R. 132.

The summing up of the votes takes place at the close of the poll and the statement to be made by each deputy returning officer is set out in s. 359 and the latter's duties are detailed in s. 360, 361, 362 and 363. Then the clerk of the municipality at the time and place mentioned in the by-law, in the presence of those appointed to be present, sums up the numbers of votes and forthwith thereafter certifies to the council the result (s.

364) but he has no vote. The by-law must receive a majority of three-fifths of those voting, otherwise it is defeated.

After the clerk has certified the result to the council a period of two weeks should be allowed for the scrutiny under s. 369, before the by-law is read a third time even although no one asks for such a scrutiny. This is to avoid trouble in view of the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Re Duncan and Midland*, ante. But the point is still doubtful as the Divisional Court reversed Mulock, C.J., on this point and the Court of Appeal was equally divided, Moss, C.J., only agreeing in the result which was to dismiss the appeal from the Divisional Court. Mulock, C.J., in *Re Coxwell and Henshall* (1908) not reported, has since refused to give effect to that objection.

Section 204 is applicable to the carrying of these local option by-laws. It provides in effect that the vote which gives the assent of the electors shall not be declared invalid by reason of a non-compliance with the provisions of the Municipal Act (1) as to the taking of the poll, (2) the counting of the votes, (3) as to any mistake in the use of the forms, (4) or by reason of any irregularity, if it appears to the court that the voting was conducted in accordance with the principles laid down in the Act and if such non-compliance, mistake or irregularity did not affect the result of the voting.

This provision is most important. The courts have generally striven to apply it where fair attention has been given to the conduct of the voting and no one has been prevented from voting. The following have been held to be within the saving provisions of this section.

1. No newspaper designated in the by-law: *Dillon v. Cardinal* (1905) 10 O.L.R. 371; and no places specifically designated for the voting: *Re Coxwell and Henshall*, ante.

2. Persons allowed in the polling place who were not entitled to be there: *idem* and *Re Sinclair v. Owen Sound* (1906) 12 O.L.R. 488; *Re Rickey v. Marlborough* (1907) 14 O.L.R. 587, but see *Re Hickey v. Orillia*, ante, a case strikingly similar on the facts to the *Cardinal Case*. But the Divisional Court held in the *Orillia Case* this offended against the principle of secrecy.

3. Non-performance by the deputy returning officer of various duties required of him at and after the close of the poll (idem and *Re Eickey and Marlborough*, ante, and other cases noted below).

4. Irregular voters' lists: *Re Sinclair v. Owen Sound* (1906) 12 O.L.R. 488; *Re Duncan and Midland* (1907) 16 O.L.R. 132.

5. Omission to enter the electors as voting: idem, and *Sinclair v. Owen Sound*, ante.

6. Declarations missing or not taken: idem.

7. Defaulters' list not supplied: idem.

8. Certificates not furnished to deputy returning officer: idem.

9. Oath of secrecy not taken: idem, and *Wynn v. Weston* (1907) 15 O.L.R. 1.

10. Number who voted not certified by deputy returning officer: idem.

11. Publication of by-law defective: idem, and *Re Robinson and Beamsville* (1906); (1907) not reported.

The following have been held not to be within the curative provisions of s. 204:—

1. Omission to post directions to voters: *Re Salter and Beckwith* (1902) 4 O.L.R. 51.

2. Want of posting up of copies of by-law: idem.

3. Illegal voting if it affects the result: *Re Cleary and Nepean* (1907) 14 O.L.R. 392.

4. Want of proper publication: *Re Cartwright and Napanee* (1905) 11 O.L.R. 69; *Re Rickey and Marlborough* (1907) 14 O.L.R. 587.

There are a few further points to be noted: In *Re Dillon and Cardinal* (1905) 10 O.L.R. 371, Mr. Justice Magee and the Divisional Court were of opinion that in voting on by-laws there is no obligation to secrecy upon the subject of requesting or depositing a ballot and that the presence of other electors in the polling place who are voting is unobjectionable. This is not the view of the Divisional Court in *Re Hickey and Orillia*, ante, but as the latter case was not fully argued on this point, the

whole question of the amount of secrecy required and the effect of its partial absence needs thorough consideration.

In *Re Armour and Onondaga* (1907) 14 O.L.R. 606, Riddell, J., says the proper method of deducting votes improperly cast was that of deducting those votes from the total and then taking three-fifths of the remainder.

The question of how far the court will go into the right of the individual voters to vote has been much debated. In *Re Coe and Pickering* (1865) 24 U.C.R. 439, the court seem to have thought a single judge might do it, but not the court in banc. In *Re Leahy and Lakefield* (1906) not reported, and in *Re Young and Binbrook* (1899) 31 O.R. 108, the court went behind the voters' list and held the voting to be illegal because of improper votes or of improper omission from the list.

In *Re Salter and Beckwith* (1902) 4 O.L.R. 51, Britton, J., decided that the voters objected to were qualified. In *Re Dillon and Cardinal*, ante, Magee, J., thought illegal votes were a ground for quashing; and Mabee, J., in *Re Sinclair v. Owen Sound* (1906) 12 O.L.R. 188, had no doubt that it was an element for the consideration of the court on a motion to quash. The Divisional Court discussed the question and decided that even if proved and the votes deducted, it did not affect the result. Mabee, J., in *Re Cleary and Nepean* (1907) 14 O.L.R. 392, decided that the foregoing cases bound him to consider the illegality of votes. Riddell, J., in *Re Armour and Onondaga* (1907) 14 O.L.R. 606, went into the question of qualification at length and deducted those improperly voting, but he limited his enquiry to those bad or good by reason of circumstances arising after the final revision of the roll, holding himself bound by *Reg. ex rel. McKenzie and Martin* (1897) 28 O.R. 523. In *Re Saltfleet* (1906) 16 O.L.R. 293, the Divisional Court laid down the rule that the voters' list is final and that all that can be considered by a judge upon these applications are the cases excepted by the Voters' List Act itself, that is, those guilty of corrupt practices, those who have become non-resident after the list was revised, and persons not qualified or competent to vote

under the Voters' List Act, 7 Edw. VII. c. 4, s. 24, and (unless the change in the statute renders *Wynn v. Weston* (1907) 15 O.L.R. 1, inapplicable) also those added by the county judge under 8 Edw. VII. c. 4, s. 24. *Re Salifeet* was followed in *Re Mitchell and Campbellford* (1908) 16 O.L.J. 578, and by a Divisional Court in *Re McGrath and Town of Durham*, decided November 20, 1908, not reported.

The voters' list cannot be added to, and, *semble*, s. 348, in its present form applies only to money by-laws: *Re Sinclair and Owen Sound* (1906) 13 O.L.R. 441; *Re McGrath and Durham* (1908) not reported.

The effect of the above decisions would seem to confine "electors" to those on the voters' list. It is possible that this may be too narrow a view and it may do injustice if the voters' list is based upon a prior assessment roll and not upon that which is actually the last one revised, the electors on which have the right to compel the submission of the by-law.

FRANK E. HODGINS.

LAW REFORM.

PART III--COSTS.

The above sub-title comes very close to the subject of law reform, though as intimated before, no attempt will be made to present it as one within the range of any immediate legislative action; but rather as a matter for consideration by members of the profession in order to see whether in the interests of both public and profession some general principles cannot be formulated which will bring the remuneration paid to solicitors somewhat more nearly to present-day requirements so that no more and no less than the value of the solicitor's services may be paid for every piece of work that he does. If the subject of settlements is one barren of authority, the question of costs is a department teeming with precedents; but so far as they deal with tariffs such precedents are perhaps somewhat foreign to

this article. The first principle to bear in mind is that costs are payment for lawyer's services; the means by which he makes his living and that if the practice of law is to be decently and honourably conducted, it must offer to good men a fair and liberal return. For solicitors in England their fees were never looked upon as honoraria, they were always the lawyer's "wages" for work done and something to which he was entitled by right (see *Germyn v. Rolls*, Cro. Eliz. 425 to 459; *Thorsby v. Warren*, Cro. Car. 159), and in our country where the two professions are combined the right to recover fees is expressly given by statute. No sensitiveness, therefore, on the subject such as was manifested by Erle, C.J., in *Kennedy v. Brown*, 13 C.B.N.S. 677, should preclude us from considering the payment of fees in their true light, namely, as the lawyer's means of livelihood, and, when this is applied to modern conditions and cost of living, we shall at least have a sensible view point from which to observe this important topic.

It should next be pointed out that no system of fees can be satisfactory that does not consider the various elements of cost that enter into the conduct of this as of any other business or manufactory. A lawyer would make much fairer charges when he could more fully justify if to each piece of work done he could allot approximately the initial cost incurred in carrying it out. The elements of rent, taxes, wages, office expenses and interest on capital are just as real and just as insistently present in his business as in any mercantile pursuit, and no lawyer can say that his work has cost him nothing, because he has paid no cash for government fees, stamps or other out of pocket disbursements. If it were realized that everything done has cost money and if the amount of cost could be allotted in each case (and there is nothing to prevent it) a lawyer would know just how much he is giving a client when he undercharges or does work for nothing, and how much, therefore (and this is most important) he is overcharging some one else in order to bring his receipts up to a point that will enable him to live. It is not pretended that work must not sometimes be done for nothing

or for less than its value. It is the privilege of every professional man to help those who would otherwise be without legal assistance; but he ought to know what his charities are costing him and ought to see to it that his generosity is not visited upon some other client whose means may enable him to pay for the work done not for him only but also for someone else. Similarly just as the man who sells goods below cost is an object of suspicion and a menace to his confrères in the business, so a man who habitually undercharges is a danger to the profession for as he must live, his livelihood is necessarily derived from some other and possibly some questionable source or else he is bringing the standard of living down to a point which will necessarily drive better men into some more remunerative employment where they can live and do business according to higher notions of propriety than the rewards in law will permit. One of the first reforms suggested, therefore, is some system of charges that will enable lawyers to ascertain and to charge according to the original cost of the work done. It is scarcely necessary to point out that our tariff absolutely ignores this. The only disbursements provided for are such as are paid out of pocket, and many things that are nothing but disbursements, such as the copying of documents, can only be charged for according to arbitrary fees. Now the copying of documents is a disbursement pure and simple, involving generally the purchase of a typewriter, the use of so much paper, the payment of so much wages and the interest upon capital invested in office fixtures and required in the work; and the first essential would be to find out what, under modern conditions, is the cost of such work and what is a fair profit to the solicitor for his share in the production of the document. Much of the work done in an office has similarly its own initial cost, but probably such a thing is never considered in making charges and it is certainly never contemplated in our tariff.

The tariff itself is not only extremely antiquated but is very partial. It makes no provision for work done in the criminal courts, for the vast amount of work done in connection with

dealings in land or with companies and it has many charges such as fees on orders, term fees, and other charges made in litigation which have no real connection with the work done in an office. Then the necessity for rendering itemized bills for work done with their paltry charges for letters, attendances and postage have been the subject of constant ridicule and criticism, and it is safe to say that almost every bill rendered as required by the tariff is unintelligible and annoying to the average layman. No criticism of the habit of making charges is offered. Some record of work done is necessary and such records should unquestionably be carefully kept; but it is submitted that in most cases the results merely of that record need in the first instance be furnished the client and those only in a condensed form.

In practice lawyers' bills are not usually excessive, nor are they generally or even frequently disputed and solicitors will probably find that criticism is disarmed rather than invited by rendering bills containing only a short summary of the work done, a reference to the disbursements, if they are not merely negligible, and a lump sum for fees. It is probably the experience of many that such bills sent with some regularity, on half a sheet of paper are less frequently criticized than the bulky document containing every item, which from the labour involved in its preparation, leads frequently to such a delay in rendering it as to itself create difficulty when at last sent out. Itemized bills will, perhaps, always be necessary for purposes of taxation or suit (though it is submitted that even for these objects they might be much simplified), but few bills are either sued or taxed, and for practical purposes a short summary is a great inducement to solicitors to render bills promptly. Clients too are better pleased, and if it could be made a practice to render bills either immediately the work is done, or at the end of the month in which it is completed, an immense amount of trouble would be saved and much money gained, for a bill promptly rendered is a bill more likely to be promptly paid, while lawyers will find as merchants do, that bills long delayed in their offices before rendering will be paid also in a casual manner and that

other claims upon the debtor's purse will receive first consideration.

The "account rendered" habit is also a good one. It consists in keeping a list of all accounts rendered in a book devoted to that purpose. It shows the date of sending the account, the name of the debtor and the amount, and has spaces to show the dates of payment and amounts paid. It is gone over at regular intervals, say at the end of each month, and short reminders may be sent out showing the date rendered, and the amount, etc., as follows:—

John Smith, Esq.,

In account with

1908	Solicitors, etc.
June 30th.	To account rendered	\$30.00
Dated Nov. 30th, 1908.		

This is frankly mercantile, but sensible, and in no way unprofessional, nor does it offend anyone in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred; while it assists wonderfully in putting a lawyer's finances upon a sounder basis and removing one incentive to overcharging or improper dealing with funds by insuring a somewhat more prompt return for work done. Such simple practices are not by any means beneath the consideration of the profession, for where a man is fair to himself and his partners in the matter of bills and payments, he will have that much less temptation to be unfair or unscrupulous in dealing with his clients. One addition to our tariff might well be some recognized standard of fees for honest, though unsuccessful efforts, to settle or shorten litigation. No one denies the importance of such work, but our tariffs only permit the recovery of costs between party and party where such attempts to settle have borne fruit. Any extension of the rule, unless carefully safeguarded, might be made the subject of great abuses, but where one party succeeds in drawing up on paper a feasible scheme which will reduce costs and submits it to the other side, the expenses thereby incurred might well be made part of the taxable costs between party and party, unless the other side has

some good reason to shew for declining it. Such costs might properly be added to the bill of the successful party where the proposal comes from him or deducted from his bill where it emanates from the opposite side and has been rejected.

One matter which has been already agitated a good deal in the profession is the question of drawing up some scale of fees for the work done in the organization of companies and the ordinary transactions in real estate such as the purchase and mortgage of lands. There is no tariff expressly covering these matters and in the case of companies there is no general experience such as will accurately guide a solicitor engaged in such matters. Various firms make different charges; in all cases probably based, to some extent, upon the amount involved in the transaction and the responsibility incurred, as well as upon the work actually done, and it is a remarkable thing that such bills scarcely, if ever, appear before a taxing officer on solicitor and client taxations. These matters have been considered by a Committee of the County of York Law Association, but no report has yet been made.

