

The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXVIII.

DECEMBER 31, 1902.

No. 20.

It was not a matter of surprise to hear that the seat rendered vacant by the death of Sir W. J. Ritchie had been filled by the appointment of Mr. Justice Strong, the senior puisne judge of the Supreme Court. The name of Sir John Thompson had been mentioned in connection with the position. He had a right to it, and had he thought proper to take it there would have been none to question the wisdom and propriety of the appointment. He would have done honor to the high position, and both the bar and the public would have joined in hearty congratulations. Failing him, however, the appointment that has been made is the natural one, and will meet with general approval; for not only is Mr. Strong entitled to it by seniority, but his legal attainments and intellectual capacity are of a high order. The position is in many ways a most difficult one, and to fill it with advantage to suitors, to the convenience of the Bar, and with a necessary regard to the peculiar composition of the court requires attributes which are not often found in one man. We trust we may be able to congratulate the new Chief upon his success in these respects, as we now congratulate him upon his promotion.

A STATUTE with an enacting clause of two lines (55 Vict., c. 32, Ont.), provides that "The Law Society of Ontario may, in its discretion, make rules providing for the admission of women to practise as solicitors." This the Society at first refused to do. But the matter was, as our readers are aware, again brought to their attention. The Attorney-General of Ontario was the important factor on this occasion, both by his personal influence and by shadowy suggestions that the Legislature might take the matter up and pass an Act which the Society would consider more distasteful than the rule which they were asked to swallow. The rule was carried by a vote of twelve to eleven, and so women can now claim admission to the ranks.

Whatever may be thought of this question on general grounds it certainly would occur to most thinking men that, whilst the Society ought to be consulted, it is really a question of general policy for the Government of the day to act upon, and it should not throw that responsibility on the profession. Notwithstanding this vote, we venture to say that a large majority both of the profession and Benchers are opposed to the change, and yet those who ought to have decided upon the question of policy can now say that we have opened the door to the ladies of our own free will. It might have been better for those who are not in sympathy with the change, but who nevertheless voted for it, to have acted more on principle and less on the supposed expediency of the case. However, it is perhaps a matter of but little consequence. There is not much harm

likely to result, and not many are likely to take advantage of the privilege. We shall be delighted to welcome those of our legal "sistren" who may join us. They will, of course, understand that the story of the lady who had been attending a women's rights convention applies to them. This lady entered a car filled with men, and looked daggers because no one offered to rise and give her a seat. An old "hayseed," more plucky than the rest, asked, "Be you one of them women's rights women?" Upon receiving a decisive answer in the affirmative, he settled himself comfortably in his corner and observed encouragingly, "Well, then, stand up for your rights like a man!"

WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.

An impression has extensively prevailed and that not among laymen only, that, since the last session of Parliament, persons charged with offences might be called as witnesses. An examination of the statutes then passed will show, of course, that this is not the case. The misapprehension arose, no doubt, from the fact that a bill to that effect was introduced by the Minister of Justice, but afterwards withdrawn—for the present, it was understood. So that we may expect to see a similar measure proposed next session; one which, we hope, will be unclogged with some of the conditions appearing in the last bill—conditions which, we thought, showed too anxious a desire for the protection of the criminal.

The subject is one that admits of an immense deal to be said on either side, and opens up a question almost as large as that of the abolition of the grand jury. Some of the most conservative of our legislators and judges would seal the mouth of every person charged with or suspected of an offence, and not permit it to be opened again till after the verdict at his trial. They are of the opinion that every such person is not of the same mental calibre as the prisoner (an Irishman, of course) who, upon being asked whether he was guilty or not, replied, "How can I tell, till I hear the evidence?" And here we cannot help recalling the many disputes and altercations we have been witness to in courts of criminal justice as to the admissibility as evidence of statements made by the prisoner, in the course of which very diverse views have been expressed by different judges.

Very old practitioners will remember when the law, as laid down in *Regina v. Drew*, prevailed, until disapproved of by the Court of Criminal Appeal. To us of the present day, it appears that the desire to prevent the accused committing himself must have been very strong, when his statements, made in the face of a warning not to say anything to prejudice himself, would not be admitted in evidence, even when there was no shadow of a pretence that any inducement was held out to make a statement. We can, however, without much trouble, lay our finger upon the recorded utterances of some of our judges here (some of them still on the Bench) against the impropriety of receiving in evidence against a prisoner any statement made to, say, a constable, even though that officer denied that anything in the shape of an inducement to make the statement had been held out by him.

We are not now going to enter upon any enquiry as to what the law on this head, as laid down by our highest court of appeal, is ; but merely to draw attention to the strong contrast between the criminal procedure in England and that prevailing amongst some of her continental neighbours. It may be that the feeling excited in the breasts of Englishmen by seeing the almost inquisitorial proceedings in the case of an accused person across the Channel has produced a possibly too strong reaction. Where the preliminary procedure there, in such a case, would tend to indicate as a maxim, that "Every accused person is presumed to be guilty till he is proved innocent," our maxim is that such a person is presumed to be innocent till he is proved guilty. But the reaction is evidently too violent ; for, if this maxim is to be followed literally, keeping a man in close confinement previous to his trial is an outrage upon an innocent man, and this without regard to the fact whether he is afterwards found guilty or not.

While the records show that there have been cases (very few, indeed, in comparison with the number of the accused) where an innocent person has asserted his guilt, with the hope that the punishment awarded to such an offence will be lightened in his case by reason of his having made a confession ; yet may not those who seek to guard against the possibility of such a case be in danger of, to some extent, forgetting the principle upon which these statements are received ? Might it not be well to consider whether the presumption that a person will not make an untrue statement against his own interest is not, at least, as strong as that a person will accuse himself of a crime he has not committed while he believes that punishment, to some degree, will be the result ?

Sometimes a curious anomaly is the result of the general rule that no admission can be given in evidence, if any inducement is held out to make it. Take, for instance, the case of a prosecutor telling the accused it will be better for him to confess, and thereupon the latter does confess, at the same time surrendering some of the stolen property, saying that it is all that is left of it. The statement must be rejected in conformity with the rule.

It might be well to consider whether, after all, it might not be proper to look equally at the advancement of justice and the protection of the accused—to permit all the *res gestæ*, as it were, to go to the jury, including all statements by the prisoner, and let these statements be commented on by counsel on both sides. As it is now, a jury, who see that the Crown proposes to give in evidence certain statements of the prisoner, and hear all the arguments, *pro* and *con*, about it, must necessarily come to the conclusion that the prisoner said *something*, but which *something* they must not hear, and this *may* have some influence with them, though unknown to themselves. It may have been something unimportant, or which could easily have been explained ; but still prisoner's counsel, in ignorance of what the statement was, dare not risk its admission as evidence. Besides which, the judge could—and would, of course—always caution the jury as to the weight to be attached to such statements under certain circumstances, especially where there was nothing shown to make it probable they were true ; *au contraire*, where there was corroboration, so to call it, as when (in the case above referred to) the prisoner surrendered the stolen property.

In the Criminal Code, to come into force on the 1st of July next year, will be found several new provisions respecting "Evidence," upon which we may, later on, make some comments. In the meantime, we await further legislation on the subject we have first touched on, feeling sure that Sir John Thompson, now Premier as well as Minister of Justice, will not fail to keep abreast of the demand for all possible improvements in the due administration of justice.

COMMENTS ON CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

(Law Reports for November—Continued.)

COMPANY—WINDING UP—SURPLUS ASSETS, HOW DISTRIBUTABLE—SHARES OF UNEQUAL AMOUNT.

In re Wakefield Rolling Stock Co. (1892), 3 Ch. 165, Williams, J., was called upon to fix the principle on which the surplus assets of a company were distributable. The original capital of the company consisted of £150,000 in £1 shares, of which 30,000 (all that were issued) were fully paid up. By special resolutions, the capital was afterwards divided into 30,000 £1 shares and 24,000 £5 shares. Only £1 was called for on the £5 shares, but the directors were empowered to receive the full amount of such shares, and on these advanced moneys interest was payable to the shareholders. Several £5 shareholders had paid up in full. The surplus which remained after winding up the company was less than the total of the called up capital, including the advances paid by the £5 shareholders. Williams, J., held that the surplus must be distributed as follows: (1) In repayment to the £5 shareholders of the advances over £1 per share, with interest up to payment. (2) In payment to the £1 shareholders of 16s. per share, so as to put them in the position of the £5 shareholders who had only paid 20 per cent. of the amount of their shares. (3) In payment to the £5 and £1 shareholders *pro rata*, treating each £5 shareholder as if he were holder of five £1 shares.

ARBITRATION—SPECIAL CASE, POWER OF COURT TO ORDER STATEMENT OF—AWARD MADE AFTER, BUT BEFORE NOTICE OF, ORDER NISI TO STATE A CASE.

The Tabernacle Permanent Building Society v. Knight (1892), A.C. 298, is a decision of the House of Lords, in which two points are decided, viz., (1) that s. 19 of the Arbitration Act, 1889, which provides that an arbitrator shall, if so directed by the court or a judge, state in the form of a special case for the opinion of the court any question of law arising in the course of a reference, applies to arbitrations under the Building Societies Act, 1874; and (2) that when an order nisi to state a case was granted, and later on the same day, before notice of the order, the arbitrators made and signed their award, the jurisdiction of the court was not thereby ousted, but that the order nisi might nevertheless be made absolute.

HABEAS CORPUS—APPEAL FROM ORDER FOR ISSUE OF WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS—ISSUE OF WRIT AGAINST PERSON WHO HAS NO LONGER THE CUSTODY OF THE PERSON DETAINED—IMPOSSIBILITY OF OBEYING WRIT.

Barnardo v. Ford (1892), A.C. 326, was an appeal by Dr. Barnardo from an order directing the issue of a writ of *habeas corpus* requiring him to produce a

child named Harry Gossage, who had been placed in his charge, as the manager of a charitable institution, on the ground that he had parted with the custody of the boy before the order was made, and it was impossible to comply with the writ. It was contended by the respondents that the order was not appealable under the Judicature Act, s. 19, but this objection was overruled; but on the main question the appeal was dismissed, and the judgment of the Court of Appeal, 24 Q.B.D. 283 (noted *ante* vol. 26, p. 167), affirmed, on the ground that the respondent was entitled to require a return to be made to the writ, in order that the facts under which the appellant had parted with the custody of the child might be more fully investigated. Lord Halsbury, C., and Lords Watson, Herschell, and Hannen, however, disapproved of the statement of the law as laid down in *Regina v. Barnardo*, 23 Q.B.D. 205, to the effect that if the custody of the person alleged to be detained has been illegally parted with before the issue of the writ, it is no answer to the writ. Lord Herschell says at p. 339: "To use it (*i.e.*, the writ of *habeas corpus*) as a means of compelling one who has unlawfully parted with the custody of another person to regain that custody, or of punishing him for having parted with it, strikes me at present as being a use of the writ unknown to the law, and not warranted by it."

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—GIFT OF INCOME—LIFE ESTATE—GIFT OVER—DEATH WITHOUT LEAVING CHILDREN—IMPLIED GIFT TO CHILDREN—RESIDUARY GIFT.

Scale v. Rawlins (1892), A.C. 342, was an appeal from the Court of Appeal, 45 Ch.D. 299. The only point raised on the appeal was as to the construction of the will of a testator, who gave three freehold houses to his nephews S. and W. upon trust to pay the rents to his niece during her life, and after her decease, "she leaving no child or children," he gave one of the houses to S. and the other two to W. After making other bequests, the testator gave his residuary estate to S. and W. equally. The niece died leaving children, and the House of Lords (Lord Halsbury, C., and Lords Watson, Herschell, Macnaghten, Morris, and Hannen) unanimously affirmed the Court of Appeal in holding that there was no implied gift of the houses to the children of the deceased niece, but that they passed under the residuary gift to S. and W. equally.

PATENT—INFRINGEMENT—PRIOR PUBLICATION—PRIOR PUBLIC USER.

The Anglo-American Brush Electric Light Corporation v. King (1892), A.C. 367, was an appeal from the Court of Session in Scotland. The action was brought by King to set aside a patent for making dynamo-electric machines on the ground of a prior publication, contained in a specification for an earlier patent. The case turned upon whether the specification in the earlier patent was sufficient to disclose the invention; and the House of Lords (Lord Halsbury, C., and Lords Watson, Herschell, Macnaghten and Field), affirmed the Court of Session, that the proper test was whether the description in the specification of the earlier patent was sufficient to disclose to men of science and employers of labour information which would enable them to understand the invention, and give a workman specific directions for the making of the machine, and that applying that test there had been such prior publication.

COLONIAL JUDGE—POWER OF GOVERNOR OF COLONY TO APPOINT JUDGE—STATUTORY LIMITATION OF POWER TO APPOINT JUDGES—SALARY.

Buckley v. Edwards (1892), A.C. 387, is an appeal from the Supreme Court of New Zealand, and although it turns on the construction of colonial statutes may nevertheless be noted here as, to a certain extent, establishing a principle of general application. By an Act of New Zealand, the governor of New Zealand is empowered to appoint judges of the Supreme Court; but the Privy Council hold that this power is subject to an implied limitation, that no appointment can be made until an ascertained salary is payable to the appointee at the time of his appointment, and, where the legislature has not provided a salary, there is no power to appoint a judge.

27 ELIZ. C. 4—VOLUNTARY GIFT TO CHARITY—SUBSEQUENT CONVEYANCE FOR VALUE.

Ramsay v. Gilchrist (1892), A.C. 412, in which the Privy Council affirmed the judgment of the Supreme Court of New South Wales, has already been referred to (see *ante* p. 418). Suffice it to say here that the case decides that a voluntary gift to a charity is not fraudulent under 27 Eliz., c. 4, and cannot be avoided by a subsequent conveyance by the grantor for value.

PRACTICE—CRIMINAL CASES—LEAVE TO APPEAL TO PRIVY COUNCIL.

In *Ex parte Deeming* (1892), A.C. 422, the Privy Council lay down the rule that they will not advise Her Majesty to grant leave to appeal to the Judicial Committee in criminal cases where it is not even suggested or surmised that substantial or grave injustice has been done either through a disregard of forms of legal process, or by some violation of the principles of natural justice. We may note that this was a murder case, in which the prisoner had been found guilty and sentenced to death.

HUSBAND AND WIFE—CUSTODY OF CHILDREN—DRUNKENNESS OF HUSBAND—FALSE ACCUSATIONS BY HUSBAND AGAINST WIFE'S MORAL CHARACTER.

Smart v. Smart (1892), A.C. 425, is an appeal from the Ontario Court of Appeal affirming a judgment of Ferguson, J., as to the sufficiency of a return to a writ of *habeas corpus*, and also upon an application for the custody of children made by a husband against his wife. It appeared that the wife had twice left him on account of his drunken habits, and that in the course of the proceedings he had made very gross and (as Ferguson, J., found) unfounded charges against his wife, affecting her moral character, in answer to questions put to him on his cross-examination by his wife's counsel, and which charges were of such an injurious nature that she could not be expected to live with him again; that the wife had ample means, and that the husband had only a narrow income. The Privy Council therefore held that the courts below had exercised a sound discretion in discharging the writ of *habeas corpus*, and remanding the children to the custody of their mother.

PRIORITY OF PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT OVER OTHER SIMPLE CONTRACT CREDITORS—PREROGATIVE OF CROWN.

In *Maritime Bank v. Receiver-General of New Brunswick* (1892), A.C. 437, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council affirm the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, holding that the Provincial Government of New Brunswick, by virtue of the royal prerogative, is entitled to priority of payment of simple contract debts in priority to other simple contract creditors of the debtor. As to Ontario, see observation of Armour, C.J., *Attorney-General v. Clarkson*, 15 O.R. 632, at p. 639. This case decides that the connection between the Crown and Province is not severed by the B.N.A. Act, but that the same connection exists between the Crown and the various Provinces as between the Crown and the Dominion; and consequently all prerogative rights affecting matters under the control of Provincial Governments may be claimed and exercised by such governments on behalf of the Crown; and the Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces are as much representatives "of Her Majesty for all purposes of the Provincial Government as the Governor-General himself is for all purposes of the Dominion Government."

MANITOBA SCHOOLS ACT, 1890, VALIDITY OF.

In *Winnipeg v. Barrett* (1892), A.C. 445, the Judicial Committee uphold the validity of the Manitoba School Act, 1890, abolishing the denominational system of public education in that Province. This case has been so much canvassed and discussed that further reference to it here seems unnecessary.

FRAUD—NEW ISSUE AS TO NEGLIGENCE CANNOT BE RAISED IN APPEAL.

Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. v. Kavanagh (1892), A.C. 473, was an action brought by the insurance company against the defendant, who had acted as their agent, charging that the defendant had fraudulently transferred an insurance in his books after a fire had occurred from another company of which he was also agent to the plaintiff company. At the trial, the plaintiffs failed to prove the charges of fraud and deceit. On appeal to the Privy Council, the plaintiffs contended that the evidence disclosed such negligence on the part of the defendant as would make him liable to indemnify the plaintiffs against the loss they had incurred under the policy in question. But the Judicial Committee was of opinion as fraud was the essence of the plaintiffs' claim that the evidence of the defendant directed to that issue could not be regarded as conclusive against him as regarded the charge of negligence, or as being all that he could have brought forward to rebut such a charge, and that therefore it was not open to the plaintiffs to take that ground on appeal, although it might have been otherwise if the question had been raised at the trial.

WIDOW'S RIGHT OF ACTION FOR CAUSING DEATH OF HER HUSBAND—QUEBEC CODE, S. 1056—(R.S.O., c. 135, ss. 3, 5).

Robinson v. Canadian Pacific Ry. Co. (1892), A.C. 481, was an appeal from the Supreme Court of Canada. The action was brought under s. 1056 of the Quebec Code by a widow to recover for damages for causing the death of her husband. The injury from which the deceased ultimately died was sustained on Aug. 27,

1882; his death did not take place until Nov. 15, 1883. At the time of his death his right of action was barred, and the question which the Privy Council had to determine was whether under the circumstances the widow could maintain the action. This depended on whether the right of action in the widow was a separate and distinct right of action from that to which her deceased husband was entitled. Their Lordships came to the conclusion that the causes of action were distinct, and that the widow was entitled to sue, although her husband at the time of his death was barred by the Statute of Limitations. The judgment of the Supreme Court was reversed. In *White v. Parker*, 16 S.C.R. 699, which is very briefly reported, the Supreme Court held that an action brought by a deceased person to recover damages for injuries which resulted in his death could not be revived by his representatives entitled to sue under Lord Campbell's Act (see R.S.O., c. 135), because the causes of action were distinct; but in the late case of *Wood v. Gray*, 93 L.T. 103, the House of Lords have determined that where a person had commenced such an action, and died before the action was brought to trial, his representatives entitled under Lord Campbell's Act cannot bring a new action under that Act in respect of the same matter; and we should infer, though that is not stated, that their only remedy is to revive the action commenced by the deceased, which our Supreme Court has held, as we have seen, cannot be done.

PREROGATIVE—INTERFERENCE WITH PRIVATE RIGHTS—TREATIES—ACTS OF STATE.