Real estate agents have a recognized commission pretty well adhered to by them. This commission is generally two and one-half per cent. on the amount involved, and is based largely upon the fact that no charge is made unless a deal is consummated. A lawyer's work is usually just as great and the responsibility much greater, but he expects to receive his fee whether the deal is closed or not, and there is theoretically no element of uncertainty in it, the fees, therefore, should not be as high. In the writer's judgment one or two difficulties which will be encountered in fixing fees at a percentage of the amount involved in the case of real estate transactions is the fact that people may be tempted in the larger transactions to suggest a fee which, while based somewhat upon the responsibility, will be disproportionate to the amount of work required. It would probably be found, however, to be of great assistance to the rank and file of the profession if a general scale of charges for work of this kind could be arrived at, based in all cases upon a

percentage; and while there might be some objection from the larger and more important firms to depart from practices which they have found to be satisfactory, both to themselves and their own clients, any self-sacrifice on their part by agreeing to a general tariff would probably be of much assistance to the ordinary practitioner. In theory there seems to be no reason why in the case of real estate, percentages should not be arrived at, which, while they differ somewhat in different localities, would fairly repay solicitors for the work which they do and which would have the inestimable value from the client's point of view of enabling him to tell accurately what it would cost him to buy or sell land. It is easier to act generally for a vendor than a purchaser, and the responsibility is much less. In the Land Titles Office, a solicitor for the purchaser finds his work and responsibility greatly reduced, and in transactions where the purchase money is small, the work may be almost as great as in much larger transactions, though the responsibility is not so considerable. Therefore, a sliding scale where the percentage is somewhat larger for small transactions than for important ones would probably be fair. These considerations would most likely be found to form a sufficient basis for the discussion of such a percentage.

The necessity for some simple, certain and general system of charges upon real estate transactions has, in this province, become acute. Nearly all companies who lend money on mortgages have their tariff for such work to which solicitors acting for them are expected to conform. Unless one's office is organized to do that class of work by wholesale, these tariffs will be found to be unremunerative, and there is a movement to introduce into this province from the United States, title guarantee companies, who will absorb much of this business, unless it can be found that work can be done by a lawyer with the same accuracy and according to a stated scale of charges which will enable the client to tell, beforehand, what his dealings will cost him. In a country like ours, where the Land Titles System is already in vogue, where titles are comparatively simple and land registers

fairly accurate and complete, there will be but little inducement for the exploitation of title guarantee companies, provided only the scale of fees on transfers are moderate, certain and simple.

For the incorporation and organization of companies, fees will be found to vary wonderfully. One instance is known to the writer where a company of \$40,000 was incorporated and organized for a fee of \$25. This is probably almost unique. Others have said that for similar work their charges have been as much as \$300 or \$400. This amount seems to be extreme. It is possible that the tendency in discussing these matters amongst the profession is to state a sum in excess of what is actually charged; but there is a great field for usefulness for a representative committee to meet and draw up a tariff which would lay down proper fees for such services, and which would put an end to the wide divergence which at present exists. There is no doubt a good deal of canvassing done amongst persons about to incorporate a company to find out who will do the work most cheaply, and there are chartered accountants who do such business, having all the forms which they consider necessary for that purpose and whose fees are usually considerably less than those which any professional man would be willing to charge. The only consolation the profession can derive from the fact that such work is done now by accountants is the feeling akin to that which possesses us when we find that a man has been his own lawyer and has drawn his own will.

The subject of fees in the Surrogate Court has also been discussed in the profession. It will be found that the fees do not contemplate, for instance, the work which is now done in preparing succession duty papers, and all fees are upon a scale which is not in any way proportionate to the value of services rendered to an estate of any size. This tariff also requires careful consideration and it would probably be found that if a representative committee of lawyers, either convened by the Benchers or otherwise, were to meet and prepare a tariff not only upon the matters last mentioned, but upon all questions of costs they could simplify greatly the present unsatisfactory and illogical method of keeping and rendering bills.

This article does not argue for any general increases in the charges which are made. It is only a plea for the simplification of the tariff and the introduction into offices of methods which, because they are simple, straightforward and exact, will more likely ensure a fair distribution amongst all clients of the expense of the work done for each and at the same time, a fair and liberal return to the professional man, which will enable him better to live up to and support the dignity and importance of his calling. If any general reforms such as are outlined could be introduced and a tariff drawn up which would appeal to and be adopted by the profession generally, much of the present temptation to undercharge, or to win clients from other solicitors by reducing fees to below a proper standard of living for a professional man, would be obviated.

SHIRLEY DENISON.

*PROOF OF DANGEROUS TENDENCY BY EVIDENCE OF
PRIOR EFFECT.*

The dissenting opinion in a recent New York case illustrates a reactionary tendency which has already assumed considerable proportions. The majority held that evidence of a prior accident in a passageway through an elevator shaft was admissible, to indicate the dangerous character of the place. Two justices maintained that, since it was not shewn that the defendant knew of the former accident, the testimony was incompetent. *Cefola v. Siegel-Cooper Co.* (1908) 111 N.Y. Supp. 1112.

Where such knowledge of dangerous tendency or quality is possessed by the individual charged with responsibility, evidence of the accidents whether one or many, through which this knowledge was derived, is uniformly admitted. Clearly, it gives rise to an inevitable inference of negligence. *City of Chicago v. Powers* (1866) 42 Ill. 169. But even where such notice and knowledge are lacking, proof of prior effect, it is submitted, is relevant. In order to investigate properly the merits of a given accident, it is not merely desirable, but material to

determine the tendency, nature, and quality of the place or object involved. To determine these accurately, it is essential to apply the practical test of common experience. *Phelps v. R. R. Co.* (1887) 37 Minn. 487. Failure to realize the true evidentiary purpose and that negligence or due caution are, at best, merely indirect inferences, has led to much of the confusion of the cases, which a neglect of two simple conditions of admissibility has not lessened.

In the first place, to make the evidence of prior effect *legally* relevant in an action where its present effect is at issue, an underlying similarity of conditions must be shewn. *Aurora v. Brown* (1882) 12 Ill. App. 131; *Bailey v. Trumbull* (1863) 31 Conn. 581. In the absence of such proof, the evidence is of too indirect a character to be of practical probative value. *Sullivan v. D. & H. Canal Co.* (1900) 72 Vt. 353. Secondly, the more recent evidence of injury at the given place, the more strongly does the presumption of a continued similar condition operate. Where the accident occurred at too distant a date, evidence of it has often been excluded, on the theory, seemingly, that while ordinarily it is merely the *weight* of the evidence which varies inversely as the remoteness increases, still, at a certain point the evidence itself becomes too unimportant to be legally material, a fortiori, competent. The conditions of modern trial by jury afford an explanation. Oftentimes these two grounds of exclusion are confused, but that there are two distinct inferences involved, is clear. Cf. *Giltrie v. Lockwood* (1890) 122 N.Y. 403. At what precise stage the exclusionary principles should operate is a question for the trial court to determine. (Thayer, *Prel. Tr. Evid.*, 517: "In such cases it is a question of where lies the balance of practical advantage.") Necessarily, the question must be largely one of judicial discretion; but that, it is submitted, in no way justifies an inflexible rule of exclusion. *Bemis v. Temple* (1894) 162 Mass. 342, 4.

In the first American case in point, *Collins v. Dorchester* (Mass. 1850) 6 Cush. 396, an injury occurred on a highway through an alleged defect in a railing. The Massachusetts

Supreme Court, speaking through Metcalfe, J., denied that evidence that another person under like circumstances had recently suffered a similar accident was admissible. Coming from so distinguished a source, this ruling naturally influenced subsequent development, and, together with the case of *Temperance Hall Assn. v. Giles* (1869) 33 N.J.L. 260, explains a long line of similar decisions. *Aldrich v. Pelham* (Mass. 1854) 1 Gray 510; *Parker v. Publishing Co.* (1879) 69 Me. 173, and cases cited. Either that the introduction of collateral events results in confusion of issues, or that the probative value is disproportionate to the incident expense of time, is the usual ratio decidendi. *Phillips v. Willow* (1887) 70 Wis. 6. If the two fundamental exclusionary principles, which have been indicated, are heeded, such consequences will rarely, if ever, be involved. It is far preferable to submit the proffered evidence to these preliminary tests than to adopt an invariable rule of exclusion which is not only illogical, but unnecessary. The theory of *Collins v. Dorchester*, supra, reached its high water mark in *Martinez v. Planel* (1869) 36 Cal. 578. The attack on its underlying fallacies, beginning with *Darling v. Westmoreland* (1872) 52 N.H. 401, culminated in the New York leading case of *Quinlan v. Utica* (1877) 11 Hun. 217, affirmed 74 N.Y. 603. These cases squarely hold that in any investigation, legal or scientific, a knowledge of the nature of the place or object involved is essential and that to properly ascertain this, the test of experience must necessarily be employed. This has since been repeatedly recognized as a specific ground for admitting evidence of previous accidents, *Fordham v. Gouverneur* (1899) 160 N.Y. 541; *Taylorville v. Stafford* (1902) 196 Ill. 288, though in many rulings the identical evidence, in the light of surrounding circumstances, has been likewise held competent to indicate notice to the person charged with responsibility. *Stair v. Kane* (1907) 156 Fed. 100. Thus, prior accidents on a defective pavement may be admissible, not only to shew that the common cause of the respective injuries possesses certain dangerous characteristics, but also to charge the municipal authorities with notice thereof, *District of Columbia v.*

Armes (1882) 107 U.S. 519; accord, *Phelps v. R.R. Co.*, supra. The two, however, are quite distinct.

The undeniable reactionary tendency in New York, revealed in the minority reasoning, is prevalent, also, at present, in a few other jurisdictions, and it is the more remarkable, perhaps, because of a recent liberal treatment of this evidence in Massachusetts itself. *Flaherty v. Powers* (1896) 167 Mass. 61; *Spaulding v. Lithograph, etc., Co.* (1898) 171 Mass. 271. Such a reaction seems unfortunate. It might, however, be noticed that a total absence of proof of recency or of similarity of conditions seems to discredit the actual result reached by the majority.—*Columbia Law Review*.

The preservation of the sacredness of the persons and personal liberty of the King's subjects has always been one of the boasts of the British Constitution; and this is something which should not be lightly encroached upon. It is not in these times of peace, plenty and prosperity that the need for such a safeguard is much in evidence as it is in the troublous times that have been, or in the troublous times that may be hereafter. Whilst this is so there is much in what was graphically said by Mr. Justice Riddell in a judgment recently delivered by him in the case of *Rex v. Leach*, on an application for a *habeas corpus*. He said: "It is to be hoped that the courts may long be spared the disreputable spectacle of a litigant claiming an advantage from an alleged irregularity in which he himself participated. A defendant has, undoubtedly, the right to place his back against the wall and fight with every advantage; he has, I think, no right, if he come out from the wall, to complain that his adversary gets behind him. And the rules in favour of the accused, derived from the bloody days when the mother was hanged for a petty theft to stay the hunger of her famishing brood, are not to be extended or applied where not reasonably applicable." But the pendulum may swing too far the other way. The liberty of the subject is a valuable relic.

Our English exchanges refer with deep regret to the death of Lord Justice Mathew. Sir James Mathew had a reputation of being a great lawyer as well as having special knowledge and grasp of matters connected with commercial law. It will be remembered that he was the originator of the Commercial Court over which he presided for some years. He was, subsequently, appointed to the Court of Appeal, from which he retired about two years ago, owing to ill-health. The learned judge was born in 1830, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. In 1881 he was raised to the Bench. As a criminal judge he was said to be thoroughly human, and in striking contrast with his brother Catholic judge, Sir John Day, making allowances and being lenient in his sentences. Though he had a reputation of being a wit and the best after-dinner speaker on his circuit, he did not carry his pleasantries to the Bench. Among other good things, one of the best of his sayings was that although in the eyes of the civil law husband and wife were one person, yet if a man killed his wife it was murder, not suicide. Mr. Mathew was one of the juniors for the prosecution in the *Tichborne Case*.

We notice that *The Times* enlarges upon the suggestion of a New York paper that a retiring President of the United States should, as a matter of course, have a seat in the Senate, receiving an appropriate salary. The thought is based upon the very sensible argument that the President, whether he be one of the greatest or only one of the average type must inevitably acquire a great fund of experience and knowledge in national business. He becomes, it is said, a national asset, and it is reasonable that the knowledge and experience that he has acquired should remain at the disposal and in the service of the nation. Possibly the principle involved in this suggestion might occasionally be beneficially invoked as to the selection of men for the Senate of the Dominion. But the supposed exigencies of party politics would probably stand in the way.

REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH CASES.

(Registered in accordance with the Copyright Act.)

PRACTICE—COSTS—SOLICITOR—TAXATION OF COSTS AFTER PAYMENT—THIRD PARTY LIABLE TO PAY—“SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.”

Hirst v. Fox (1908) A.C. 416 is a case known in the court below as *Re Hirst* (1908) 1 K.B. 982 (noted ante, p. 451) and it is somewhat surprising that it should have been thought of sufficient importance to be carried to the House of Lords, and it is not surprising to find that their Lordships regarded the appeal, which took the greater part of two days, as a waste of their valuable time. The whole question was as to whether or not a solicitor's bill was liable to taxation. The costs were costs of an action which had been compromised, the defendants agreeing to pay the plaintiff's costs as between solicitor and client. The plaintiff paid her solicitors' bill without taxation, and the defendants subsequently applied as third parties liable to pay for an order to tax it. This was granted by the Court of Appeal (see ante, p. 451) and it is from that decision that the present appeal was brought by the solicitors. Their Lordships (Lord Loreburn, L.C., and Lords Ashbourne and Macnaghten) affirmed the order for taxation, but in doing so they dealt the appellants a backhanded stroke by varying that part of the order appealed from which had directed the client to pay the costs of the prior appeal, by ordering the solicitors themselves to pay them.

TRADE MARK—INFRINGEMENT—ASSIGNMENT OF TRADE MARK—CAUSE OF ACTION.

Ullmann v. Leuba (1908) A.C. 443. This was an appeal from the Supreme Court of Hong Kong. The action was brought to recover damages for infringement of a trade mark. The facts of the case as found by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Robertson, Atkinson and Collins, and Sir A. Wilson) were, that the plaintiffs were manufacturers of watches in Switzerland. They sold watches for the purposes of trade to a firm in Hong Kong, carried on by one Madame Bovet, who, for the purpose of trade had them marked with the trade mark in question. This trade mark had been assigned to the plaintiffs. The court below had granted the plaintiffs relief, being of

opinion that the business of Madame Bovet, in Hong Kong, had also been transferred to the plaintiffs, or that, at all events, owing to the course of the proceedings of the trial, the defendants were not in a position to say that it had not. The Judicial Committee, however, considered that it was clear upon the evidence that there had been no transfer of the business of Madame Bovet to the plaintiffs, and, consequently, they had no status to maintain the action, a mere assignment of the trade mark giving them no such right. As regards the plaintiffs, the only person who could be deceived by the defendants' use of the trade mark in question, would be Madame Bovet, and it was clear that she was not, in fact, deceived. The appeal was therefore allowed, and the action dismissed.