In *Walker v. Baird* (1892), A.C. 491, an important point of constitutional law is considered by the Privy Council. It will be remembered that the action was brought against a captain of the Royal Navy by a person engaged in the lobster fishery in Newfoundland, for an alleged wrongful interference by the defendant with the plaintiff's rights of property. The defendant set up that the acts in question were done in pursuance of orders received from the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty by command of Her Majesty for the purpose of putting in force an agreement embodied in a *modus vivendi*, which, as an act of State and public policy, had been by Her Majesty entered into with the Government of France, and the defendant contended that the alleged trespass, being an act of State and involving the construction of treaties and of the *modus vivendi*, could not be inquired into in a court of law; but the Privy Council, without determining how far, if at all, private rights can be interfered with by treaties with foreign powers, or otherwise than by an Act of the legislature, was nevertheless of opinion that the court below was correct in deciding that, as between the Queen's subjects, the court had jurisdiction to inquire into the matter, and that the question of the validity, interpretation, and effect of all instruments and evidences of title and authority affecting the matter in dispute rest, in the first place, in the courts of competent jurisdiction within which the cause of action arises.

Early Notes of Canadian Cases.

SUPREME COURT OF CANADA.

Ontario.]

[Oct. 10.

MCDUGALL *v.* CAMERON.BICKFORD *v.* CAMERON.

Solicitor—Action for costs—Set-off—Mutuality—Appeal—Jurisdiction.

A firm of solicitors brought an action against certain clients on a bill of costs, to which action it was sought to set off a sum of money received by one of the solicitors from one of the clients for special services. The taxing officer allowed the set-off, but his decision was reversed on appeal.

Held, affirming the judgment of the Court of Appeal for Ontario, that assuming the court had jurisdiction to entertain the appeal, which was doubtful, the client was not entitled to set-off in an action by a firm, a sum paid to one of its members, the debts not being mutual; moreover, the money being paid to one of the solicitors for special services, and not for services covered by the retainer to the firm, it could not be set off.

Held, per TASCHEREAU, J., that the appeal was not from a final judgment within the meaning of the Supreme Court Act, and there was no jurisdiction to entertain it.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Riddell & Nesbitt for appellants.

Ritchie, Q.C., for respondents.

WESTERN ASSURANCE CO. *v.* ONTARIO
COAL CO.

Marine insurance—General average—Insurance on hull—Abandonment—Attempt to save vessel and cargo—Expense incurred—Liability of cargo to contribute—Average bond.

A schooner loaded with coal was stranded in Humber Bay near Toronto, and abandoned. The hull was insured, but not the cargo, and notice of abandonment was given to the underwriters, who secured the services of an experienced wrecker and a wrecking expedition, and attempted to save the vessel. It was considered advisable, and the best course in the interest of the owners of the cargo as well as the under-

writers, to attempt to save the vessel and cargo together. Owing to stress of weather, operations could not be begun for some days after the expedition was ready, and when the wreckers got to work a portion of the coal was taken out and attempts made to save the vessel, but without success, and she had to be abandoned. Before any of the cargo was delivered, the owners and the underwriters executed an average bond, by which, after a recital of the loss of the schooner, they respectively bound themselves to pay the losses and expenses incurred according to their respective shares in the vessel, her earnings as freight and her cargo, and that such losses and expenses should be stated and apportioned in accordance with the established laws and usage of the Province in similar cases by a named adjuster.

The adjuster apportioned the loss between the underwriters, as owners of the material saved, and the owners of the cargo, making the amount due from the latter \$2314, and an action was brought against them on the average bond to recover the same. The sum of \$557 was paid into court, and liability beyond that amount was denied.

Held, affirming the judgment of the Court of Appeal (19 A.R. 41), of the Queen's Bench Division (20 O.R. 295), and of *BOYD, C.* (19 O.R. 462), that the average bond only obliged the owners of the cargo to pay what should be legally due according to the law of general average; that the cargo and the vessel were never in that common peril which gives the right to claim for general average; and that the sum paid into court was sufficient to cover the cost which would have been incurred in saving the cargo by itself, and the underwriters were not entitled to recover more.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Osler, Q.C., and *Chrysler, Q.C.*, for appellants.

Delamere, Q.C., for respondents.

HARRIS *v.* ROBINSON.

Contract—Specific performance—Time—Extension—Waiver—Rescission.

H. made an offer to R. for exchange of properties on specified terms, the matter to be closed within ten days if possible. R. accepted the offer. He had not, at the time, the title to

the property he proposed to transfer, but had an agreement for the sale of it with one S., who had a similar agreement with the holder of the title. Several interviews took place between the parties and their solicitors, both before and after the ten days elapsed, and the registry office was visited, where it was found that the contract which formed the title of S. was not registered, and also that there was an annuity charged against the lands which R. was to transfer. These matters were pointed out to S., who took no active steps to remove them. Finally a letter was sent by H. to R.'s solicitor, informing him that unless something were done in regard to the proposed change by the following morning the agreement would be considered null and void. After this letter was written, R. took proceedings to enforce his agreement with S., and obtained a decree declaring his title to the property he proposed to transfer to H. a valid title, and he then brought a suit against H. for specific performance of the agreement for exchange. This suit was tried before ARMOUR, C.J., who dismissed the action, holding that time was of the essence of the contract. His judgment was reversed by the Divisional Court, and on further appeal to the Court of Appeal the judges were equally divided in opinion, and the decision of the Divisional Court stood.

Held, reversing the decision of the Court of Appeal (19 A.R. 134) and of the Divisional Court (21 O.R. 43), TASCHEREAU, J., dissenting, that the action could not be maintained; that as the evidence established that R. had no title whatever, at the date of the agreement, to the land he proposed to transfer to H., the latter was not bound to give reasonable notice of intention to rescind, as he would have been if the title had been imperfect merely; that the letter to R.'s solicitor put an end to the contract; and, independently of any rescission, the conduct of R. was such as to disentitle him to relief by way of specific performance.

Held, further, affirming in this respect the judgment of the courts below, that time was originally of the essence of the contract, but H. had waived the necessity to adhere to the time specified by negotiating as to the title after it had expired.

Appeal allowed with costs.

Reeve, Q.C., for the appellant.

Hodgins and Coatsworth for the respondent.

Quebec.]

[Oct. 6.

TREMBLAY v. BERNIER.

Notarial Code—R.S.Q., Art. 3871—Board of Notaries—Disciplinary powers—Prohibition.

When a charge derogatory to the honour of the profession of notary is made against a notary under the provisions of the Notarial Code, R.S.Q., Art. 3871, which amounts to a crime or felony, the Board of Notaries has jurisdiction to investigate it without waiting for the sentence of a court of criminal jurisdiction.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Belcourt, Q.C., for the appellant.

Fremont and Languedoc, for the respondents.

[Oct. 10.

PARADIS v. BOSSÉ.

Proceedings before Exchequer and Supreme Courts of Canada—Solicitor's costs—Quantum meruit—Parol evidence—Art. 3597, R.S.Q.

In proceedings before the Exchequer and Supreme Courts, there being no tariff as between attorney and client, an attorney has the right to establish the *quantum meruit* of his services by oral evidence in an action for his costs.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Belcourt and MacRy for appellant.

Casgrain, Q.C., for respondent.

O'SHAUGNESSY v. BALL.

36 Vict., c. 81 (P.Q.)—Booms—Proprietary rights—Replevin—(Revendication)—Estoppel by conduct.

O'S., claiming to be the legal depositary, and T. McC., claiming to be the usufructuary of certain booms, chains, and anchors in the Nicolet River under 36 Vict., c. 81, and which G.B., being in possession of the same for several years under certain deeds and agreements from T. McC., had stored in a shed for the winter, brought an action *en revendication* to replevy the same, and for \$5000 damages.

Held, affirming the judgment of the court below, that O'S. and T. McC. were not entitled to the possession as alleged, and that they were precluded by their conduct and acquiescence from disturbing G.B.'s possession. See *Ball v. McCaffrey*, 20 S.C.R. 317.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

M. Honan for appellants.

P. N. Martel for respondent.

EMERALD PHOSPHATE CO. v. ANGLO-CONTINENTAL GUANO WORK CO.

Mining lands—Borinage—Injunction—Appeal—Jurisdiction—R.S.C., c. 9.

In a case of a dispute between adjoining proprietors of mining lands, where an encroachment is complained of and it appears that the limits of the respective properties have not been legally determined by a *borinage*, the Court of Queen's Bench (appeal side) held that an injunction would not lie to prevent the alleged encroachment, the proper remedy being an action *en borinage*.

On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada, *Held*, that as the matter in controversy did not put in issue any title to land where the rights in future might be bound, the case was not appealable. R.S.C., c. 139, s. 29 (b).

Appeal quashed with costs.

Lastname, Q.C., and *Cross*, for the appellant.
McCarthy, Q.C., and *Foran*, for the respondent.

BAPTIST v. BAPTIST.

Appeal—Final judgment—Action en reprise d'instance—Art. 439, C.C.P.—R.S.C., c. 135, ss. 2, 24, 28.

In an action brought to set aside a deed of assignment, the plaintiff died before the case was ready for judgment, and the respondent having petitioned to be allowed to continue the suit as legatee of the plaintiff under a will dated the 17th November, 1869, the appellant contested the continuance on the ground that this will had been revoked by a later will dated 17th January, 1885. The respondent replied that this last will was null and void, and upon that issue the Court of Queen's Bench for Lower Canada (appeal side), reversing the judgment of the Superior Court, declared null and void the will of 17th January, 1885, and held the continuance of the original suit by respondent to be admitted. On appeal to the Supreme Court, the respondent moved to quash the appeal on the ground that the judgment appealed from was an interlocutory judgment; and it was

Held, that the judgment was *res judicata* between the parties and final on the petition for continuance of the suit, and therefore appealable to this court. R.S.C., c. 135, s. 2 & 28. *Sharv v. St. Louis* (8 S.C.R. 385) followed.