LEAVE TO APPEAL—JUDGMENT FINAL AND CONCLUSIVE UNDER COLONIAL STATUTE — PREROGATIVE RIGHT TO ENTERTAIN APPEAL.

Re Will of Wi Matua (1908) A.C. 448. This was an application for leave to appeal from the native Appellate Court of New Zealand. Under a statute of New Zealand establishing the court the judgment of this court was declared to be final and conclusive, but the prerogative right of the King in Council to entertain an appeal was not expressly taken away. The questions involved were such as would have been appealable to His Majesty in Council before the establishment of the native court, and it was held by the Judicial Committee (Lords Robertson, Atkinson and Collins, and Sir A. Wilson) that the prerogative right to entertain the appeal could not be taken away except by express words. On the merits of the case, however, their Lordships did not see fit to grant leave to appeal.

BRITISH COLUMBIA PROCEDURE ACT, s. 4—(ONT. RULE 923)—
STATUTORY DUTY TO SUBMIT PETITION OF RIGHT TO LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR—DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF STATUTORY DUTY.

Fulton v. Norton (1908) A.C. 451 was an action brought against the Provincial Secretary of British Columbia to recover damages, for his refusing to submit the plaintiff's petition of right to the Lieutenant-Governor as required by the Provincial Procedure Act, s. 4 (see Ont. Rule 923). Pending the action the defendant presented the petition and obtained his refusal of a fiat, and he set that up as a defence and paid \$5 into court as damages. At the trial, the judge dismissed the action. On

appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada a new trial was ordered on the ground that the plaintiff was entitled to have the damages assessed by a jury, and with this conclusion their Lordships of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Loreburn, L.C., and Lords Robertson and Atkinson and Sirs A. Wilson and Elzear Taschereau) agreed.

RULE ABSOLUTE FOR PROHIBITION TO JUSTICES—REFUSAL TO AWARD COSTS—APPEAL AS TO COSTS.

Rieken v. Justices for Yorke (1908) A.C. 454. In this case a rule for a prohibition against justices of the peace had been made absolute by the Supreme Court of South Australia, but the court had refused to order the justices to pay the costs of the proceedings. From this refusal of costs the appeal was taken to His Majesty in Council. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Robertson, Atkinson and Collins, and Sir A. Wilson) being of opinion that there had been no declining of jurisdiction on the subject of costs, nor any mistake in any matter of law, but a sound and proper exercise of discretion, dismissed the appeal with costs.

COLONIAL LEGISLATURE—VALIDITY OF STANDING ORDER OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY — EXCLUDING MEMBER OF LEGISLATURE ACCUSED OF CRIME.

Harnett v. Crick (1908) A.C. 470 was an appeal from the Supreme Court of New South Wales, and the question involved was whether an order of the legislative assembly, which suspended any member of the House accused of crime, until after a verdict, was valid. The Constitution Act, 1902, s. 15, empowered the Legislative Assembly to adopt rules for the orderly conduct thereof. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Macnaghten, Atkinson and Sirs H. DeVilliers, A. Scoble and A. Wilson) held the order to be valid and dismissed the appeal.

CONTRACT FOR SALE OF LAND—CONSTRUCTION—UNCERTAINTY OF CONTRACT—SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE.

Douglas v. Baynes (1908) A.C. 477. This was an action for specific performance of a contract for the sale of land or for damages in case the defendant failed to convey pursuant to the order of the court. The contract in question provided for the transfer by the defendant to the plaintiff of a farm in the Transvaal, on which deposits of tin had been found, in consideration

of 3,700 shares of £5 each in a syndicate to be formed for the purpose of developing the same as a mining property, the 3,700 shares to represent the plaintiff's holding in a syndicate of 12,000 shares. The Supreme Court of the Transvaal refused specific performance on the ground that the syndicate, which had been formed, had not sufficient working capital to develop the property, as contemplated by the agreement. From this judgment the plaintiff appealed, but the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Robertson, Atkinson and Collins, and Sir A. Wilson) dismissed the appeal, on the ground that the agreement was too uncertain in its terms. Their Lordships considered that there could not be any condition imported by implication into the contract as to sufficient working capital being provided for effectively developing the property, and to this extent they disagreed with the court below; but as to two matters "not raised in the pleadings or dealt with in the argument," viz., (1) Is the contract, as it stands, without any words being, by implication, imported into it, so ambiguous as to one material matter, that specific performance of it cannot on any principle of equity or natural justice be decreed? and, (2) If not, can damages be awarded instead? And the first of these questions they answer in the affirmative and the second in the negative. As to the first point they consider the word developing was ambiguous, and its meaning uncertain, and that as this contract to develop in fact constituted part of the consideration for which the land was agreed to be sold, the uncertainty as to its meaning disabled the court from enforcing the agreement, though the defendant might himself be responsible for the ambiguity, on the ground that it would be against conscience for a man to take advantage of the plain mistake of another, or at least that a Court of Equity would not assist him in doing so. As to the question of damages: as they were only claimed in the event of the defendant refusing to assign the farm within the time to be fixed by the court, their Lordships held they could not be awarded. In these circumstances each party was left to bear his own costs of the appeal and also of the appeal in the court below.

TAX SALE—ASSESSMENT ACT (R.S.O. 1897, c. 224) s. 184(3)—
3 Edw. VII. c. 21 (O.) s. 11—3 Edw. VII. c. 86 (O.), s. 8
—4 Edw. VII. c. 23 (O.), s. 148—NOTICE IN WRITING UNDER
R.S.O. c. 224, s. 184.

Toronto v. Russell (1908) A.C. 493 is an important decision on the subject of tax sales in which the Judicial Committee of

the Privy Council (Lords Robertson, Atkinson and Collins, and Sirs A. Wilson and Elzeer Taschereau) have reversed the judgment of the Ontario Court of Appeal, 15 O.L.R. 484. The land in question belonged to Russell, the plaintiff, and was advertised to be sold on April 10, 1901, under the Assessment Act (R.S.O. c. 224) for taxes in arrears, and after an adjournment was bought by the city of Toronto. The city had advertised its intention to purchase in case the amount bid was less than the arrears due, but omitted to give Russell a notice in writing as required by 184 (3). In 1906 Russell commenced the action to set aside the sale on the grounds (1) that the land was insufficiently described in the assessment roll, and (2) that he did not receive the said notice. Their Lordships held that the defect, if any, in the assessment roll was cured by 3 Edw. VII. c. 86, s. 8, and secondly, that although the Act R.S.O. c. 224, s. 184(3) intended that the notice therein mentioned should be given to the owner, yet Russell could, and did waive it, and that even if he did not, it was "an omission on the part of an official" which was also cured by 3 Edw. VII. c. 86, s. 8; and an alleged defect in the certificate of sale given by the treasurer under s. 193 of the Assessment Act, c. 224, was also in like manner cured. And with regard to the plaintiff's alternative claim to redeem, their Lordships held that the period allowed by 3 Edw. VII. c. 68, s. 8, viz., three months after the passing of that Act, had not been extended by any subsequent legislation, and that therefore the plaintiff's action commenced in 1906 was too late.

POWERS OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE—APPELLATE JURISDICTION
OF SUPREME COURT—R.S.M. c. 110, s. 36, LIMITING RIGHT
OF APPEAL ULTRA VIRES—B. N. A. ACT, 1867, s. 101.

In *Crown Grain Co. v. Day* (1908) A.C. 504, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lord Loreburn, L.C., and Lords Robertson and Atkinson, and Sirs A. Wilson and Elzeer Taschereau) have affirmed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, holding that it is not competent for a provincial legislature to limit the right to appeal to the Supreme Court contrary to any statute of the Dominion giving jurisdiction to that court. The Mechanics' and Wage Earners' Act of Manitoba (R.S.M. c. 110, s. 36) which purports to make the judgment of the King's Bench final and conclusive in actions to enforce mechanics' liens, was therefore declared to be ultra

vires. The important principle therefore seems to be established that the cases in which appeals may be had to the Supreme Court is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament under s. 101 of the B. N. A. Act, 1867, and no provincial legislature can in any way curtail the right of appeal given by any Dominion statute.

POWERS OF PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURES—B. N. A. ACT, 1867, s. 92 (2)—ONTARIO SUCCESSION DUTY ACT (R.S.O. c. 24)—PROVINCIAL TAXATION—PROPERTY OUT OF PROVINCE—ULTRA VIRES.

Woodruff v. Attorney-General (1908) A.C. 508 is an appeal from the decision of the Ontario Court of Appeal in *Attorney-General v. Woodruff*, 15 O.L.R. 416, in which the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Robertson, Atkinson and Collins, and Sir A. Wilson) have made a further contribution to our constitutional law. The action was brought by the Attorney-General of Ontario to recover succession duties on property of a deceased person which, at the time of his death, was situate outside the territorial limits of the province. The case was debated in the court below as turning on the effect of certain settlements made by the deceased of the property in question, and it was not until the present appeal that the point was taken that the local legislature had no power of taxation over property outside the province, and it was on this contention the case ultimately turned, their Lordships holding that under the B. N. A. Act (1867), s. 92 (2) the powers of taxation conferred on the local legislatures is strictly limited to "direct taxation within the province."

TRADE UNION—ACTIONABLE CONSPIRACY—RESOLUTION OF UNION CALLING A STRIKE—MISDIRECTION.

Jose v. Metallic Roofing Co. (1908) A.C. 514. This was an appeal from the decision of the Court of Appeal, 14 O.L.R. 156, in the case of *Metallic Roofing Co. v. Jose*. The action was brought against a trade union for conspiracy in inducing the plaintiff's workmen to strike, and for maliciously combining to injure the plaintiffs, and an injunction and damages were claimed. Certain questions were submitted to the jury and answered by them in favour of the plaintiffs and damages were assessed at \$7,500, but in charging the jury MacMahon, J., in the opinion of the Judicial Committee (Lords Robertson, Atkin-

son, and Collins, and Sir A. Wilson) led the jury to believe that the calling out of the men on strike, by resolutions of the union, if those resolutions were the cause of the strike, was an actionable wrong, without regard to motive and without regard to the conspiracy alleged. This, in their Lordships' opinion, was so material a misdirection as necessitated a new trial of the action which was accordingly ordered.

STREET RAILWAY — REMOVAL OF SNOW FROM TRACKS — IMPLIED OBLIGATION TO REMOVE SNOW FROM STREETS.

Shea v. Reid-Newfoundland Co. (1908) A.C. 520. This was on appeal from the Supreme Court of Newfoundland. The Reid-Newfoundland Co., by s. 42 of their charter, were empowered to remove snow and ice from their railway tracks so as to operate their cars in the streets of the city of St. John, but conditioned upon their levelling the snow and ice on each side of the tracks to a uniform depth to be determined by the city's engineer, and so as not to impede the ordinary traffic of the streets. The point in dispute was whether in the event of its becoming necessary to remove snow from the streets in order to comply with the city engineer's direction as to level, it was the duty of the Reid-Newfoundland Co., or the city itself, to remove it. The courts below had held that it was not the duty of the Reid-Newfoundland Co., because that duty was not expressly imposed on them, but the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Robertson, Atkinson and Collins, and Sir A. Wilson) took the contrary view, and held that the duty of removal rested on the company, and the appeal was accordingly allowed with costs.

BRITISH COLUMBIA—DIVORCE JURISDICTION OF SUPREME COURT OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

In *Watts v. Watts* (1908) A.C. 573 an appeal was brought from the somewhat startling decision of Clement, J., to the effect that the Supreme Court of British Columbia had no jurisdiction in divorce, and notwithstanding that for the last fifty years the court had been acting on the assumption that it had such jurisdiction. By proclamations having the force of law, and British Columbia statutes, the civil laws of England, as they existed on 19th November, 1858, were declared to be in force in that province, and by a proclamation having the force of law, the Supreme Court of British Columbia was constituted

with complete cognizance of all pleas whatsoever, and to have jurisdiction in all cases, civil as well as criminal, arising within the colony of British Columbia. These provisions the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Macnaghten, Atkinson and Collins) held, had the effect of conferring on the colonial court jurisdiction under the English Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, 1857, which came into force on January 11, 1858, and also under the Amending Act, 21 & 22 Vict. c. 108, which came into force on August 2, 1858.

Correspondence.

RE JUDICIAL UTTERANCES.

To the Editor, CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

SIR,—It is to be regretted that persons whose position would give weight to their utterances are not always guarded in their expressions. The other day an alderman of the city of Toronto is reported to have said that the ladies of his native city were largely addicted to drink, because he had been informed by some one that ladies often carried a flask of spirituous liquors to provide for emergency on their journey to the seaside. One would suppose this to be a very reasonable and common precaution, but the injurious statement was published broadcast by one of the leading papers in the Dominion. Of course his remark being made in the course of a temperance lecture may account for his intemperate language, but being a lawyer he ought to have known better.

Such a charge is of course so absurd as only to cause a smile, but occasionally a remark is made from the Bench, which may do serious harm; and one of that character I would venture now to call attention to.

An action against the Canadian Pacific Railway Company recently came before a Divisional Court of Ontario in which the defendants pleaded insufficient notice of the death of the man for whose representatives action was brought. The learned chief justice is reported to have said to the counsel for the company: "This is a very petty defence for a great corporation

like the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to set up. Why don't you fight it out on the merits, and seek to prove that you were not guilty of negligence." To which the counsel is said to have retorted: "Apparently I am not on the popular side of this motion," which elicited from His Lordship the remark: "You are not on the honest side."

If the above report be correct, and it is printed in inverted commas, one is led naturally to consider whether judges are appointed to decide questions of morals or points of law. With due respect to the learned chief justice, I would venture to suggest that as the company had a perfect right under the statute to raise this defence, it was not his province to discuss it from a purely moral or ethical standpoint. The company had the right to make this defence, and whether it was meritorious under the circumstances was not in question. If the judge thought such an enactment was undesirable it would be quite proper for him to make a suggestion to that effect in the proper quarter, or he might descend from the Bench and seek a repeal of the provision on the floor of the House of Assembly. But the real harmfulness of such a remark is, perhaps, made apparent by what seems to underlie the retort of the counsel. If it all means that the din of popular clamour against rich corporations, unconsciously of course, could affect the judicial mind, it is something to be guarded against. There is too much attention paid in these days to popular clamour. "Vox populi" is not "vox Dei."

ONLOOKER.

[Our readers can form an opinion of this matter as well as we can. We therefore make no comment, except to say that possibly our valued correspondent makes too much of the matter; and further, that, as to that part of the letter which takes exception to judges seeking to take the place of legislators and over-riding Acts of Parliament by judge-made laws to meet hard cases (which is, I presume, what our correspondent means), we would refer to the weighty words of Mr. Justice Meredith, J.A., in the case of *Johnston v. Dominion of Canada Guarantee and Accident Ins. Co.* (post infra). They are much in point.—
EDITOR, C.L.J.]