Motion refused with costs.

Lafleur for motion.

Stuart, C., *contra*.

[Nov. 2.]

THE RICHELIEU ELECTION CASE.

Election petition—Status of petitioner—Preliminary objection—Lists of voters—Dominion Elections Act—R.S.C., c. 8, ss. 30 (b) 31, 33, 41, 54, 58, & 65—The Electoral Franchise Act—R.S.C., c. 5, s. 37.

Held, affirming the decision of GILL, J., where the petitioner's status in an election petition is objected to by preliminary objection, the evidence of his being entitled to petition against the return of the respondent being susceptible of easy proof by the production of the voters' list actually used, or a copy thereof certified by the Clerk in Chancery, R.S.C., c. 8, ss. 41, 58 & 65; R.S.C., c. 5, s. 52, the production at the *enquête* of a copy certified by the revising officer of the list of voters upon which his name appears, but which has not been compared with the voters' list actually used at said election, is insufficient proof. GWYNNE and PATERSON, JJ., dissenting.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Morgan and *Genmill* for appellant.

Belcourt and *Plamondon* for respondent.

[Nov. 3.]

COUTURE v. BOUCHARD.

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Amending Act, 1871—54-55 Vict., c. 25, s. 3—Appeal from Court of Review—Case standing over for judgment—Amount necessary for right of appeal—Arts. 1178 & 1178 (a) C.C.P.

The action in this cause was for \$2006, and the case was argued and taken *en délibéré* by the Supreme Court sitting in review on the 30th September, 1891, the day on which the Act 54-55 Vict., c. 25, s. 3, giving a right of appeal from the Superior Court in review to the Supreme Court of Canada, was sanctioned, and the judgment appealed from was rendered a month later. On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Held, per STRONG, FOURNIER, and TASCHEREAU, JJ., that the respondent's right could not be prejudiced by the delay of the court, and under the ruling of *Hurtubise v. Desmarceau* (19 Can. S.C.R. 562) the case was not appealable.

Per GWYNNE and PATERSON, JJ.: That the case did not come within the words of s. 3, c. 25, 54-55 Vict., inasmuch as the judgment being for less than £500 sterling was not a judgment

which the appellant had a right of appeal to the Privy Council in England. Arts. 1178 & 1178 (a) C.C.P.

Appeal quashed with costs.

T. C. Casgrain, Q.C., for motion.
Pelletier, contra.

GREAT EASTERN RAILWAY *v.* LANDE.

Opposition afin de charge—Pledge—Art. 40 C.C. — Agreement—Effect of—Arts. 1971, 2015, and 2094 C.C.

The respondent obtained against the Montreal & Sorel Railway Co. a judgment for the sum of \$675 and costs, and having caused a writ of *renditioni exponas* to issue against the railway property of the Montreal & Sorel Railway, the appellants, who were in possession and working the railway, claimed under a certain agreement in writing to be entitled to retain possession of the railway property pledged to them for the disbursements they had made on it, and filed an opposition *afin de charge* for the sum of \$35,000 in the hands of the sheriff. The respondent contested the opposition. The agreement relied on by the appellant company was entered into between the Montreal & Sorel Railway and the appellant company, and stated, amongst other things, that "the Montreal & Sorel Railway Co. was burthened with debts, and had neither money nor credit to place the road in running order," etc. The amount claimed for disbursements, etc., was over \$35,000. The Superior Court, whose judgment was affirmed by the Court of Queen's Bench for Lower Canada, dismissed the opposition *afin de charge*. On appeal to the Supreme Court, the respondent moved to quash the appeal on the ground that the amount of the original judgment was the only matter in controversy, and was insufficient in amount to give jurisdiction to the court. The court, without deciding the question of jurisdiction, heard the appeal on the merits, and it was

Held, (1) that such an agreement must be deemed in law to have been made with intent to defraud, and was void as to the anterior creditors of the Montreal & Sorel Railway Co.

(2) That as the alleged deed of pledge affected immovable property, and had not been registered, it was void against the anterior creditors of the Montreal & Sorel Railway Co. (Arts. 1977, 2015, and 2094 C.C.).

(3) That Art. 419 C.C. does not give to a pledgee of an immovable who has not registered his deed a right of retention as against the pledger's execution creditors for the payment of his disbursements on the property pledged, but the pledgee's remedy is by an opposition *afin de conserver* to be paid out of the proceeds of the judicial sale (Art. 1972 C.C.).

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Louergan for appellant.

Choquette for respondent.

Nova Scotia].

[Oct. 10.

SMITH *v.* MCLEAN.

Bill of sale—Affidavit of bona fides—Adherence to statutory form—Description of deponent—R.S.N.S., 5th ser., c. 94, ss. 4 & 11.

By R.S.N.S., 5th ser., c. 92, s. 4, every bill of sale executed in Nova Scotia must be accompanied by an affidavit by the grantor that it is given in good faith, etc., and by s. 11 such affidavit shall be as nearly as may be in the form given in schedules to the Act. The prescribed form begins as follows: "I, A.B., of . . . in the county of . . . (occupation) make oath and say." In an affidavit accompanying a bill of sale given under this Act, the occupation of the deponent was not stated.

Held, per STRONG, GWYNNE, and PATTERSON, JJ., that as the affidavit referred in terms to the bill of sale itself, in which the occupation of the grantor was mentioned, the statute was complied with, and the instrument was valid.

Per TASCHEREAU, J.: The onus was on the persons attacking the bill of sale to prove, by direct evidence, that the deponent had no occupation, which they had failed to do.

The judgment of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia was reversed.

Appeal allowed with costs.

Whitman for the appellants.

Silver for the respondent.

BRITISH-AMERICAN ASSURANCE CO. *v.* LAW.

Marine insurance—Insurable interest—Insurance on advances—Construction of policy.

A policy of marine insurance on the barque Lizzie Perry was issued by the British American Assurance Co. to W.L.&Co., managing owners of the vessel. The first part of the policy read as

follows: "L. & Co., on account of owners, loss, if any, payable to L. & Co., do make insurance and cause to be insured, lost or not lost, the sum of \$2000, on advances upon the body tackle," etc. The policy was on a printed form, but the words "on advances" were inserted in writing. The remainder of the instrument was applicable to insurance on a ship only.

To an action on this policy the defence was that it only insured advances by the owners, which were not a proper subject of insurance, and the policy was, therefore, void. It was shown that L. & Co. had expended considerable money in repairs on the vessel.

Held, affirming the judgment of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, that the rule *ut res magis valeat quam pereat* required the policy to be construed, if possible, so as to make it a valid instrument, and this could be done either by striking out the words "on advances" as surplusage, or treating them as being a mere immaterial reference to the inducement which led the owners to insure the ship.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Henry, Q.C., for appellants.

Borden, Q.C., for respondents.

CROWE v. ADAMS.

Sheriff—Action against—Trespass or trover for seizing goods—Justification—Necessity to show judgment—Title to goods—Married Woman's Property Act (R.S.N.S., 5th ser., c. 74).

A sheriff having seized goods under execution against Donald A., the wife of the execution debtor brought an action against him for trespass by such seizure, alleging that the goods seized were her separate property, under the Married Woman's Property Act (R.S.N.S., 5th ser., c. 74), and claiming also that the execution was void, as her husband's name was Daniel, and not Donald. On the trial the sheriff, under his plea of justification, put in evidence the writ of execution, but did not prove the judgment on which it issued. The jury found that the plaintiff's right to the goods seized, whatever it was, was acquired from her husband after marriage, which would not make it her separate property under the Act; they also found that the husband was well known by both names of Daniel and Donald. The trial judge held that the plea of justification was not proved by the production

of the execution, but that proof of the judgment was necessary, and he gave judgment for the plaintiff, which was affirmed by the full court.

Held, reversing the judgment of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, that the action could not be maintained; that a sheriff sued in trespass or trover for taking or converting goods seized under execution can justify under the execution without showing the judgment: *Hannon v. McLean* (3 S.C.R. 706) followed; and that by the findings of the jury the goods seized must be considered to belong to the husband, which is a complete answer to the action.

Appeal allowed with costs.

Newcombe for the appellant.

Borden, Q.C., for the respondent.

CHANDLER ELECTRIC CO. v. FULLER.

Negligence—Manufacture of electricity—Discharge of steam—Damage to adjoining property.

F. was owner of a warehouse in the city of Halifax used for storing iron, and had occupied the same for some twenty years. In 1889 the Chandler Electric Co. established a station for generating electricity on the adjoining premises. Attached to the engine used by the company in said business was a condenser which passed through the floor of their premises and discharged into the dock below at a distance of some twenty feet from said warehouse. In March, 1889, the warehouse was found to be full of steam, which fact was communicated to the officers of the company who stated that they could not understand how it could have been caused by their engine. The steam continued to enter the warehouse, injuring the iron therein, and in 1890 an action was commenced by F. against the company for such damage. The company contended, as a defence to the action, that they were using the latest and best improvements in machinery for their business, and that they operated the same in a proper manner, and without negligence; that the injury, if caused by their engine, was due to the defective state of the plaintiff's premises; and that they were acting in pursuance of statutory powers contained in their act of incorporation, and were therefore exempt from liability. At the trial judgment was given against the company and on appeal to the full court the judges were equally divided.

Held, affirming the judgment of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, that the act causing the injury violated the rule which does not permit a person, even on his own land, to do an act which, lawful in itself, yet necessarily causes injury to another, and, especially as the injury continued after notice to the company, the plaintiffs were entitled to recover damages therefor.