 REPORTS AND NOTES OF CASES.

 Province of Ontario.

 COURT OF APPEAL.

Full Court.] FOX v. CORNWALL STREET RY. CO. [Nov. 10.

Duty as to highways—Municipality or company—Rails flush with street—Wearing down of highway.

This was an appeal by the plaintiff from the judgment of ANGLIN, J. (ante, p. 159). He had held that the municipality was liable for damages sustained owing to the wearing down of that portion of the highway adjacent; but his attention was not called on that occasion to R.S.O. 1897, c. 208, s. 23, which provides that unless otherwise agreed upon between the company and the municipality, the company shall at their own expense keep clean and in proper repair the streets between the rails and for 18 inches on each side of the rails.

Held, that as the accident was evidently caused by the defendants' neglect of their obligation in this respect, and the plaintiff was therefore entitled to judgment.

Appeal allowed.

G. I. Gogo, for plaintiff. *Middleton, K.C.*, and *C. H. Cline*, for defendants.

Full Court.] [Nov. 10.

JOHNSTON v. DOMINION OF CANADA GUARANTEE & ACCIDENT
INS. CO.

Accident insurance—Conditions of policy—Affirmative proof of death—Notice of death—Time—Waiver—Forfeiture.

This was an appeal by the defendants from the judgment of BOYD, C. The action was brought under a contract in an accident insurance policy in favour of deceased and his representatives. One of the terms of the policy was that immediate written notice of any "accident or injury" should be given to the insurers at Toronto; and another was that unless "affirmative proof" of death should be so furnished within 13 months no

claim based thereon should be valid. There was no breach of the first condition, but there was of the second; and, in respect of this, the defendants claimed immunity from liability. It was, however, contended that the notice of "accident and injury," which, under the terms of the policy, was to be an immediate written notice, was also the "affirmative proof of death," which, if not furnished, "within 13 months from the time of such accident" was to make the claim invalid.

Held, that this notice did not satisfy the second requirement as to "affirmative proof" of death within 13 months. One thing was to be done immediately, the other, a very different one, was to be done within 13 months. If the one or the other were the same it was not necessary to give different periods within which each was to be done and provide for the doing of different things in each.

MEREDITH, J.A., who delivered the judgment of the court said: "There is, in my opinion, no reasonable evidence of any waiver of this condition. The correspondence regarding the proofs began with a distinct statement by the appellants that it was without prejudice, and throughout, with the exception of one letter, this position was expressly declared and maintained. We ought not to strain at every gnat in the insurers' way, and swallow every sort of camel that stands in the insured's way, to success in an action such as this.

The agreement which the parties chose to make must be held binding upon them, and upon each, respectively, alike, in the absence of any ground of legal or statutable defence, or of equitable relief such as fraud or mistake. I am quite unaware of any ground, statutable or otherwise, for making a new contract between the parties by eliminating the condition in question, and giving relief upon the contract in question thus emasculated. To treat the condition as a forfeiture which any court can, in its discretion, ignore, would be to create a revolution in the law of contracts of insurance; and it would be an extraordinary thing that it should be left until this late day to discover that the courts had such power. A condition requiring proof of loss under a contract of insurance is a reasonable, and almost, if not quite, a universal one; and one which is necessary for the prevention of fraud as well as for the speedy adjustment and payment of claims. The legislature has taken great pains to regulate contracts of insurance and to prevent unjust and unreasonable conditions being imposed; but has not prohibited conditions requir-

ing proofs of loss; on the contrary, it has fully recognized the need of such proofs, and made provisions respecting them. We must look to such legislation for any relief, such as the respondent seeks, from conditions such as that in question. It would, in my opinion, be legislation, not adjudication, to extend its provisions to analogous cases; and, if it were not, it would be difficult to find a case provided for in such legislation analogous to this so as to justify any such method of dealing with this case. It is impossible for me to think that s. 57 of the Judicature Act is applicable to such a case as this, to think that it gives to any judge power to—to use the words of a late eminent Master of the Rolls—"to run his pen through that part of the contract": see *Eastern, etc., Co. v. Dent*, [1899] 1 Q.B. 835, and *Barrow v. Isaacs*, [1891] 1 Q.B. 417. To borrow again the words of a very eminent judge, to give relief in this fashion would be "taking a prodigious liberty with a contract."

J. A. McIntosh, for plaintiff. *Blackstock*, for defendants.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Cartwright, Master.]

[Oct. 27.

SOVEREIGN BANK v. WILSON.

Summary judgment—Rule 603—Action by assignee of chose in action—Defence.

This was a motion by plaintiff for a summary judgment under Rule 603 in an action to recover \$642.21, the amount of an account for goods sold and delivered to the defendants by the former receivers and managers of the Imperial Paper Mills, duly assigned to plaintiff.

Held, that the defence disclosed in the affidavits in answer to the motion does not differ in substance from that set up in *Sovereign Bank v. Parsons*, not reported. In that case it was said by the Divisional Court: "If the receiver is personally liable for the price of the goods supplied for the purposes of his receivership, it follows that he must be personally responsible for breach of the contract entered into by him." (See *Burt v. Bull* (1895) 1 Q.B. 276.) In the *Parsons Case* the defence was first set up by way of counterclaim. This, it was decided by MEREDITH, C.J., could not be done, and the Divisional Court held

that it was not available as a defence, even if the action had been brought by the Imperial Paper Mills. That being so judgment must go as asked.

Boland, for plaintiff. *Grayson Smith*, for defendants.

Falconbridge, C.J.K.B., Britton, J., Riddell, J.] [Nov. 12.

HIGGINS v. CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. CO.

Railway—Animals killed on track—Sheep going from owner's field into a neighbour's field adjoining the railway track—Fences and gates.

This was an appeal by the defendants from the judgment of the judge of the County Court of the County of Simcoe awarding damages to the plaintiff in an action for the loss of sheep killed on the defendants' railway line. The plaintiff had a flock of sheep on his farm which escaped out of the field in which they were enclosed into a field in the farm of a neighbour, through which ran the line of the defendants' railway. By a verbal agreement between these farmers the gate between the neighbour's field and the railway line was raised about 2 feet from the ground. It was probable that it was under this gate that the sheep made their way to the track. There was no proof of negligence or wilful act of omission on the part of the owner of the sheep (see s. 294) (4) of R.S.C. c. 37). This section provides that when any cattle or sheep at large, whether upon the highway or not, get upon the property of the company and are killed by a train, the owner of such animal so killed shall, except in the cases otherwise provided for by the next following section, be entitled to recover the amount of such loss from the company, unless the company establishes that such animal got at large through the negligence or wilful act or omission of the owner or his agent or of the custodian of such animal or his agent.

On behalf of the defendants it was contended that the sheep did not come within the meaning of the words "sheep at large," and that the right, if any, of the plaintiff must be under s. 254; and, consequently, that his rights were no higher than those of his neighbour through whose field the sheep escaped, and that the latter could not claim, for the reason that the defect was due to the verbal agreement between the parties. Under s. 254 the railway must erect and maintain cattle-guards on each side of the railway at the crossing and turn the fences into the cattle-guards,

the fences and cattle-guards being suitable and sufficient to prevent cattle and other animals from getting off the highways on to the railway.

Held, that the railway company having neglected the provisions of the above section and the animals having from such neglect got upon the railway and were killed, the railway company was liable; and it made no difference in this liability that the cattle had strayed through the lands of an adjoining owner.

Creswicke, K.C., for plaintiff. *Shirley Denison*, for defendants.

Province of Nova Scotia.

SUPREME COURT.

Full Court.]

[Nov. 17.

SUTHERLAND v. GRAND COUNCIL OF PROVINCIAL WORKMEN'S ASSOCIATION.

Injunction—Discretion of judge refusing not reviewed—Corporate funds and business.

After the commencement of their action plaintiffs applied to a judge of the court for an interim injunction to restrain defendant corporation from carrying on business or dealing with the corporate funds pending the trial of the action. The grounds, supported by a number of affidavits, were (1) that certain persons appointed to office in the council were not persons who under the rules of the Association were qualified to hold office, and (2) that certain lodges of the Association were not properly represented at the meeting of council at which such officials were appointed.

The learned judge dismissed the application with costs, holding that the legality of the appointment of the officials in question should not be decided against defendants on an interlocutory application, and that it was not necessary to decide the rights of the lodges to representation at the meeting at which the appointments were made, it not being shewn that any different results would have followed; and also that to grant the injunction would have the effect of preventing the defendant corporation from doing business or carrying on its

affairs, and the case was not one in which the court, in the exercise of its discretion, on the evidence before it, should before trial interfere with the business of the defendant corporation or its funds.

The court dismissed plaintiff's appeal, holding that there was no reason for interfering with the discretion of the learned judge appealed from.

Harrington, in support of appeal. *Mellish*, K.C., contra.

Full Court.] NICHOLLS v. RAWDING. [Nov. 21.

Municipal election petition—Security—Removal of objection by deposit of cash—Construction of statute word “insufficient.”

The Nova Scotia Municipal and Town Controverted Elections Act, R.S. (1900) c. 72, s. 7(c) provides that “At the time of the presentation of the petition, or within three days afterwards, security shall be given on behalf of the petitioner for the payment of all costs, charges and expenses that may become payable by the petitioner, etc.” It is provided by s. 9(1), “. . . If an objection to the security is allowed it shall be lawful for the petitioner within a further prescribed time . . . to remove such objection by a deposit in the prescribed manner of such sum of money as is deemed by the judge to make the security sufficient.” There was a motion in this case to dismiss the petition, chiefly on the ground that the recognizance filed by petitioner was taken before a commissioner of the Supreme and County Courts, who had no authority to take the same, and the judge of the County Court while sustaining the objection as to the authority of the commissioner declined to hold the security absolutely void and permitted the petitioner to remove the objection by making a cash deposit as provided by s. 9 (1) quoted above.

Held, per TOWNSHEND, C.J., GRAHAM, E.J., and MEAGHER, J., that he was right in doing so and that respondent's appeal must be dismissed.

Held, also, that the word “insufficient,” in the Nova Scotia Act, applies as well to a security wrong in point of form or irregularly or insufficiently entered into, as it does to the amount of it or the sufficiency of the sureties or any other objection of that kind, and that this construction is sustained by the omission from the Nova Scotia Act of the words in the Eng-

lish Act from which it is copied which specially define the objections which may be taken.

DRYSDALE and LAURANCE, JJ., dissented, holding that as no valid security was given within the time prescribed by the Act, the objection could not be cured by a deposit of cash subsequently made.

Mellish, K.C., for appellant. *Milner*, for respondent.

Province of Manitoba.

COURT OF APPEAL.

Full Court.] RE NORTH CYPRESS. [Oct. 20.

Liquor License Act—Local option by-law—Receipt of petition by municipal council.

Application for mandamus to compel the council of the rural municipality of North Cypress to submit a local option by-law to a vote of the electors under s. 62 of the Liquor License Act, R.S.M. 1902, c. 101, as amended by s. 2 of c. 26 of 7 & 8 Edw. VII. A petition duly signed has been sent in to the clerk of the municipality before the first day of October, but it had not been presented to or received by the council as there had been no session until after that date.

Held, that the receipt by the clerk of the petition was not a receiving of the same by the council within the meaning of the statute and that the judge appealed from was right in refusing a mandamus.

E. L. Taylor, for applicants. *A. J. Andrews*, for license holders.

KING'S BENCH.

Mathers, J.] MORDARSON v. JONES. [Oct. 20.

Assignment for creditors—Lien of execution creditor for costs when assignment made after execution placed in sheriff's hands.

After the plaintiff's writ of fieri facias had been placed in

the sheriff's hands, but before the goods in question had been actually seized the defendant made an assignment for the benefit of his creditors under the Assignments Act, R.S.M. 1902, c. 8. The sheriff refused to withdraw from possession of the goods except upon payment to him of his own and the plaintiff's costs, and the assignee obtained an order from the referee requiring the sheriff to withdraw without such payment.

Held, on appeal, that under s. 11 of the Executions Act, R.S.M. 1902, c. 58, the plaintiff had acquired a lien on the goods for his costs, which was not taken away, but, on the contrary, expressly recognized by ss. 8 and 9 of the Assignments Act, and that the appeal should be allowed with costs and the application of the assignee dismissed with costs.

Gillard v. Milligan, 28 O.R. 645; *Ryan v. Clarkson*, 17 S.C.R. 251, followed.

Howell, for the sheriff. *Hanneson*, for the plaintiff. *Monkman*, for the assignee.

Macedonald, J.]

HILL v. ROWE.

[Oct. 23.

Sale of land—Agreement to purchase on fixed date at option of vendor—Time, whether of the essence of the contract.

In consideration of the plaintiff purchasing an interest in certain lands and paying \$500 on account, the defendant signed an agreement that he would purchase the plaintiff's interest for the sum of \$600, if the latter desired to dispose of it on the 1st day of December, 1907. That day was a Sunday and the plaintiff was away from home until the 4th of December, when he at once notified the defendant that he wanted the agreement carried out. The defendant did not then repudiate the agreement, but asked the plaintiff to call again, saying that he had not the money just then. He afterwards refused to carry out the agreement and claimed that the plaintiff was bound to come on the very day fixed by the contract.

Held, that the circumstances shewed that it was never intended that time was to be the essence of the contract, that the plaintiff had made his demand within a reasonable time and that he was entitled to a verdict for the \$600 and costs.

Monahan, for plaintiff. *Dysart* and *Wemyss*, for defendant.

Cameron, J.]

MORICE v. KERNIGHAN.

[Oct. 28.]

Sale of land—Liability of purchaser to pay off mortgage—Implied covenants—Assignability of right to indemnity.

W. by a transfer under the Real Property Act, R.S.M. 1902, c. 148, conveyed to the defendants the lands in question, expressly subject to two mortgages, one of which had been made by her to the plaintiff. On the same day an agreement was executed by W. and the defendants in which it was recited that the defendants had assumed the payment of the two mortgages mentioned. W. afterwards assigned to the plaintiff any claims she had against the defendants in law or equity and all her "rights to indemnity against any person or persons under any implied covenants in any transfer given" by her to the defendants.

Held, that the plaintiff could sue the defendants upon the covenant to indemnify set forth in s. 89 of the Real Property Act, which had been effectively assigned to the plaintiff and was entitled to recover the amount of his mortgage from the defendants.

O'Connor and Blackwood, for plaintiff. *Hudson and Garland*, for defendants.

Province of British Columbia.

SUPREME COURT.

Clement, J.]

REX v. PERTELLA.

[Nov. 6.]

REX v. LEE CHUNG.

Criminal law—Charge to jury—Exception to—When to be taken—Application for a case stated—Crim. Code, ss. 1014, 1021.

After verdict, but before sentence, it is too late to move for a reserved case.

Sec. 1014, sub-s. 2, of the Code, provides that the court before which any person is tried may, either during or after the trial, reserve any question of law arising either on the trial, or on any proceedings preliminary, subsequent or incidental thereto, or arising out of the direction of the judge, for the opinion of the Court of Appeal.

Held, that this means that any reservation of a case after verdict must be of the court's own motion.

A. D. Taylor, K.C., for the Crown. Farris, for Lee Chung Woods, for Pertella.

Full Court.] WILLIAMS v. HAMILTON. [Nov. 12.]

Vendor and purchaser—Contract for sale of land—Offer—Acceptance—Correspondence.

Judgment of HUNTER, C.J., affirmed on appeal. [Noted, ante, p. 86.]

Full Court.] ENTWISLE v. LENZ & LEISER. [Nov. 13.]

Statutes, construction of—Judgments Act, Stat. 1908, c. 26, s. 3, Stat. 1906, c. 23, s. 74—Execution debtor—Dry legal trustee.

Execution creditors, in April, 1907, registered their judgment against the lands of the judgment debtor, pursuant to the Judgments Act. Previous to this, in January, 1906, the debtor conveyed a certain lot to plaintiff, who neglected, through ignorance of s. 74 of Land Registry Act, to register his conveyance until August, 1907, when he found this judgment registered against the lot. In an action to set aside this cloud upon his title, the learned trial judge ruled that s. 74 of the Land Registry Act, making registration of conveyances a sine qua non to the passing of any interest, legal or equitable, to lands, governed.

Held, on appeal, that the Judgments Act gives the creditor only the interest in lands possessed by the judgment debtor, and that in this case the debtor having conveyed the land so long before the execution creditors' judgment was obtained, was a dry trustee of the land for the plaintiff.

S. S. Taylor, K.C., for appellant (plaintiff). Higgins, for respondents (defendants).

Bench and Bar.

Duncan Finlayson, of Arichat, Nova Scotia, barrister-at-law, to be judge of the County Court of District No. 7, comprising the counties of Cape Breton, Victoria and Richmond, in that province, in the room and stead of His Honour Daniel D. McKenzie, resigned.

ANALYTICAL INDEX

OF THE CONTENTS OF THIS VOLUME.

Absconding debtor—

Priority of payment as against attachers, 705

Acceleration clause—

See Mortgage—Vendor and purchaser.

Accident—

See Electricity—Negligence.

Action—

For trespass causing bankruptcy, 227

Cause of action passing to trustee, 227

For interference with contractual relations, 278

Frivolous—New consideration—Gambling debt, 345

Staying—Practice—Cause of arising out of jurisdiction, 349

Maintenance—Common interest—Trade rivals, 452

Covenant of indemnity—Assignment of, 867

See Debtor and creditor.

Administration—

Executor's accounts—Judge's discretion, 157

Fraud—Mistake—Rebates—Costs, 157

Ad colligenda bona—Liability for rent, 197

Breach of trust—Account, 482

Debt barred by statute—Residuary legatee, 433

Gift of share of residue to debtor, whose debt not due, 526

Real assets—Purchase for value from devise in trust, 610

Bond—Duration of sureties' liability, 618

Power of sale in trustee under will, 628

See Succession duty.

Admiralty—

See Maritime law.

Adulteration—

See Provincial Health Act.

Agent—

See Principal and agent.

Air—

See Easement.

Alberta, Province of—

Sketch of law making in, 713

Alimony—

Agreement as to payment of—Construction, 749

Amendment—

Practice, 75, 303

Ancient light—

Alteration of building—New windows, 24
Enjoyment—Consent or agreement, 25, 222

Annuity—

See Tenant for life.

Appeal—

To Privy Council,
Special leave—Colonial statute, 31, 535, 775
In criminal case, 537
Cross appeal nunc pro tunc, 537
As to costs, 776

To Supreme Court,
None from order of judges fixing day of trial, 65
Alternative relief, 461
Criminal law—Application "during trial," 461
Consolidating two appeals, 745
Provincial legislature cannot limit right of appeal to Supreme Court contrary to Dominion statute, 778

To Court of Appeal, Ontario,
Judgment at trial affirmed by Divisional Court—Security for costs, 311
From county judge—Jurisdiction, 544, 545
Question of general interest—Traction engines on highways, 741

To Divisional Court, Ontario,
Appeal from Division Court—Extending time, 313

To judge in chambers—No jurisdiction—Court of Appeal, 544, 545

Under Water Clauses Act (B. C.), 87

Issue of fact—Refusal to interfere, 44

Meaning of "judgment finally recovered," 201

See Costs—Constitutional law—Criminal law.

Appointment, power of—

By document not provable at a will, 303
Invalid execution of, 303
Partial exercise of, 304
Special formalities—Non-compliance with, 352
General testamentary power—Execution of—Express reference to power, 734

Appropriation of payments—

Marshalling assets, 548

Arbitration—

Award not made in time, 318
When arbitrator functus officio, 318, 323
Costs—Fees to arbitration, counsel and expert witnesses, 438
See Friendly society—Workmen's Compensation Act.

Assault—

See Schoolmaster.

Assessment—

Toll bridge over navigable waters, 39
 "Real property" includes an easement, 39
 Land covered by water—Excavation for piling, 237
See Taxation—Tax sale.

Assignments and preferences—

Chattel mortgage—Priorities, 510
 Lien of execution creditor for costs, 789
See Fraudulent conveyance—Insolvency.

Attachment—

See Absconding debtor.

Attachment of debts—

Tort—Garnishing order before judgment, 467
 Meaning of "claim and demand," 468
 Informal promissory note, but negotiable, 629

Attorney-General—

Adding as party plaintiff, 303, 579

Automobile—

See Motor car.

Banks and banking—

Overdrawn account—Collateral securities—Transfer to third person, 204
 Compound interest—Right to, 204
 Security on stock of trading company—Assignment of, to guarantor,
 282
 Assignment of lease to bank—Right to carry on business, 542
See Cheque—Company—Forgery.

Bankruptcy—

See Action—Insolvency.

Bench and Bar—

Mr. Justice Longley, 1
 King's counsel in Ontario—Recent appointments criticised, 49, 62
 Mr. Justice Cameron, 54, 88
 Sir T. W. Taylor, 88
 Death of Mr. Justice Killam, 129, 172, 247
 Professional ethics, 131
 Death of Mr. Justice Burbidge, 141
 The Bench in British Columbia, 173
 Exchequer Court—Appointment of Mr. Cassels as judge, 193, 208
 Railway board—Appointment of Mr. Justice Mabee as Chief, 209
 Memorial of late Christopher Robinson, K.C., 210
 Election of Benchers of Law Society, 211
 The Exchequer Court and Royal Commissions, 289, 307
 Interference with proper functions of the judiciary, 289
 Answering legal questions in newspapers, 302
 Mr. Justice Latchford, 329, 367
 British Columbia—Not enough judges, 450

Bench and Bar—Continued.

- Birth-day honours to judges, 478
- Law Clerk of the House of Commons, 564
- Damnation of the modern Bar, 567
- Quebec judicial appointments, 592
- Personel of British cabinet, 592
- Lawyers' fees discussed, 603
- Uniformity of decision in courts, 655
- Prompt disposition of cases by judges—Suggestion for, 732
- Reports and reporting, 739
- Death of Mr. Justice Mathew, 773
- Judicial utterances, 781
- See Judicial appointments.

Benevolent society—

- Certificate of, not liable to succession duty, 314

Bills of Exchange Act—

- See Bills and notes.

Bills of lading—

- Rules as to, by Railway Commissioners, 335

Bill of sale—

- See Chattel mortgage.

Bills and notes—

- Bills of Exchange Act—Fictitious person, 195
- Interest payable by instalments—Overdue note, 202
- Transfer for value—Constructive notice, 202
- Endorsement by way of security, 230
- Irregularity on face of—Rights of prior endorser, 230
- Presentment for payment—Pleading, 437
- Material alteration—Forgery—Assent—Partnership action, 539
- Holder in due course, 564
- Informal, but negotiable, 629
- See Cheque—Company—Debtor and creditor.

Biography—

- Use of information contained in letters for writing—Injunction, 59

Bona vacantia—

- See Company.

Bond—

- See Fidelity bond.

Book reviews—

- Beven on Negligence, 47
- The Criminal Code and law of criminal evidence, by W. J. Tremear, 48, 440
- Phippison's Manual of Evidence, 167
- Student's guide to Roman law, 168

Book reviews—Continued.

- New guide to the British Bar, 168
- Martin's Mining and Water cases of British Columbia, 168
- Principles of Company law, 168
- Theobald on Wills, 326
- Stone's Justices' Manual, 327
- Devolution of Real Estate, by Robbins & Maw, 327
- Dowell's Income Tax law, 327
- Roscoe's Criminal Evidence, 365
- Fraser on Torts, 365
- Topham on Real Property, 590
- Thomas on Constitutional law, 591
- Phillipson on International law, 591
- Analysis of Williams on Real Property, 591
- Parker's Company law, 669
- Beynon Harris on Tenders, 669
- Dacey on Conflicts of Laws, 670
- Edmunds and Bentwich on Copyright, 670
- Law reports annotated, 671
- The Drainage Acts of Ontario, by Frank E. Proctor,

Breach of promise—

See Marriage.

Bribery—

Proposed legislation as to, 133

Bridge—

See Ferry.

British Columbia—

- Powers of local legislature, 31
- The Bench in—Friction, 173
- Procedure Act—Petition of right, 775
- Divorce jurisdiction in, 780

B. N. A. Act—

- Powers of local legislatures, 31, 234
- Railway Act—Meaning of "person," 234

Broker—

See Stock broker.

Burbidge, Mr. Justice—

Notice of his death, 141

Burials—

Evil of premature—Suggestions, 212

Ca. sa.—

Omission in recital in writ, 666

Canada Temperance Act—

Search warrant, 34, 71
 Attachment for costs, 71
 Appeal—Computation of time, 118

Cassels, Mr. Justice—

Appointment to Exchequer Court, 193, 208

Champerty—

Agreement to assist—Consideration, 43

Charity—

Charitable or immigration uses, 350
 Bequest to—Ejusdem generis, 457

Chattel mortgage—

Renewal—Time for filing, 38
 Good as to part and bad as to part of lands, 502
 After acquired goods, 710
 Purchase subject to liabilities—Estoppel, 710
 Extension of time for registration, 124
See Bills of sale.

Cheque—

Forged endorsement—Fictitious payee, 195, 534
 Countermand. payment of—Notice, 232, 316
 Consideration for—Part payment under unenforceable contract, 238
 Negligence of bank—Payment by mistake—Laches, 538
 Transfer of—Property in, 620
See Bills and notes.

Children—

See Cruelty—Infant.

Chinese Immigration Act—

Non-payment of duty not a criminal offence, 43

Chose in action—

Assignment of book debts to creditor—Notice not given to debtors,
 620

Collection Act, Nova Scotia—

Rights of assignees, 546

Colonial Legislatures—

Validity of standing orders suspending member for crime, 776

Commission—

Meaning of "completion of sale," 323, 589
 Sale by principal to purchaser concealing work done by agent, 503
 Quantum meruit, 550
 Payable as long as customer "does business"—Death of contractee, 612
See Principal and agent.

Commission, royal—*See* Royal commission.**Commission to take evidence—**

Material on application for, 583

Company—

Extra provincial companies—Operations beyond province—Fire insurance—Constitutional law, 66, 249

Right as to illegal contracts, 125

Conflict between federal and local legislatures as to incorporation and control of companies, 249

Prospectus—Misrepresentation—Sale of shares, 491

Promoter—Fiduciary relation of, 729

Directors—Why not abolish—Defects and dangers of present conditions, 7

Liability for false prospectus, 58, 491

As to allotment of shares, 573

Qualification shares held in trust—Rights of cestui que trust, 146

Acts of, when some disqualified, 285

Election of, without ballot, 285

Acting separately and concurring but not at a meeting, 625

Debentures—Action on—Receiver—Debts incurred by without authority—Priorities, 25

Floating security—Subsequent issue—Priority, 453

Debenture not in default when action commenced, 526

Payment of debt for which issued—Re-issue, 57

Shares—Sale of by president, 127, 491

Note given for purchase of, 127, 240

Allotment of, 127, 240, 572, 573

Lien on for debt due company, 245

Waiver of—Estoppel, 245

Calls on—Allotment, 285

Transfer of—Personation of holder—Forgery—Liability of broker, 488

Prospectus—Misrepresentations—Sale through broker, 491

Meetings—Notice of business at—Shareholders, 147

Contract by, without seal, by-law or resolution binding, 625

Dividend—Paying out of capital, 94

Shareholders—Rights of minority, 339

Power of, to give guarantee, 161

Hypothecation of securities—By-law, 240

Dissolution of—Effect of, on its property—Bona vacantia, 272

Reconstruction—Sale to new company for partially paid shares, 480

Or voluntary winding up, 481

Liability of, for costs of procuring Act of incorporation, 548

Winding up—Contributory—Assignment to escape liability, 149

Agreement with company after subscription, 246

Lien under *fi. fa.* after commencement of winding up, 286

Application for direction as to fraudulent acts, 361

See Public service companies.**Compulsory taking—***See* Expropriation.**Conditional sale—***See* Sale of goods.

Consideration—

See Contract—Gaming.

Constabulary—

A rural, advocated, 601

Constitutional law—

Local legislatures—Powers of—*See* Provincial legislatures.

Disallowance of Provincial Act, 450, 553, 657

Taxing incomes of officials of Dominion Government, 659

See Company—Crown—Railway—Immigration—Provincial Health Act.

Contempt of court—

Release on payment of costs, 45

Suggested legislation as to, 270

Contract—

Implied obligation for quiet enjoyment—Noise, 33

Cancelling—Assigns of lessee, 67

False representation—Equitable relief, 77

Performance prevented by fire—Effect of accepting insurance money, 84

Penalty or liquidated damages, 121

Consideration—Offer of newspaper to give advice—Liability, 231

Damages—Remoteness, 231

Unenforceable—Verbal—Statute of Frauds, 163, 238

Part payment under, 238

Evidence to vary—Term omitted—Rectification, 509

Oral testimony—Book entries, 588

Inducing dealer to commit breach of—Fraud, 278

Default in contracts—Recent decisions, 298, 355, 429

Not to trade within certain limits, 350

Absolute or conditional—Share of profits, 433

Contractor's bondsmen—Ultra vires, 552

Cost of generating light, 578

Avoiding for drunkenness, 592

Not in terms of by-law authorizing it—Illegality, 621

Sale of timber—Right of removal—Time, 694

Ascertainable only from words and acts of parties, 709

Lease of oil rights—Condition—Time of commencement, 743

For services—Construction, 748

Negotiations—Incompleteness—Acceptance, 750

Surrounding circumstances—Extrinsic evidence, 751

See Derogation from grant—Vendor and purchaser.