F. H. Bell for the appellants.

Newcombe for the respondents.

New Brunswick.]

[Oct. 10.

BUCK *v.* KNOWLTON.

Marine insurance—Application to agent—Neglect to forward—Liability of agent for—Privy of contract—Negligence—Trove.

B., wishing to insure his vessel, went to a firm of insurance brokers at St. John, N.B., to whom he gave an app' cation for \$800 insurance at 11 per cent. on a valuation of \$2500. The brokers sent the application by a clerk to K., the agent at St. John for an underwriter's company in Portland, Me., requesting a policy from his company. K. informed the clerk that he would not forward the application unless the valuation was put at \$3000, or the premium raised to 12 per cent. This was never acceded to by the brokers, and two days after K. forwarded an application to his company putting the valuation at \$3000, and on the following day the vessel was burnt. The policy was sent to K., but recalled by telegram before it was delivered to B. or to the brokers, and was returned to the company. B. brought an action against K. claiming damages for negligence in not forwarding the application in proper time, with a count in trover for conversion of the policy.

Held, affirming the decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, that as K. never forwarded, nor undertook to forward, the application signed by the brokers on B.'s behalf he owed no duty to B., and could not be liable for any negligence.

Held, further, that as the policy issued never ceased to be the property of the company, and was nothing more than an escrow in the hands of K., no action would lie against K. for its conversion.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Palmer, Q.C., for appellants.

McLeod, Q.C., for respondent.

VAUGHAN *v.* RICHARDSON.

Marine insurance—Charter party—Disbursements—Difference in freight—Guarantee of part owner—Consideration—Misrepresentation—Pleading—Evidence.

V., part owner and managing owner of the ship *Eurydice*, chartered her to R. for a voyage from Savannah to Liverpool; the charterer was to pay a lump sum for freight and the master to sign bills of lading at any rate of freight without prejudice to the charter party; if the actual freight exceeded the sum payable by the charter, the master of the ship was to give bills for the difference to R., payable ten days after the arrival of the ship at Liverpool, and the disbursements were to be secured by similar bills. When the ship was loaded it was found that the difference in freight was in favour of R., and by arrangement with the son of V., the managing owner, who held a power of attorney to act as his agent, the master drew two bills of exchange on the agents of the ship at Liverpool, one for the amount of the disbursements, and the other for the difference in freight; each in favour of R., and payable sixty days after sight.

The bills were accepted by the agents, but were not paid at maturity, and notice of dishonour was given to V., who, on receiving it, sent another of his sons to the solicitors who held the bills for collection. This son stated to the solicitors that his father would like the matter to be held over until he could communicate with the other owners, which was acceded to, and an agreement was drawn up, in the form of a letter to the solicitors, requesting them to delay proceeding on the bill for disbursements until the ship arrived at St. John, N.B. (where V. lived), and guaranteeing immediate payment, on her arrival, of that bill, with cost of protest, etc., and also of the bill for difference in freight. This agreement was taken to V., who signed it, and it was returned to the solicitors. When the ship arrived V. paid the draft for disbursements, but refused to pay the other, on the ground that he had supposed that they were both for disbursements, and that the solicitors had so stated to his son when the agreement was prepared. An action was then brought against V. on his guarantee to pay the draft for difference in freight, to which he pleaded that he had been induced to sign the same by fraud and misrepresentation.

On the trial of the action, it was held that the son who acted for V. at Savannah under a power of attorney had at first refused to sanction the drawing of the bill for difference in freight, but finally agreed to it on receiving a letter stating the circumstances and what the draft was for, which letter, as he stated in giving evidence, he had sent to V., but it was not produced. The son who had called upon the solicitors swore that they had told him that both bills were for disbursements, and had so stated to his father. In this he was contradicted by V. himself, who said in his evidence that his son had told him that the larger bill was for disbursements, and the smaller for difference in freight. His counsel contended, on moving against the verdict in favour of R., that he was incapacitated by age and infirmity from giving reliable evidence.

It was admitted by counsel for V. that any misrepresentation made by the solicitors as to the nature of the drafts was an innocent misrepresentation only, not made with intent to deceive. A verdict was given for the plaintiff, which the full court sustained.

Held, affirming the judgment of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick (28 N.B. Rep. 364), that the verdict should stand; that the defence of misrepresentation set up at the trial was not open to the defendant under the plea of fraud, and should have been distinctly pleaded; that no application to amend by adding such a plea having been made at the trial, it could not be entertained now, in view of the length of time the case had been in litigation and the delays that had taken place; that even if the defence were available nothing could be gained by ordering a new trial, as no jury could help finding for the plaintiff under the evidence given by the defendant himself, which would have to be read to the jury, the defendant having died since the trial.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Barker, Q.C., and *Palmer*, Q.C., for appellants.

Hasen and *Currey* for respondents.

British Columbia.] [Oct. 19.

EDMONDS v. TIERNAN.

Mechanics' lien—Suspension—Waiver—Taking promissory note for amount.

T. was building a house under contract, and E. supplied him with material, taking a promis-

sory note for \$100, the amount of his account. The note was discounted, but dishonoured at maturity, and E. took it up and filed a mechanics' lien against the property which T. had been building. Prior to this the owner had paid T. \$500, and afterwards—but when was not certain—he paid \$600 more. In an action by E. to enforce his lien,

Held, affirming the judgment of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, that E. had waived his lien by taking the note, which suspended the lien during its currency; and there being nothing in the Lien Act to show that, being once abandoned, it could be revived again, even assuming that only part of the amount had been paid to T. before the lien was filed, it would be absolutely gone.

Appeal dismissed with costs.

Cassidy for the appellant.

Chrysler, Q.C., for the respondents.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE
FOR ONTARIO.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Queen's Bench Division.

Div'l Court.]

[Nov. 28.

IN RE THOMPSON v. HAY.

Prohibition—Division Court—Territorial jurisdiction—R.S.O., c. 51, s. 87; 52 Vict., c. 12, s. 5—Application to transfer cause—Trial of question raised by notice disputing jurisdiction—Refusal of judge to try.

Where the judge presiding at the trial of an action in a Division Court declines to try the question of the jurisdiction of the Division Court raised by a notice disputing the jurisdiction, he may be prohibited.

Such question is to be tried at the time and place of the trial of the action; and the defendant is no way bound by anything contained in R.S.O., c. 51, s. 87, as amended by 52 Vict., c. 12, s. 5, to apply for an order transferring the action to a Division Court having jurisdiction over it, or to apply to the judge at any other time or place for the trial of the question so raised.

In re Watson v. Woolverton, 9 C.L.T. Occ. N. 480, distinguished.

Per FALCONBRIDGE, J., dissenting: The defendant, before coming to the High Court for prohibition, is bound to apply to the county judge somewhere, either at or before the trial, to transfer the cause; and in this case he did not so apply.

Shepley, Q.C., for the plaintiff.

G. W. Marsh for the defendant.

FALCONBRIDGE, J.]

[Dec. 5.]

MURRAY *v.* MACDONALD.

Life insurance—Policy—Construction of—Money payable to "children"—Representative of deceased child.

By a policy of life insurance, the insurers agreed to pay the amount of the insurance within ninety days after notice and proof of the death of the insured to the wife of the insured, or her legal representatives; or, if she should not then be living, to her children, or to their guardian, if under age. The wife predeceased the insured. Two of her children predeceased her, one of them leaving a child.

Held, that only the children who survived the wife were entitled to share in the insurance moneys payable under the policy.

Bain, Q.C., for the plaintiffs.

Marsh, Q.C., for the defendant.

Chancery Division.

BOYD, C.]

[Oct. 4.]

RE MCDOWELL AND THE CORPORATION OF THE TOWN OF PALMERSTON.

Legislative Assembly—Powers of, to change ownership of land—Necessity for intervention as to burial ground—48 Vict., c. 92 (O.).

The legislature has power, as far as abstract competence is concerned, to change the ownership of land in the province without making any compensation. The intervention of the legislature is necessary to change the distinctive character of a burial ground or the site of the graves. The provisions in 48 Vict., c. 92 (O.), providing that the costs of legislation and re-interment should be charged against the compensation to be allowed to the original owner of the land were just, and should be charged against the value of the land.

A. M. Clark for the motion.

Guthrie, Q.C., and *Hoyles*, Q.C., *contra*.

STREET, J.]

[Nov. 15.]

SKLITZKY *v.* CRANSTON.

Plan—Streets on—Sale of lots by—Highways—Township lot—Right of way on streets—Right of action—R.S.O., c. 152, s. 62—Costs.

A street laid out through a township lot where no village exists is a private street, even though lots are sold facing on it, until the township council adopts it as a public highway, or until the public, by travelling on it, accepts the dedication offered; and s. 62 of R.S.O., c. 152, applies only to incorporated villages.

A purchaser of a lot on a registered plan of a township lot acquires against his vendor a private right to use the streets on the plan, subject to the right of the public to make them highways.

The plaintiff having brought this action to restrain the fencing-in of certain streets, one of which was found by the trial judge to be a highway, and, not having shown any special or peculiar damage not shared in by the public, was

Held not to be entitled to maintain the action as to that street, and was ordered to pay the costs of that part of the action.

Held, also, as to other streets on the plan not found to be highways, that the plaintiff was not necessarily entitled to a roadway over every part of the streets, but to such a width as might be necessary for his reasonable enjoyment of it.

Held, also, that as there was no immediate or serious damage to be apprehended from the maintenance of fences on the streets it was unnecessary to apply for an interim injunction, which was obtained, and that the plaintiff must pay the costs of it.