Conviction—

For doing "an unlawful act," 708

Copyright—

Amendment to act, 216

Assignment to intended company—Registration, 305

Foreign musical composition, 305, 571

Unauthorized performance at home, 305, 571

Unpublished picture—Common law right of owner, 352

Correspondence—

- Trial by newspaper, 61
- Re Ontario K.C. list, 62
- Priority of wage-earners, 108
- Mr. Justice Cassels and commissions, 307
- Judicial arithmetic, 354
- Default in contracts, 355
- Reports and reporting, 739
- Re judicial utterances, 781

Corroboration—

- Claim against estate of deceased, 748

Costs—

- Suggested reform as to law of, 761
- Successful party—Depriving of—Good cause, 88
- Counsel retained contrary to client's instructions, 225
- Bill of—Form—Solicitor's act, 277, 532
- Counsel fees not actually paid, 576
- Taxation after payment—Liability of third party, 451, 774
- Injunction—Interlocutory motion, 547
- Appeal to Privy Council—Execution—Stay—Set-off, 743
- Verdict in Superior Court action for amount in County Court jurisdiction—Pending litigation, 747
- Suit defended by Crown, 750
- Lien for—*See* Assignments and preferences.
- See* Arbitration—Crown—Security for costs.

County court—

- Manitoba—
 - Jurisdiction, 629
- British Columbia—
 - Taxation—Scale, 167
 - Woodman's lien for wages, 325
 - Official Administrators Act, 512

Covenant running with land—

- New style of, 605
- Discussion on the law as to, 699
- See* Landlord and tenant.

Criminal law—

- Dying declaration—Threats, 37
- Crown case—Reserving, 42
- Confession obtained by trick—Pretence that, detective acting for prisoner's counsel, 242
- Halifax charter—Jurisdiction, 358, 570
- Criminal appeals in England, 443
- Juvenile Delinquents Act, 445, 446
- Prevention of crime, English Act, 446
- Judge withdrawing from jury verdict for lesser offence, 471
- Record of trial in police court not produced, 494
- Concealing with intent to escape from prison, 511
- Striking out plea of guilty, 511
- Evidence of accomplice—Corroboration, 615
- Judge omitting to caution jury, 615

Criminal law—Continued.

Idle and disorderly person, 632
 Officer must disclose his authority before examining prisoner, 632
 Information charging the "doing of an unlawful act," 746
 Reserved cases—Charge to prove—Time to move for case, 791
*See Appeal—Conviction—False pretences—Flogging—Gaming and
 wagering—Incest—Larceny—Liquor License Act—Manslaughter—
 Perjury—Riot—Speedy trial—Summary conviction—
 Summary trial—Vagrancy—Weights and measures.*

Cruelty—

To children—Neglect of father, 484

Cromer, Lord—

His book on modern Egypt, 269

Crops—

Destroyed by sparks from engine, 619
 Marsh hay is "crops" within Railway Act, 619

Crown—

Prerogative of, 200
 Dominion of—Floatable streams, 201
 Rights and liabilities as to costs, 631
See Costs—Public works.

Cumulative legacies—

Law as to discussed, 336

Damages—

Measure of remoteness, 231, 233, 328, 615

Death—

Compensation, 248
 Proof of, 733

Debtor and creditor—

Acceptance of note for debt, 272
 Agreement not to sue, 272

Deceit—

Action for—Contract—Principal and agent, 26
 Damages—Liability to make representations good, 78, 79
 Misrepresentation as to future event, 243
See Insurance, life.

Debt—

Assignment of—Notice, 41

Deed—

Description ambiguous—User—Evidence, 27
 Misdescription—Statute of Frauds, 582
 Delivery—Presumption, 75

Deed—Continued.

Misrepresentation as to contents—Plea of non est fac.am. 142
Conveyance of same land to two purchasers—Fraud—Priorities, 384
See Easement—Vendor and purchaser.

Defamation—

See Libel and slander.

Demurrage—

See Maritime law.

Dentist's register—

Removal of name from, for misconduct, 200

Derogation from grant—

Air—Easement, 224
Quiet enjoyment—Implied contract, 456

Description—

See Deed.

Devolution of estates—

Defective legislation, 332

Directors—

See Company.

Disallowance of Provincial Acts—

The right of considered, 553, 657

Discontinuance—

Terms—No action to be brought, 116

Discovery—

Marine insurance—Ship's papers, 452
Practice in, 471, 607
Inspection of books, 486
Officer of foreign company, 498
Refusal by one partner to make—Jurisdiction, 576
Examining officer of company before examination of another officer
concluded, 744
See Libel and slander.

Distress—

See Landlord and tenant.

Disorderly house—

What constitutes, 86

Dividends—

See Company.

Division Court—

Appeal to Divisional Court—Extension of time, 313

Divorce—

Recent decision as to in British Columbia, 23, 780
 Stare decisis—Jurisdiction of Supreme Court, 46
See Marriage—Supreme Court.

Dog—

Keeping a savage—Servant causing dog to bite—Liability of master, 531, 737

Domicile—

Acquiring a foreign, 126

Drainage—

Nuisance—Statutory powers, 733

Dying declaration—

Evidence—Threats, 37

Easement—

Dominant and servient tenement—Extinguishment, 195
 Air—Derogation from grant, 224
 Use of land in common with others, 434
 Appurtenant—Fire escape, 434
 Party wall—Damage by smoke, 455
 Lost grant, 707
See Ancient light—Light—Right of way—Statute of Limitations.

Editorials—

Hon. Mr. Justice Loughley, 1
 Codification of the laws of England, 3
 Why not abolish directors? 6
 The Royal Arms and the courts, 23
 King's Counsel in Ontario, 43, 106
 Changes in railway legislation, 52
 Sundays and non-judicial days, 53
 Modern journalism, 55
 Nisi prius procedure, 56
 Law reform in Ontario, 89, 134, 560, 651, 681, 761
 Paying dividends out of capital, 94
 Death of Hon. Mr. Justice Killam, 129
 Professional ethics, 131
 Amendments of law regarding bribery, 133
 Newspaper ignorance of legal matters, 135
 Some recent criticisms on real property statutes, 136
 Master and servant—Hiring by the month, 139
 Death of Mr. Justice Burbidge, 141
 The Board of Railway Commissioners, 199, 209, 600
 The Bench in British Columbia, 173
 Permissive waste by tenants for life or years, 175
 New judge of the Exchequer Court, 193
 Memorial of the late Christopher Robinson, K.C., 210

Editorials—Continued.

- Election of Benchers in Ontario, 211
- Premature burials, 212
- No equities as between rouges, 213
- The crime of perjury, 215, 296
- Amendment to Copyright Act, 216
- Conflict of control of corporations, 249
- Breach of promise of marriage, 267
- Administration of justice to foreigners, 268
- Lord Cromer and modern Egypt, 269
- The Exchequer Courts and Royal Commissions, 289
- The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 292
- Default in contract, 298, 429
- Answering legal questions in newspapers, 302
- Hon. Mr. Justice Latchford, 329
- Workmen's lien—Defective drafting of statute, 329
- Devolution of Estates Act, 332
- Sunday observance and golf, 333
- Bills of lading and the Railway Board, 335
- The law as to railway sleeping berths, 338
- What persons are within the purview of statutes affecting the enforcement of claims for services, 369
- Amendment to the Exchequer Court Act, 428
- Flogging as a punishment, 441
- Criminal appeals in Ontario, 443
- Juvenile Delinquents Act, 445
- The prevention of crime, 446
- The crime of suicide, 473
- Persons taking the law into their own hands, 477.
- Jurisdiction of police magistrates, 478
- Liability for misrepresentation, 513
- Law clerk of the House of Commons, 524, 564
- The right of disallowance, 657
- The advantages of ignorance, 663
- Bills and notes—Holder in due course, 564
- Castles in the air—*Iredale v. Loudon*, 593
- A rural constabulary, 601
- Lawyers' fees, 603
- Covenants running with land, 605
- The revocation of treaty privileges to alien subjects, 633
- Uniformity of decisions, 655
- Automobile atrocities, 657
- Suggested change in the B.N.A. Act, 657
- The law of motor cars, 657, 673, 726
- Law-making in Alberta, 713
- Employers' liability to workmen, 718
- Liability of manufacturers of food products for injuries to third persons, 720
- Judicial appeals, 732
- Local option by-laws in Ontario, 753
- The liberty of the subject, 772
- Death of Mr. Justice Mathew, 773

Ejusdem generis—

See Charity—Maritime law—Tax sale.

Election—

See Foreign judgment, 581

Elections—**Provincial—**

- Deposit, 76
- Affidavit verifying petition, 76
- Scrutiny of votes, 76
- Status of petitioner, 76
- Want of prosecution, 85

Municipal—

- Recount—Appeal to County Court, 119
- Marking ballots, 119
- Payment for dinners, 119
- Cross examination on affidavit—Authority of master, 161
- Security—Cash deposits, 788
- Bribery—Proposed legislation as to, 133
- See* Appeal.

Electricity—

- Supply of—Preferences—Construction of statute, 32
- Negligence—Accident to trespasser, 35
- Master and servant—Insulation of wires, 434

Employers' Liability Act—

- See* Master and servant.

Estate tail—

- Protector of settlement—Survivorship, 144

Estoppel—

- Agreement to settle controversy, 72
- Failure to defend action on prior forged note, 244
- By signing lease, 587
- By judgment, 688
- Compromise of former action, 707
- See* Chattel mortgage—Company—Municipal law.

Evidence—

- Appeal—Plans discovered after date of judgment, 64
- Telephonic communications as, 606, 660
- Onus—Purchase for value—Affirmative and negative, 660
- Corroboration—Claim against estate of deceased, 748
- See* Commission to take evidence—Incest—Malicious prosecution—
Workmen's Compensation Act.

Examination—

- See* Discovery.

Exchequer Court—

- Royal Commission interfering with work of, 289
- Amendments to Act, 428

Execution—

- See* *Fi. fa.* goods.

Executor and administrator—

- See* Administration.

Expropriation—

Value for special purposes—Waterworks, 276
 Statutory powers of, 346, 486
 See Landlord and tenant—Railway.

Extradition—

Discharge of criminal—Exemption from punishment by lapse of time, 151

Factor—

See Principal and agent.

False imprisonment—

Liability of solicitor procuring, 435

False pretences—

Obtaining money under, 302

False representation—

See Contract—Deceit.

Ferry—

Disturbance of franchise—Bridge over river, 145

Fi. fa. goods—

Money of debtor—Death of debtor before seizure, 194
 Equity of redemption—Sale before seizure, 206
 Exemptions—Seizure of goods for price of which action brought, 207

Fidelity bond—

Liability under, 552

Fire—

See Railway.

Fishery—

Public right of, 73

Fixtures—

Trade—Hire purchase agreement—Landlord and tenant, 196, 273
 Landlord and tenant—Covenant to give up fixtures with premises, 455
 Chattel affixed to freehold—Gas engine, 196
 Tapestry—Right of removal, 454

Flogging—

As a deterrent to crime, 441

Flotsam and Jetsam—

48, 288, 367, 472, 512, 592, 632, 712, 752

Food products—

Liability of manufacturers of, for injury to third persons, 720

Foreigner—

Administration of justice to, 268
 Service of papers on—Jurisdiction, 359, 506
 Residing in England—Land in India—Jurisdiction, 483
See Cheque—Company—Estoppel.

Foreign judgment—

Enforcement of—Jurisdiction of foreign courts, 271
 By default, 271
 Partnership assets in foreign country, 271
 Alimony—Arrears—Special endorsement, 312
 In England against Ontario Co.—Breach of contract—Place of performance, 581
 Alternative claim—Merger—Election, 581

Forfeiture—

See Landlord and tenant—Will—Construction.

Forgery—

What constitutes, 248

Fraud—

See Company, winding up—Contract—Deed—Deceit—Fraudulent conveyance—Misrepresentation—Vendor and purchaser.

Fraudulent conveyance—

Setting aside—Injunction against transfer by grantee, 361
 Injunction—Pleading—Evidence, 468
See Assignments and preferences.

Friendly society—

Arbitration under rules—Costs, 574

Gaming and wagering—

Keeping gaming house—Summary trial—Police magistrate—Election, 37
 Action for money borrowed to pay gaming debt assignment, 41
 Cheque given for bet—Forbearance to publish default in payment—New consideration, 691
See Action—Vagrant.

Garnishee—

See Attachment of debts.

Gas Inspection Act—

Liabilities of company and consumer, 358

General sessions—

Jurisdiction of high—Finality of their decisions, 616

Gift—

Imperfect, of personalty—Intention, 574
See Administration—Will.

Going concern—

Valuation of, 216

Guaranty—*See* Husband and wife.**Habeas corpus—**

Discharge of prisoner—Condition as to action, 38
 Right to, on ground of want of jurisdiction, 123
 Examination of proceedings anterior to conviction, 689

Hand car—*See* Railway.**Hay, wild—**

Growing—Whether goods or lands, 551

Highway—

Obstruction—Liability of municipality, 113
 Nuisance, 276
 Mine under—Subsidence—In pairs—Damages, 615
 Dedication by lessee, 144
 User by public, 734
 Width of, in Manitoba, 746
See Municipal law.

Hire purchase agreement—*See* Fixtures.**Husband and wife—**

Covenant to pay annuity—Restraint against anticipation, 33
 Gift to wife—Fraud on creditors—Set-off, 199
 Guaranty by wife for husband—Undue influence—Notice, 229
 Liability of wife for goods supplied to household, 437
See Alimony—Married woman.

Hydro Electric Commission—

Contract with municipal corporation—Illegal as not in accordance with by-law, 621
 Chairman charged with misrepresentation and fraud—Pleading—Embarrassment, 621

Ignorance—

The advantages of, 563

Immigration—

B. C. Act—Ultra vires, 287, 470
 Delegation of power under, 304

Immigration Act—

Deporting Chinese—Powers as to, 665

Impossibilities—

The law does not require—Maxim discussed, 299

Incest—

Proof of blood relationship on charge of, 364

Indemnity—

See Action.

Indian—

See Medical Act.

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act—

Discussion of, 292

Infant—

Ward of court—Religious education, 58

Necessaries, 457

Intestate—Conversion of realty, 484

Release signed by, 668

See Co. ueity—Will, construction.

Injunction—

Interim—R.S.O. 1897, c. 51, s. 58, 40

To restrain publication of letters in biography, 59

Right of purchaser of land to, 579

Discretion as to, 787

See Biography—Costs—Fraudulent conveyance.

Innkeeper—

Limiting liability—Deposit for safekeeping, 617

Insolvency—

Foreign and domestic assets—Pooling, 347

Sham sale by insolvent, 431

Landlord and tenant—Disclaimer of lease by trustee, 735

Partnership—Breach of trust, 736

Insurance—

Provincial companies doing business outside province, 60

Against damage for leakage from sprinkler system—Extent of policy,

67

Statutory relief from liability for debts, 200

Accident—

Conditions—Affirmative proof of death—Notice—Time—Waiver,
783

Fire—

Re-insurance—Recovery from third party—Subrogation—Ex-
penses, 149

Change in nature of risk—Notice, 281

Life—

Fraud of agent—Recovering back premises, 275

Statement basis of contract—Withholding material facts, 532

Marine—

Prohibited waters—Breach of warranty, 74

Against "all risks," 230

Warranty against capture—Subsequent wreck, 345, 616

Against contraband of war, 430

Constructive total loss—Value of wreck, 535

Interest—

Right of banks to compound, 204
 On legacy, 280
 Abortive sale, 630

International law—

The revocation of treaty privileges to alien subjects, 633

International law association—

Recent session of, 608

Interpleader—

Execution—Goods belonging neither to execution, creditor or claimant,
 150
 Money in court—Trial—Notion by claimant, 150
 Proof of judgment at trial—Evidence, 504

Judgment—

To bind lands—No steps for 20 years—Possession, 586
 Application for—Pleadings, 663

Judicial appointments—

See Bench and Bar.

Judicial utterances—

Thoughtlessness in, 781

Jurisdiction—

See Criminal law—Divorce—Foreigner—Gaming and wagering—Mar-
 riage—Police magistrate—Service of papers—Summary trial
 —Supreme Court—Water Clauses Act.

Jury notice—

Striking out—Discretion, 40

Juvenile delinquents—

Act as to, 445

Killam, Mr. Justice—

Notice of his death, 120, 172, 247

King's counsel—

Ontario—Recent appointments, 49

Labour and capital—

The industrial disputes investigation Act, 292

Laches—

See Cheque—Mortgage.

Landlord and tenant—

Covenant running with land—Covenant to perform—Covenants in
 head lease, 106

Landlord and tenant—Continued.

- Liability of landlord as to tenant's goods—Premises out of repair, 160
- Lease—Covenant not to assign without leave, 143, 345, 571, 741
 - To live on premises—Assignment, 143
 - Expropriation of leasehold subject to, 571
 - Proviso for re-entry—Breach of covenant, 353
- Forfeiture—Notice determining lease—Demand of possession, 353
 - Relief against, 439
- Quiet enjoyment—Derogation from grant, 456
 - For pasturing purposes—Tenant sowing hay off the farm, 662
- Distress—Goods of underlessee, 145
 - Exemptions—Privilege, 145
- Excessive charges by bailiff—Penalty, 377
- See Fixtures—Insolvency.

Larceny—

- Pleading—Sufficiency of averment, 347

Law associations—

- County of Hastings, 128
- City of Hamilton, 128

Law clerk, House of Commons—

- Appointment of Mr. A. H. O'Brien, 564

Law reform—

- In Ontario—Resolutions as to considered, 89, 134, 135
 - Suggestions for, 580, 633
 - Discussion as to fees, 603
 - As to settlements, 681
 - As to costs, 761

Law Society of U. C.—

- Amendment of law as to election of Benchers, 211

Law suits—

- Some instances of unfruitful ones, 727

Legislatures—

- See Colonial legislatures—Provincial legislatures.

Libel and slander—

- Privilege—Malice—Evidence, 205
 - Absolute—Statements of provincial officers, 276
- Slander imputing unchastity, 283
 - Assessment of damages, 283
- Verdict of jury opposed to judge's charge, 472
- Discovery—Justification, 486
- Fair comment—Misdirection, 530
- See Trade protection society.

Lien—

- For carriage of goods—Taking possession, 227, 484
- Agreement for, for current account—Bill of sale, 227, 484
- Advance of money to pay wages, 705
- See Costs—Mechanics' lien—Sale of goods.

Light—

Prescription—Dominant and servient tenements—Prescription, 29, 195
 Lessee entitled to easement of, 29, 195
See Ancient light.

Limitation of actions—

See Statute of Limitations.

Liquidated demand—

Practice—Claim for instalment, 432

Liquor License Act—

Sale without license—Evidence, 39
 Permitting drunkenness, 430
 Defective information—Amendment, 404
 By-law to reduce number of licenses, 496
 Construction—Ultra—Meaning of "year," 496
 Construction of R.S.O. 1897, c. 245, s. 101, 698
 Amending conviction, 699
See Local option—Canada Temperance Act.

Literary property—

Legal rights to, 270

Local option—

By-laws—Two-thirds majority—Scrutiny—Final passing, 204
 Legislation and procedure in relation to discussed, 753
 Receipt of petition by municipal council, 789

Longley, Mr. Justice—

Character sketch, 1

Lord Campbell's Act—

See Negligence.

Lord's Day Act—

Is still in force in Ontario, 494

Lost grant—

See Easement.

Lumber driving—

Fixing tolls for—Part user of stream—Mandamus, 659

Lunatic—

Detention—Informalities in certificate—Trial as to sanity, 36
 Appointment of married woman as guardian, 73
 Action by committee—"Lunatic so found," 223
 Appointment to carry on business of, not so found, 576

Maintenance—

See Action.

Malicious prosecution--

Reasonable and probable cause--Malice--F. of, 310

Mandamus--

Wrongful refusal by municipal council, 199
To compel mayor to sign cheque on order of council, 507
See Lumber driving.

Manslaughter--

Constable killing fugitive suspect, 81

Manufacturers--

Of food products--Liabilities of to third persons, 720

Maritime law--

Seaman--Contract--Carriage of contraband--Refusal to serve, 28
Error in judgment of master, 226
Advance of purchase money--Resulting trust, 479
 For purpose of repair, 705
Mortgage on ship--Right of possession, 57
Freight, contract for--Unseaworthiness--Damage, 221, 233
Bill of lading--Delivery--"Port inaccessible by ice"--Ejusdem generis,
 220, 531, 738
 Condition limiting liability--Negligence, 349, 614
Charter-party--Expenses of supply, 308
 Holiday--Loading on--"Days saved," 533
 Exceptions--Construction--Ejusdem generis, 615
Demurrage--Lay days--Arrival at place of loading--Choice of berth,
 274
General average--Damage to cargo by repairs, 529
Charter by demise--"Owner," 534
Material men--Supplies for last voyage, 308
Action in rem--Abatement in contract price of ship, 540
Practice--Preliminary act--Amendment--Evidence, 311
Collision--Overtaking vessel, 471
 Damage to cargo--Action by buyers not owners at time of loss--
 Rights of underwriters, 479
 Total loss--Proximate cause--Repairs, 688
See Discovery--Insurance, marine.

Marriage--

Declaration of nullity--Jurisdiction, 41, 220
Under false name--False notice, 60
Breach of promise--Suggestion for abolition of action, 267
 Promise by married man, on death of wife, 348
Divorce--Foreign jurisdiction--Putative marriage, 610
 Invalid marriage--Legitimacy of issue--Law of Scotland, 610
 Mistake in fact and in law, 610
Unlawfully solemnising--Minister of independent congregation, 660
See Will, construction.

Married woman--

Appointment as guardian to lunatic, 73
Restraint on anticipation--Covenant not to sue, 304
Settlement--Covenant to settle after acquired property--Exceptions,
 225
 Post nuptial--Consideration, 488

Married woman—Continued.

Separate property—Debts of husband, 538
See Estate tail—Husband and wife.

Marshalling assets—

Appropriation of payments, 543

Master and servant—

Employers' liability to workmen discussed, 716
 Law in England and Ontario contrasted, 716
 Contract of service—Ordinary—Extra risk—Refusal to serve, 27
 Hiring by the month considered, 139
 Verbal contract—Statute of Frauds—Desertion, 163
 Repudiation—Wrongful dismissal, 350
 Negligence—Dangerous machinery—Voluntary exposure, 63
 Common employment, 109, 120, 459, 473
 Employees' Liability Act—Operation of coal mine, 120
 Scope of employment—Motor car driver, 356
 Insulation of electric wires, 434
 What persons are within the purview of statutes affecting the enforcement of claims for service, 369
 Employment obtained by misrepresentation, 668

Mathew, Mr. Justice

Death of, 773

Maxims legal—

Equity does not adjust differences between rogues, 213
 The law does not require impossibilities, 299

McCord, F. A.—

Notice of his death, 525

Mechanics' lien—

Description of claimant and of goods supplied, 545
 Date of lien, 545

Medical Act—

Indian unlawfully practising, 111

Mental suffering—

Damages for in tort and contract, 343

Mercantile agency—

See Trade Protection Society.

Milk—

Adulteration—Provincial health regulations, 324

Mines and minerals—

Location of claim—Fictitious signature, 65
 Hydraulic lease—Breach of conditions—Rights of lessee, 490
 Surface rights—Registration, 511

Mines and minerals—Continued.

- Setting aside patent for fraud or mistake, 579
- Jurisdiction of High Court—Parties, 579
- Right of support—Subsidence, 690
- See Highway—Statute of Frauds.

Misconduct—

- Removal of name from register for, 200

Misrepresentation—

- Liability for, discussed, 513
- See Deceit—Deed—Vendor and purchaser.

Mistake—

- See Administration—Will, construction.

Money Lender's Act—

- Evidence of loan—Assignment of salary—Oral testimony to explain contract, 588

Mortgage—

- Equitable—Assignment subject to—Contribution, 24
- Statute of Limitations—Extinguishment of title of second mortgagee
 - First mortgagee in possession, 26
- Foreclosure—Acceleration clause—Relief on payment of part due, 320
- Redemption—Limitation Act—Constructive possession by mortgagee, 501
 - Lost by laches and acquiescence, 502
- Power of sale—Exercise of, by giving agreement to sell, 501
 - Notice requiring payment—Default, 525
- Liability of mortgagee to see to application of money, 611
- See Maritime law.

Motor cars—

- Brutal recklessness of owners and drivers, 657
- The law as to, considered, 673
- Are they carriages, 726
- See Appeal—Negligence.

Municipal law—

- By-law or resolution—Contract—Estoppel, 80, 316
 - Retroactive effect—Illegality, 243
- Council meetings—Rights of public, 306
 - Excluding newspaper reporters, 306
- Aldermen—Qualification, 325
 - Contract with corporation, 711
- Sale of corporate property—Authority of committee of council, 110
- Unlawful expenditure—Action by ratepayer—Intervention of Attorney-General, 201
- Obstruction on highway—Negligence—Knowledge, 113
 - Misfeasance or non-feasance, 113
 - Nuisance—Usual travelled way, 114
 - Subsidence of street by repairs, 577
- Liability for not exercising supervision of tramway on highway, 159, 783
- Bridge—Liability for maintenance, 159

Municipal law—Continued.

Contract not in terms of by-law submitted to ratepayers illegal, 621
See Elections, municipal—Local option—Mandamus—Street railway—Taxation.

Naturalisation Act—

Application by Japanese—Cross examination as to facts, 326

Negligence—

Accident to trespasser from electricity, 35
 Breach of statutory duty—Common employment, 109
 Independent contractor, 497
 Injury to railway employee, 498
 See Railway.
 Lord Campbell's Act—Damages—New trial, 71
 Dangerous premises—Building let out in flats—Liability of landlord, 489
 Dangerous work—Protection, 604
 Proximate cause, 328, 542
 Injury by gas explosion, 497, 695
 Infringement of public right by negligent navigation, 347
 Motor car—Liability of owner for chauffeur—Scope of employment, 356, 357
 Frightening horse on highway, 357
 Water company—Liability to restate pavement—Subsidence, 577
 Liability of municipality, 577
 Negligent mode of conducting business—Dangerous practice, 614
 Infecting customer with barber's itch, 614
 Failure to close door of railway carriage, 617
 Proof of dangerous tendency by evidence of prior effect, 769
 Contributory, 63, 66, 114, 120, 460, 495, 694
See Maritime law—Master and servant—Municipal law—Railway—Statutory powers—Street railway—Trustee.

New trial—

Defective charge to jury, 64
 Time for moving for, 231
 Verdict opposed to judge's charge, 472
 Evidence fairly submitted, 537
See Negligence.

Newspapers—

Modern journalism discussed, 55
 Trial by, discussed, 61
 Offering to give advice—Loss to reader, 231
 Reporters excluded from council meetings, 306

Noise—

See Contract.

Notice—

See Cheque—Insurance, fire.

Nuisance—

Statutory authority—Rights under, 458, 733
 Right to abate by force, 477
 Joinder of two parties defendants—Election by plaintiff, 704
See Highway—Municipal law.

Obstruction—

See Highway—Municipal law.

Oil wells—

Lease of—Condition—Time of commencement, 743

Order—

Final or interlocutory, 451

Conditional—Performance of conditions, 436

Osgoode Hall, Toronto—

Royal arms in court rooms, 23

Parent and child—

Guardianship—Transfer of—Family arrangement, 309

Parties—

Foreign judgment—Representatives of original plaintiffs, 581

See Nuisance.

Partnership—

See Bills and notes.

Partition—

Order for sale—Death before sale of person entitled, 735

Patent—

See Deed—Mines and minerals.

Patent of invention—

Application to extend—Conditions, 30

Manufacture—Sale—Lease or license, 60

Novelty—Combination of known elements—Mechanical equivalent, 60

Sale of—Payment by royalties—Assignment—Vendor's lien, 528

Improvement—Infringement—Damages, 665

Infringement—Action for—Revocation of patent after judgment, 688

Payment into court—

Condition as to payment out, 121

See Statute of Limitations.

Petition of right—

In British Columbia, 775

Perjury—

Increase of, 215, 200

Indictment—Requirements of, 493

Intent to deceive, 661

In Police Court—Jurisdiction, 661

Evidence of—Record of trial, 661

"Judicial proceeding," 712

Permissive waste—

By tenants for life or years considered, 173

Personal liberty—

Preserving rights of, 772

Physician—

Registration obtained by false certificate—Power to revoke, 663

Pictures—

Common law right of property in—Pirating copy, 680

Pleading—

See Deceit—Evidence—Practice.

Police magistrate—

Jurisdiction, 122, 661

Possession—

Actual—Legal title, 587

Of room in upper story of house, 583

Power of appointment—

See Appointments, power of.

Practice—

County Court action transferred to Supreme Court, 511

Summons for directions—Subsequent application to change venue, 470

Striking out pleadings, 547

Alternative claim, 581

See Action—Amendment—Appeal—Attorney-General—Ca. sa.—Commission to take evidence—Costs—Discovery—Fi. fa. goods—Injunction—Jurisdiction—Liquidated demand—New trial—Order—Payment into court—Production—Service of papers—Special endorsement—Summary judgment—Third party—Venue.

Prescription—

See Limit—Statute of Limitations.