J. P. Mabee and *J. L. Darling* for the plaintiff.

Garrow, Q.C., and *G. G. McPherson* for the defendant.

FERGUSON, J.]

[Nov. 17.]

MITCHELL *v.* MCMURRICH.

Action for damages for wrongful issue of a writ in a civil action—Malice—Special damage—Demurrer.

Held, on demurrer to a statement of claim in an action for damages for the wrongful issue of a writ of summons in a civil action in the name of a third person, that

(1) The statement that the writ was issued

"wrongfully and unlawfully and without instructions" was not a sufficient allegation of malice and want of probable cause to support the action.

(2) The allegations that, by reason of the act complained of, the plaintiff was injured in his calling and occupation as a builder, and in his credit and reputation, and delayed in the performance of his contracts, and had to procure moneys at a higher rate of interest, and that other creditors were induced to take action against him, and in order to compromise and settle such actions he had to sacrifice his property, were not sufficient allegations of special damage.

E. D. Armour, Q.C., for the demurrer.

Swartout, *contra*.

Practice.

Q.B. Div'l Court.]

[Nov. 21

COLEMAN *v.* CITY OF TORONTO.

Discovery—Examination of officer of municipal corporation—Medical health officer.

In an action for an injunction and damages in respect of the alleged insanitary condition of a certain bay into which the defendants drained part of their sewage, the plaintiffs sought to examine for discovery the medical health officer of the defendants, whose sole connection with the subject-matter of the action arose from his having made an examination of and a report to the local board of health upon the sanitary condition of the bay. The plaintiffs desired to cross-examine upon the report and to have its meaning explained.

Held, that, having regard to the kind of discovery which the plaintiffs desired to obtain from the medical health officer, he was not examinable as an officer of the defendants.

Decision of GALT, C.J., *ante* p. 575, 15 P.R. 27, affirmed.

R. Boulton for the plaintiffs.

H. M. Mowat for the defendants.

BOYD, C.]

RE WARTMEN.

Will—Devise—Postponement of enjoyment—Vested interest—Present payment.

A testator directed the realization of his estate and the deposit of the proceeds in a bank

until his youngest child should come of age, when they were to be divided among three named children. Two of the children attained 21, and sold and assigned all their interests to third parties. The estate was wound up except as to the division, and the purchasers applied to the court for an order for the payment to them of the two shares so assigned without waiting for the coming of age of the youngest child.

Held, that the two children who were of age had a vested interest absolute, which, under the rule laid down in *Curtis v. Lukin*, 5 Beav., at p. 155, warranted an order for the present payment.

Hoyle, Q.C., for the petitioners.

J. Hoskin, Q.C., official guardian for the infant.

THE MASTER IN CHAMBERS.]

[Nov. 23.

EMERSON *v.* HUMPHRIES.

Interpleader—Writ of possession—Adverse claim—Right of sheriff to interplead—Rule 1141 (b)—Parties—Infant devisees—Executors—Mortgage action—Claim for possession of land.

In an action upon a mortgage made by a deceased person, who died in 1889, payment, foreclosure, and possession were claimed, and the executors were the only defendants. Judgment for possession, *inter alia*, was recovered, and a writ of possession placed in the sheriff's hands. The widow, who was one of the executors, and the infant children of the deceased mortgagor had an interest under the will in the mortgaged lands, and were in possession when the sheriff attempted to execute the writ. The infants, and the widow as their guardian, made a claim to the possession as against the writ, based on the ground of the infants not having been made parties to the action.

Held, that the sheriff, by virtue of Rule 1141 (b), was entitled to interplead.

Held, that the action as regards the claim for possession was properly constituted; and the infants were bound by the judgment against the executors.

Keen v. Codd, 14 P.R. 182, distinguished.

R. J. MacLennan for the sheriff.

G. C. Campbell for the plaintiffs.

Ballantyne for the defendant.

F. W. Harcourt for the infant claimants.

Q.B. Div'l Court.]

[Dec. 1.

BELLAMY v. CONNOLLY.

Lien—Solicitor's lien for costs—Settlement of action by parties—Order for costs—No fruits of litigation—Notice by solicitor to parties—Collusion.

The solicitor for the plaintiff in an action for slander gave notice to the plaintiff and defendant that if the action should be settled between them it must be settled in his office, in his presence, and with his knowledge and consent.

A settlement was arrived at before trial between the plaintiff and defendant, without the knowledge of the plaintiff's solicitor, by which the action was to be dropped and each party was to bear his own costs. At the same time, a settlement was also effected of a County Court action brought by the same plaintiff against the same defendant for the conversion of a mare and colt, valued by the defendant at \$135, it being agreed that the defendant should pay an overdue note for \$122, which he had indorsed for the accommodation of the plaintiff, and should keep the mare and colt as his own property, and that each party should pay his own costs.

The plaintiff's solicitor alleged that this action was fraudulently and collusively settled with a view of depriving him of his costs thereof, and obtained an order in Chambers requiring the defendant to pay him such costs.

Held, that the action was the plaintiff's action, and it was competent for him to settle it behind the back of the solicitor, notwithstanding the notice given; that the solicitor had no lien on the action, but could only have had a lien on the fruits, and, there being no fruits, there was no lien, and he was not entitled to invoke the equitable interference of the court; that there were no fruits of the County Court action, and, if there had been, they could not be said to be the fruits of this action, and, besides, the solicitor had not notified the defendant that he claimed a lien upon such fruits; that it was necessary for the solicitor to show clearly that there had been collusion with a view to defraud him of his costs, and, upon the evidence, it could not be fairly inferred that there was such collusion; and, therefore, the order in Chambers should be set aside.

Aylesworth, Q.C., for the plaintiff's solicitor.

Masten for the defendant.

MEREDITH, J.]

[Dec. 6.

IN RE SOLICITOR.

Appeal—Certificate—Solicitor and client taxation of costs—Report—Court or Chambers.

The certificate of the result of a taxation of a solicitor's bill of costs at the instance of a client is a report, and, under Rules 848, 849, and 850, the appeal therefrom should be to a judge in court upon seven clear days' notice.

W. H. Blake for the solicitor.

J. B. Pattullo for the client.

ROSE, J.]

[Dec. 10.

MALCOLM v. LEYS.

Costs—Scale of—Jurisdiction of County Court—Amount in controversy—Interest.

Where the plaintiffs in an action in the High Court of Justice to recover a sum for work and labour and materials, the amount not being liquidated or ascertained, recovered \$197.01 for debt and \$14.54 for interest from the issue of the writ of summons;

Held, that the amount recovered was not within the jurisdiction of the County Court, and the plaintiffs were entitled to costs on the scale of the High Court.

G. B. Gordon for the plaintiffs.

E. D. Armour, Q.C., for the defendant.

BOYD, C.]

[Dec. 12.

MCARTHUR v. MICHIGAN CENTRAL R.W. CO.

Venue—Application to change—Refusal to interfere—Apportionment of costs by trial judge.

Having regard to the difficulty of deciding upon contradictory affidavits whether it is proper in any case to order a change of the place of trial, and to the unsatisfactory nature of the practice and the conflicting decisions upon the question of change of venue, it is better to refuse applications for change of venue, and to leave the trial judge to apportion the costs so as to do justice, if it appears to him that the expense has been increased by the plaintiff's choice of a place of trial.

Roberts v. Jones and *Willey v. Great Northern R.W. Co.* (1891) 2 Q.B. 194, followed.

Douglas Armour for the plaintiff.

D. W. Saunders for the defendants.

INDEX.

	PAGE		
ACCORD AND SATISFACTION—		APPEAL— <i>Continued.</i>	
Check in payment of smaller amount.....	96	Benefit of, from colonial courts to England...	1
ACQUIESCENCE IN JUDGMENT—		Questions of fact—Trial judge.....	19
Quebec Law.....	312, 313	To Supreme Court—Jurisdiction... 20, 21, 89,	
ACTION—		To Supreme Court—Bond—Parties—Condition	126
Laches—Leave to proceed—Terms.....	216	Notice of appeal—"Special case".....	127
Dismissing, as vexatious.....	235	Quashing by-law.....	246
Decree for account—Claim for interest.....	297	Extension of time—Grounds for—Ex-	
Where it arises—Breach of contract.....	448	chequer Court Act.....	315
For wrongful issue of writ—Malice—Damage	624	Question of costs.....	
ADMINISTRATION—		147, 373, 374, 376, 472	
Bond—Breach—Legacy to minor.....	489	Whether final judgment.....	93
<i>See</i> Probate.		In criminal matter—Mandamus to magistrate	37
ADULTERATION—		Reinstatement of.....	62
Milk—Mode of selling—Intent.....	165	To Divisional Court under R.S.O., c. 133, s. 9,	127
Portion only submitted to analysis.....	488	From order of county judge commit' de-	
ADVERSE POSSESSION—		fendant as judgment debtor for fraud.	185
Husband and wife.....	413	Acquiescence in judgment—Quebec law . 312, 313	
ADVOCATE—		Raising new issue on.....	615
Meaning of term.....	138	Bond—Disallowance—Re-filing—Insufficiency	
AEROLITE—		of security.....	351
Ownership of.....	521	Final judgment—Quebec law.....	619
ALIMONY—		To Privy Council—Criminal Case.....	614
Examination on affidavit—Extent.....	95	APPOINTMENTS TO OFFICE—	
Not subject to prior debts of wife.....	138	27, 127, 218, 281, 351, 477, 602	
<i>See</i> Husband and Wife.		ARBITRATION—	
ALTERATIONS—		Arbitrator must be absolutely impartial....	349
In documents—Detection.....	74	Ascertaining amount of loss under policy....	349
AMENDMENT—		Practice—Commission to take evidence....	132
After judgment—Mortgage action.....	601	Single arbitrator—Refusal to concur in	
AMERICAN DECISIONS—		appointment—Notice.....	137
Citation of, in England.....	206	Staying proceedings—Fire insur. policy.	137
ANIMALS FERÆ NATURÆ—		Special reference—Consent.....	184
Rights of trespasser.....	264	Liability determined—Reference as to	
ANNUITY—		damages.....	184
Payment in lieu of—Value of.....	104	Commercial arbitrations—Benefits of con-	
APPEAL—		sidered.....	545
Defects of present appellate system.....	226, 277	Statement of special case.....	612
Court of, composed of even number of judges—		ARREST—	
Inconvenience.....	106	Affidavit for—Intent to defraud... ..	214
		ARTICLES FROM COTEMPORARY JOURNALS—	
		List of.....	156, 284, 604
		ASSESSMENT—	
		Income of insurance companies.....	33
		Exemption—Crown lands.....	93, 148
		Irregular—By-law.....	148
		Railway tunnel an hereditament.....	165
		Place of business—Branch.....	596
		Setting aside Court of Revision and County	
		Judge's decisions.....	596

	PAGE		PAGE
ASSIZES—		BAILMENT—	
Spring of 1892.....	96	Recovery of goods by bailor.....	75
Fall of 1892.....	416	Injury to chattel in possession of bailor—Damages.....	237
ASSIGNMENT AND PREFERENCES ACT—		BANKRUPTCY—	
Purchase by assignee—Trust—Inspector.....	541	B. N. A. Act—Jurisdiction of Dominion.....	88
Assignee acting as auctioneer.....	542	BANKRUPTCY ACT (English)—	
ASSIGNMENT, EQUITABLE—		When applicable in colonies.....	15
Contract to advance money.....	232	BANKS AND BANKING—	
Order for payment of money—Intention.....	249	Bill of lading—Transfer—Goods attached in foreign country—Conflict of laws.....	25
ASSIGNMENT FOR BENEFIT OF CREDITORS—		Error discovered after 20 years.....	75
Construction—Resulting trust.....	11	B. N. A. Act—Jurisdiction of Dominion.....	88
ASSIGNMENT OF DEBT—		Shares—Quebec law.....	92
Notice of prior change.....	429	Forged cheque—Laches.....	108
ASYLUM—		Fraud by agent of customer—Overdraft by Government officer.....	460
Right of.....	588	Bank Act—Warehouse receipt.....	122
ATTACHMENT OF DEBTS—		Delay in presenting cheque—Liability of drawer.....	127
Final order for payment—Notice to debtor—Assignment of debt.....	126	Liability of directors 139, 427, and <i>see</i> Joint Stock Co.....	206
Proceeds of sale of land—Debtor tenant by curtesy.....	153	Deposit—Liability.....	459
Security for costs.....	153	Of securities by broker.....	459
Trust fund—Counterclaim by garnishee.....	194	Winding up— <i>See</i> Joint Stock Company.	
Practice—Affidavit—Nature of debt.....	396	BARBED WIRE FENCE—	
Garnishing part of debt.....	397	Injury by.....	169
Legacy changed upon testator's estate—Receiver.....	570	BILLS AND NOTES—	
ATTORNEY AND CLIENT—		Acceptance qualified—Words prohibiting transfer in favor of drawer only.....	106
<i>See</i> Costs—Solicitor and Client.		Cancellation without authority—Damages.....	107
AUCTIONEER—		Endorsement—Guarantee or trust—Evidence.....	124
Conversion by—Sale on private premises.....	238	Failure of consideration—Laches.....	176
Assignee in insolvency acting as.....	542	Presentment—Notice—Waiver.....	179
AUTHORS—		Seizure of, in foreign country—Rights of prior holders in England.....	201
Rights and liabilities of publisher.....	265	Endorsement by party not named—Liability as maker.....	376
BENCH AND BAR—		Payment to payee, not then holder.....	399
Judges' doubts and difficulties in deciding.....	462	Note given as collateral security.....	414
Criticizing judges.....	589	BEHRING SEA CONTROVERSY—	
Retirement of inefficient judges.....	193	Discussed.....	163, 418
Counsel throwing up briefs.....	225	BERTHOE, MR. G. T. —	
Judges, their work and salaries.....	226	Obituary notice.....	66
English judges of to-day.....	266	BICYCLE—	
Judges as oarsmen.....	448	Right of way.....	431
Barristers and Solicitors in Melbourne.....	302	BIGAMY—	
Lawyers in the British Parliament.....	545	Offence committed out of colony.....	14
Charges against Judge Cook, of Trinidad.....	321	Powers of Colonial Legislature.....	14
Unprofessional advertising.....	322	BILL OF LADING—	
Unprofessional debt collector in trouble.....	449	Wrongful delivery—Trover.....	39
Lady lawyers.....	450, 609	<i>See</i> Strikes.	
Queen's Counsel and precedence.....	484	BILL OF SALE—	
Ontario's oldest barrister.....	495	<i>See</i> Chattel Mortgage.	
Recreations of lawyers.....	590		
<i>See</i> Judges.			
BENEFIT SOCIETY—			
Certificate payable to "legal heirs".....	280		
Appointment—Revocation—Trust.....	349		
<i>See</i> Friendly Society—Insurance (Life).			

	PAGE		PAGE
BOND—		CLUB LAW—	
Affidavit of justification—Cross-examination on	280	Liability of committees	302
Special endorsement in action on—Practice . .	429		
BOOMS—		COLONY—	
Proprietary rights—Estoppel	618	Power of Jjudge to appoint JJudge	614
BREACH OF PROMISE—		COMPANY—	
In what countries action for lies	29	Quebec law	471
		See Joint Stock Company.	
BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT—		COMPOSITION—	
Legislative authority over interest—Municipal		Loan to effect payment	89
taxes—"Interest"	22		
Readjustment of representation	322	CONSPIRACY—	
Legislative power c. Dominion Parliament . .	353	Combination of shipowners to keep up freight	235
See Separate Schools.			
See Bankruptcy—Separate Schools.		CONSTITUTIONAL LAW—	
BROKER—		Royal prerogative—Lieutenant-Governors . .	121
Deposit of securities with bank	459	Commuting and remitting sentences, 51	
		Vict., c. 5, (O.)	121
BURIAL GROUND—		Private rights—Treaties	616
Changing character of	624	Provincial crimes—Power of Legislature as to	
		procedure	124
BY-LAW—		See British North America Act—Crown.	
See Local Option—Municipal law.		CONTEMPT OF COURT—	
CANADA, HISTORY OF—		Non-performance of act necessitating payment	
Review of Mr. Kingsford's book	144, 171	of money	125
		Proceeding contrary to order of court	279
CANADIAN CONSTITUTION—		Pardoning power in relation to	386
Law of, discussed	353	CONTINGENT INTEREST—	
		Income prior to happening of contingency . .	426
CARRIER—		CONTINGENT REMAINDER—	
Goods refused by consignee—Sale by carrier	154	Estate <i>pur autre vie</i> —Dower	427
Payment before goods delivered	496		
End of responsibility of	521	CONTRACT—	
CHANCERY DIVISION—		Carriage of mails for Crown—Authority of	
jurisdiction of, in criminal matters	578	Postmaster-General	342
		Construction of railway—Standard of quality	17
CHAPMAN ON MEDICAL JURISPRUDENCE—		Tender for—Acceptance—Bond	18
Review of	525	Damages—Non-acceptance of offer—Reason-	
		able time	60
CHATTEL MORTGAGE—		Engineer's certificate—Finality	91
Statement of renewal	95	To make article on premises of third party . .	105
Solicitor's liability as to renewing	151	Rescission—Performance of condition	177
Effect of taking possession under as to priorities	180	Liability of contractor to third person	196
Bill of sale—Affidavit—54 Vict., c. 20	182	Illegal—Stifling prosecutions	97
Execution creditor contesting—Assent—		Stifling prosecution—Implied condition—	
Estoppel	182	Costs	199, 374
Nova Scotia—Affidavit	620	To advance money—Breach—Damages	232
		Revocation of offer	242
CHEQUE—		Rights of author and publisher	265
See Banks.		Agreement for service— <i>Quantum meruit</i> . . .	373
CHILDREN—		Letters—Condition precedent	414
Custody of. See Infant.		Acceptance—Time of—Withdrawal	426
CHURCH—		Restraint of trade—Rival business	456
Gift to, on condition of using black gown . .	202	Manufacture of patented article—Substitution	
Willings, by slander and buffoonery	577	of new agreement	504
		Wagering or insurance—Warranty	518
CLEMENT'S CANADIAN CONSTITUTION—		Specific performance—Time—Extension—	
Review of	555	Waiver	617
		See Action—Vendor and purchaser.	
		CONVICTION—	
		Quashing—Costs	124
		Under invalid by-law—Belief of right	253