Principal and agent—

Fraudulent representations by agent, 26

Commission—Sale of land, 46

Sale not completed, 73

Exchange of lands, 78

Secret profit—Sham purchaser, 311

Delegation of authority—Statute of Frauds, 87

Liability of agent to principal in respect of illegal transactions, 125

Authority of agent to pledge, 229

Undisclosed principal, 241

Liability of principal to agent—Contract by agent in his own name on behalf of principal, 707

See Lunatic—Stock broker.

Probate—

See Will.

Probate duty—

Share of deceased partner—Business in colony, 30

Production—

Striking out defence for non-production, 748

Professional ethics—

Notice of Mr. Sharswood's book on, 131

Answering legal questions in newspapers, 302

Promoter—

See Company.

Provincial Health Act—

Adulteration of milk—Regulations ultra vires, 324

Provincial Legislatures—

Powers of—Vancouver Island—Settlers' rights, 31

Provincial companies operating beyond province, 60

Railway legislation in N.W.T., 69

Extent of, 499

Cannot curtail right of appeal given by Dominion statute, 778

As to taxation limited to direct taxation within the province, 779

Public Schools—

See School law.

Public Service Companies—

Mode of valuing their property, 276

Public works—

Operation of railway—Negligence—Crown, 459

Quantum meruit—

Commission on sale of lands, 550

Quarter Sessions—

See General Sessions.

Quiet enjoyment—

See Contract—Landlord and tenant.

Railway—

Omnibus business—Incidental powers, 28

Changes in legislation, 52

Fares—Third-class passenger—Construction of statute, 68

Legislative jurisdiction—Railway legislation—Constitutional law, 69

Rights of passengers to seats in cars, 115

As to use of sleeping berths, 336

Authority of conductor in placing passengers in seats, 115

Railway—Continued.

- Carriage of goods—Tolls and rates—Refund, 117
 - Reasonable condition—Value—Dogs, 230
- Fencing—Meaning of "locality," 126
 - Obligation as to—Liability arising from, not caused by trains or engines, 162
 - Negligence of owner, 317
- Damages "sustained by reason of the railway," 155
- Expropriation—General principles as to value, 244
 - Acceptance of amount offered, 469
- Handcar not "engine, machine or train," 284
- Government road—Running rights on other roads—Public work, 541
- Negligence—Defective operation—Public work—Crown, 459
 - Collision—Stop at crossing—Rules, 46
 - Injury to employee coupling cars, 493
 - Fire destroying crops, 619
 - Animals killed on track straying from neighbour's field—Fences, 786
- Statutory powers exercisable within limited time, 689
- See Negligence—Railway Commissioners, Board of.

Railway Commissioners, Board of—

- Re-construction of, 169, 600
- Appointment of Mr. Justice Mabee as Chief, 209
- Jurisdiction—Location of railway, 605

Real Property Statutes—

- Some recent criticisms on, 136

Receiver—

- Cannot purchase without leave of court, 361

Registry Act—

- Unregistered conveyance—Subsequent mortgage—Statute of Limitations, 235
- Priority—Subsequent purchaser registering first, 361
- Judgment recorded—Rights, 500
- Wrongful registration—Damages, 536
- Judgment Acts, B.C.—Priorities, 792

Rent—

- See Administration—Landlord and tenant.

Replevin—

- Præcipe order for, 208

Reports, Law—

- Some defects in reporting, 739

Rescission—

- See Contract—Vendor and purchaser.

Restraint on anticipation—

- See Married Woman.

Revenue—

See Succession duty.

Reviews—

See Book reviews.

Right of way—

Enjoyment as of right, 705

Riot—

Injury to property by boys, 150

Riparian rights—

See Watercourses.

Rivers and streams—

See Waters and watercourses.

Robinson memorial—

Completion of, 210

Royal commission—

Appointment of judges to, 289, 307

Sale of goods—

Contract to insure against all risks, 230

Passing of property—Ship, 233

Retention of goods without notice of rejection, 505

Special conditions—Agreement not to sell, 278

Conditional—Lien note—Title to purchaser, 710

Sale for taxes—

See Tax sale.

School law—

Providing school premises—Neglect of trustees, 744

School master—

Corporal punishment by assistant teacher, 198, 432

Security for costs—

Action against constable for arrest—Affidavit—Grounds, 2.

Solicitor is "agent" under statute, 239

Poverty of plaintiff, 311

In Court of Appeal, Ontario—*See* Appeal.

Seduction—

Under promise of marriage. —Crim. Code, s. 212, 166

Service of papers—

Out of jurisdiction—Statement of claim—Attachment, 359, 362,
506, 589

On unnecessary party, 453

Breach of contract, 487

Statement of claim—Substitutional service within—Non-resident
foreigner, 506

Self-defence—

Homicide, 248

Set-off—

Unliquidated damages—Unconnected transactions, 436

Settlement—

Of controversy—Estoppel, 72

Settlement, marriage—

See Estate tail—Married woman.

Sewer—

See Drainage.

Shareholder—

See Company.

Sheriff—

Acting under defective writ, 606

Ship—

See Maritime law—Sale of goods.

Slander—

See Libel and slander.

Solicitor—

Form of charging order, 57

Procuring false imprisonment—Liability, 435

See Costs.

Solicitor and client—

Opening settled accounts, 224

Lien on papers—Waiver of, 274

Collusive settlement—Costs, 507

Special endorsement—

Arrears of alimony on foreign judgment, 312

Speedy trial—

Right to elect after bill found by grand jury, 322

Statute, construction of—

See Electricity—Railway.

Statutes—

Defective drafting of, 329, 332

Statute of Frauds—

Mines—Transfer of interest in, 70
 Past performance, 70
 Unenforceable verbal contract—Wages, 163, 238
See Deed.

Statute of Limitations—

Adverse possession—Meaning of, 501, 502
 Of part of building, 36, 492, 593
 Upper room in building—Implied grant—License or easement, 492, 593
 Mortgage of proceeds of land—Money in court, 144
 Payment of cheque postponed—Implied promise to pay balance of debt, 577
See Mortgage.

Statutory duty—

Breach of, 431, 775
See Negligence.

Statutory powers—

Negligence in exercising, 30, 497
 To supply electricity—Contract—Breach, 228
 Remedy—Penalty or damages, 228
 No right to create nuisance, 459
See Negligence—Railway—Waterworks.

Staying proceedings—

See Action.

Stock broker—

Right of, to indemnity from customer—Payment without authority, 458, 576
 Not bound to disclose name of principal, 708
See Company.

Street railway—

Accident to motorman from disregard of rules, 66
 Passenger fares—School children—By-law of municipality, 495
 Duty as to highway—Wearing down—Liability of municipality, 159, 783
 Level crossings—B. N. A. Act—Dominion Railway Act, 234
 Removal of snow, 780
 Negligence, 327, 328, 365, 366, 367, 495, 693, 708
 Rules of company—Motorman's duty, 693
 Duty to put on wheel guards, 708

Subpoena—

Duces tecum—Sealed packet deposited in bank, 530

Subsidence—

Risk of future—Damages, 233
See Highway—Street railway.

Subrogation—

See Insurance, fire.

Succession duty—

Property abroad—Trust for conversion, 152

Transfer of property—Foreign bonds—Foreign situs—Anticipation of death, 153

Certificate of benevolent society not part of estate liable to duty, 314

Life insurance money—Aggregate value, 461

Administration—Equitable charge—Exoneration, 610

Right of provincial legislature to tax, 779

See Will, construction.

Suicide—

The crime of discussed, 473

Summary conviction—

Quashing—No evidence taken down, 697

Summary judgment—

Action by assignee of chose in action, 785

Summary trial—

Jurisdiction of magistrate—Offence in another county, 696

See Gaming and wagering—Speedy trial.

Summons—

See Writ of summons.

Sunday—

And non-judicial days—Voting on, 53

Observance—Playing golf, 333

Supreme Court—

Divorce—Jurisdiction, 46

See Appeal.

Surgeon—

See Physician.

Surrogate Court—

Removal of cause into High Court—Contest as to will, 312

Taxation—

Of incomes of government officials, 659

See Assessment.

Taxes—

See Assessment.

Tax sale—

Invalid assessment—Description, 203

Service of notice on owner, 203

Amending Act—Ejusdem generis, 203

Tax sale—Continued.

Deed—Prior registration of deed from defaulting owner, 236
Insufficient description—Notice—Waiver by owner—Omission by official—Statute curing defects, 777

Telephones—

Messages by, as evidence, 606

Tenant for life—

Remainderman—Annuity out of capital or income, 60
Permissive waste by, 175
Trust for sale—Postponement of—Rents and profits, 527

Theobald on Wills—

Canadian edition of, 297

Third party notice—

Application for leave to serve, 572

Timber—

Sale of—Construction of contract, 694
See Lumber driving.

Time—

Computation of, 39, 118, 694

Trade mark—

Invented word, 609
Infringement—Assignment of trade mark, 774

Trade name—

Similarity of names, 29

Trade protection societies—

Mercantile agency—Communications by agency to customer not privileged—Libel, 737

Trade union—

Strike—Combined action—Conspiracy, 508, 779
Liability of assets of union for damages, 508
Right to sue—Branch—Succession, 734

Treaties—

The revocation of treaty privileges to alien subjects, 633

Trespasser—

See Electricity.

Trustee—

Appointment of new, 222
Investments by—Extension of powers, 304
Unauthorized—Question of capital and income, 350

Trustee—Continued.

- Breach of trust—Wilful neglect or default, 482
- Conflicting equities—Negligence, 575
- Trustee's discretion—Gift of income—Assignee of legatee, 616
- See Receiver.

Ultra vires—

- See Contract—Immigration—Waterworks.

Uniformity of decision—

- Need for, 655

Upper room—

- In building—Possession—Statute of Limitations, 492, 593

Vagrant—

- One supporting himself by following the race track not a, 631

Vendor and purchaser—

- Contract—Offer—Acceptance—Correspondence, 86, 792
- Purchase money payable by instalment, 155
- Rescission of agreement—Fraud, 287, 591
- Relief against acceleration clause—Redemption—Waiver, 322
- Time of essence—Delay of vendor, 112, 790
 - Default—Waiver—Rescission—Notice, 155, 324
 - Time for completion—Delay—Default to tender conveyance, 582
- Uncertainty of contract, 770
- Misrepresentation as to quality of land—Specific performance, 287, 468, 503, 582
- Misdescription—Satisfying Statute of Frauds as to, 582
- Sale to bona fide purchaser—Timber having been cut and removed—Action for, 541
- Warranty of title—Representation that land patented, 551
 - Mistake—Caveat emptor, 551
- Restrictive covenants—Rights of purchasers between inter se, 613
- Stipulation for formal contract—Waiver, 631
- Covenant running with land—Breach of covenant, 699
- Agreement to purchase on fixed date at option of vendor, 790
- Liability of purchaser to pay off mortgage—Implied covenants, 791
- See Commission—Deed—Easement—Interest.

Venue—

- Change of, 124, 665

Veterinary surgeon—

- Qualification—Canine specialist, 489

Volunteer corps—

- Liability of commanding officer for supplies, 199

Voters' list—

- Qualification of appellant, 111

Wages—

- Priority—None in case of distress for rent, 108

Waiters—

Tips to—Judgment as to, 208

Waiver—

See Insurance—Vendor and purchaser.

Waters and watercourses—

High and low water marks, 73, 238

Crown domain—Rights of riparian owners, 202

Land bordering on river—Alluvium or bed of stream, 238

Non-tidal rivers—Ownership of medium flum, 238, 281, 318

Dredging sand out of, 313

See Fishery.

Water Clauses Act, B.C.—

Jurisdiction of commissioner, 124

Water company—

See Negligence.

Waterworks—

Neglect of company to supply water, 431

Statutory powers—*Ultra vires*, 480

See Expropriation.

Will—

Attestation clause—Sufficiency, 44

As to what, a testator can leave by will, 136

Testamentary expenses—Legacies charged on land, 148

Estate duty—Out of what fund, 149

Interest on legacy, 280

Two contemporaneous wills—Election, 536

Probate of—Incorporation of memorandum, 277

In England—Executed with foreign formalities, 352

See Administration—Appointment, powers of—Surrogate Court.

Wills, construction—

Alternative absolute gifts, 34

Next of kin—Time for ascertaining class, 59

Children born previous to—*En ventre sa mere*, 143

Express trust of residue, 146

Executors of last surviving trustee, 148

Life interest to wife whilst unmarried—Bigamous marriage, 221

Specific devise—*Falsa demonstratio*, 223

Gift to surviving children and issue—Issue competing with parents, 225

Gift to class—All but one dead—Mistake, 279, 571

Gift to two named daughters—Death of one, 282

Gift subject to maintaining infants, 280

Condition not to enter military service, 280

Dying without leaving child, 282

Gift of whole estate—Enumeration of—“Appurtenances,” 313

Cumulative legacies, 336

No next of kin—Undisposed residue, 351

Executors beneficially entitled—Rights, 351

Forfeiture clause—Substituted legacy, 354, 733

Wills, construction—Continued.

- Devise to "my wife" though not legal wife, 435, 459
- Devise to wife—Remainder to children and issue of, 584
- Land subject to incumbrance—Option to purchase, 482
- Substitutionary gift—Words of futurity—Child dead at date of will, 525, 527
- Specific legacy—Shares in bank—Misdescription, 527
- "Leave no issue him surviving," 586
- Contingent remainder or executory devise, 609
- Beneficial devise to executor, subject to charge and legacies, 611
- Implied power to sell or mortgage, 611
- Direction "to pay debts"—Colonial succession duties a "debt." 612
- Bequest of "all my debentures" includes all kinds 691

Weights and measures—

- False measure—Possession of by servant Knowledge of master, 275
- Vehicle carrying coal—Person in charge—Liability, 529

Winding-up—

See Company.

Woodman's Lien Act, B.C.—

Meaning of "woodman," 325

Words, construction of—

- Actual cost, 578
- Adverse possession, 502
- Appurtenances, 313
- Assigns of lease, 67
- Charity, 350
- Claim and demand, 408
- Commence, 743
- Completion of sale, 323
- Crops, 619
- Debt, 612
- Dependants, 363
- Does business, 612
- Fictitious person, 195
- Going concern, 216
- Hay, 550
- Hereinafter, 502
- Household goods, 313
- Inaccessible, 738
- Judgment finally recovered, 201
- Judicial proceeding, 712
- Last voyage, 308
- Locality, 126
- Owner, 534
- Pasturing purposes, 662
- Person, 234
- Property, 363
- Sufficient evidence, 80, 316
- Unsafe, 738
- Vagrant, 631
- Woodman, 325
- Year, 496

Workmen's Compensation Act—

Case stated by arbitrator—Reference back, 323
Meaning of "dependants," 363
Apportionment of costs, 364
Taking evidence on commission, 334

Workmen's Lien Act, Manitoba—

Defective drafting of statutes, 329

Writ of summons—

Incorrect address in summons—Stay, 604
See Special endorsement.

END OF TEXT LLMC