	PAGE		PAGE
COPYRIGHT—		CRIMINAL LAW—Continued.	
Pictures—License—Assignment	42	Attempt to discharge loaded arms—Evidence.	453
Infringement—Evidence	454	Costs—Acquittal on some counts.....	458
COSTS—		Forgery — Interest of witness, R.S.C., c.	542
Scale of —Transfer from County Court to High	218	174, s. 2	589
Court	218	Judicial sentences.....	610
In Supreme and Exchequer Courts— <i>Quantum</i>	618	Witnesses and evidence	610
<i>meruit</i>	618	See Appeal—Constitutional Law—Forgery—	
Proceedings on Crown side	487	Larceny—Summary Conviction.	
Action for—Set-off—Mutuality	617	CROSS-EXAMINATION—	
Security for—Amount—Nominal plaintiff....	576	A Socratic fragment	304
Appeal to Supreme Court—Delivery out	601	Incidents.....	604, 605
of bond	601	CROWN—	
Plaintiff giving false address—Temporary	601	Liability of, for acts of servant.....	246
residence	601	Not a bailee—Goods stolen from customs ware-	
Plaintiff a prisoner.....	601	house.....	315
Taxation of—Alleged settlement—Appeal....	19	Damage by Government railway.....	342
Delivery of bill—Supplemental bill—Spe-	447	Injury to workman on public works.....	594
cial circumstances	447	Liability as common carrier.....	594
Three actions which could have been	448	Priority over simple contract creditors.....	615
joined	448	CROWN LANDS—	
Service of writ—Copies—Rules 274, 258,	475	Quebec law	91
259, 395	475	In British Columbia.....	314
After payment—Costs retained before bill	515	CURTESY, TENANCY BY—	
delivered.....	515	Wife dying intestate	515
Setting aside certificate—Affidavit of dis-	574	See Husband and Wife.	
bursements	574	DALTON, MR. R. G.—	
Review of taxation by Master.....	574	Retirement of.....	129
Final certificate—Appeal—Interlocutory	575	Obituary notice.....	385
costs	575	DAMAGES—	
Certificate is a report	626	Mental suffering	108
Witness and counsel fees	600	Liquidated—Penalty—Condition.....	136
False affidavit—Setting aside certificate—	600	Remote—Obstruction to highway.....	211
Jurisdiction	600	DEED—	
See Solicitor.		Construction—Right to mine—Mistake.....	105
COUNTY COURT MANUAL—		Trust—Parol evidence.....	177
By Mr. Gorman—Notice of	144	Reservation of right to get minerals—Setting	
COUNTY COURTS—		aside lease.....	295
Equity jurisdiction	33	Rule in Shelley's case—"Heirs"	457
Jurisdiction—Liquidated amount—Interest...	626	See Mortgage.	
COUNTY JUDGES—		DICKENS, H. F.—	
Appointment of.....	130	Notice of.....	553
COVENANT FOR TITLE—		DIGBY ON REAL PROPERTY—	
Breach—Damages—Easement.....	378	Review of.....	526
CRIME—		DIRECTOR—	
Preventive legislation considered.....	482	See Banks and Banking—Joint Stock Co.	
CRIMINAL CODE—		DISCOVERY—	
Who had precedence in introducing?	552	Infants.....	126
CRIMINAL LAW—		Production of documents—Privilege—Letters.	216
Work of International Association	450	Questions allowable—Identity of plaintiff....	217
Competency of defendant to testify.....	124	Infant plaintiff.....	324, 487
Hearing before magistrate—Refusal to hear	213	Inspection of bankers' books—Privilege—	
evidence taken before Parliamentary Com-	263	Sealing up entries.....	401
mittee.....	213	Action for penalties	430, 491
Recommendation to mercy in France.....	263	In libel to mitigate damages.....	491
Excessive sentences.....	303		
Conviction insufficiently describing offence—	523, 547		
Canadian Criminal Code.....	523, 547		
Evidence of accused person.....	590		

	PAGE		PAGE
DISCOVERY—Continued.		EDITORIALS—Continued.	
Action by agent	492	Behring Sea controversy	163
No examination in vacation (reversed in 1893)	574	Judicial incapacity	193
Production of documents in hands of third party	574	Law Associations	193
Examination of corporation official	575, 625	Counsel throwing up briefs	225
Practice—Extent	584	Mortgages and third persons	225
See Libel.		Judges—their work and salaries	226
		Queen's Counsel	289
DIVISION COURT—		Provincial legislation of 1892	289
Judgment reserved, but no day fixed	58	Judicial eccentricities	321
Jurisdiction—Judgment for \$200.70—Interest	150	The census and the B.N.A. Act	322
Judgment beyond—Limiting excess	150, 543	Unprofessional advertising	323
Transcript—Foundation for—"Proceeding"	184	The law of the Canadian constitution: General legislative power of Dominion Parliament	353
To County Court during pendency of judgment summons	412	Obituary notice of Mr. R. G. Dalton, Q.C.	385
Judge reserving judgment without naming day or notifying parties	597	Contempt of court and the pardoning power	386
Prohibition—Jurisdiction—Judge refusing to try	623	Injuries to free passengers	389
		Appointment of Mr. Winchester	417
		Transfer of insurance risk by agent	417
		Voluntary conveyance to a charity	418
		Behring Sea Arbitration	418
		Codification of criminal law	430
DOMICIL—		Practice in foreclosure	451
At commencement of proceedings	492	The Supreme Court Bench	481
		Tenancy by the curtesy	481
DONATIO MORTIS CAUSA—		Preventive legislation and crime	482
Delivery of keys	348	Pedestrians and electric street cars	483
		Obituary notice of Sir W. J. Ritchie	483
POWER—		Queen's Counsel and precedence	484
Estate <i>pur autre vie</i> —Contingent remainder	427	Electricity on highways	513
Nova Scotia law—Crown lands	472	Commercial arbitrations	545
		Police weapons	577
DRAINAGE—		The church and the law	577
Petition—New work	59	Criminal jurisdiction of the Chancery Division	578
Interference of council—Land injuriously affected—Mandamus—Notice	471	The new Chief Justice of the Supreme Court	609
Non-completion—Rights of municipality—Mandamus	504	The Law Society and the ladies	609
		Witnesses and Evidence in Criminal Cases	610
DRUNKENNESS—			
As an incentive to crime	66	ELECTIONS—CONVERTED—	
Legal relations, how affected by	269	Parliamentary—Reservice of petition—Extension of time	19
		Preliminary objections—Description of petitioner	19, 23
EASEMENT—		Service at domicile	21
Light—Extinguishment	298	Status of petitioner	21, 146, 147
Overhanging building	426	Personal service—Security—Receipt	22
Right of support—Canals—Mines	520	Deposit of security	146, 175
		Appeal—Dissolution of Parliament—Return of deposit	20
EDITORIALS—		English rules—Manitoba	23
Unlicensed conveyancers	1	Preliminary examination of respondent—Postponement until after session	146
Benefit of Appeal Courts	1	Electoral Franchise Act—Mandamus—Notice of objection	179
The Lord's Day Act	2	Loan for travelling expenses—Free tickets	247
Obituary notice of Sir Adam Wilson	3	Promise to procure employment	248
Grand juries	5	Appeal—Discontinuance	344
Assessment of income of insurance companies	33	Consent judgment voiding election	345
Equity jurisdiction of County Courts	33	Judgment—Enlargement—Notice of trial—Shorthand notes	374
Municipal election appeals from Master in Chambers	34	Municipal—Is decision of Master in Chambers final?	34
Land transfer and tenure	35	Qualification—51 Vict., c. 28, s. 9	212
Drunkenness and crime	65	Practice—Rule 1041	214
Contracts to stifle prosecutions	97	Recognition—Allowance of sureties—Appeal	214
Law reform in England	97		
Power to extend time after statutory limit expired	99		
Grand juries	129		
Appointment of county judges	130		
The Law Society and its secretary	161		
Telephone wars	161		
The uses of a Lieutenant-Governor	162		
		See Local Option.	

	PAGE		PAGE
ELECTRICITY—		FIREWORKS—	
Law of, as to highways	513	Injury to spectators	462
Electric Railways v. Telephone Company 141,	145	FIXTURES—	
Telephones v. Telegraphs	159	See Mortgage.	
Liability for loose wires	461	FOREIGN COUNTRY—	
Prevention of accidents	483	Trespass to land in—Jurisdiction	516
Stealing electricity	495	FORGERY —	
As a thief detector	553	Jurisdiction as to—Police magistrates	544
See Negligence.		See Criminal Law.	
EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT—		FRAUD—	
See Negligence.		See Fraudulent Conveyance—Fraudulent Pref- erence—Judgment Debtor—Misrepresenta- tion—Preference.	
EQUITABLE ASSIGNMENT—		FRAUDULENT CONVEYANCE—	
See Assignment.		Lands in foreign country—Jurisdiction	123
EQUITY—		Setting aside—Ranking on estate	254
Conflicting equities—Legal estate—Fraud—		Gift over on bankruptcy	400
Priority	459	See Voluntary Conveyance.	
ESTEN, J. H.—		FRAUDULENT PREFERENCE—	
Obituary notice	321	Knowledge of insolvency—Intent	57
EVICTIOn—		Money advanced to insolvent to pay creditors	57
Construction	16	Pressure—Intent—Collusion	149, 342, 413
EVIDENCE—		54 Vict., c. 20—Actual preference	178
Examination out of jurisdiction—Discretion	26	"Payment to creditor" under R.S.O., c. 124,	56
Malicious prosecution—Police officers' privilege	57	Knowledge of insolvency	46
Examination of foreigner within jurisdiction	60	Bill of sale given to correct mistake in prior one	480
Refusal of witness, an M.P., to submit to ex- amination	195	Intent—Presumption—54 Vict., c. 20	573
Oaths of witnesses—Binding conscience	204	Chattel mortgage—Prior agreement therefor	573
Use of, taken at former trial—Perpetuating testimony	217	Sale of goods to defeat creditors	380
Commission to take—Material—Good faith— Considerations involved	217	See Preference—Voluntary conveyance.	
Of accused persons	590, 610	FREE PASSENGERS—	
Witnesses and evidence in criminal cases	610	Liability for injury to	389
See Liquor Licenses.		FRIENDLY SOCIETY—	
EXAMINATION—		Dispute between member and society	489
See Discovery—Judgment Debtor.		See Benefit Society.	
EXECUTION—		FRIGHT—	
Wages—Chattel mortgage—Priority—Concur- rent writs of <i>fi. fa.</i>	516	Injuries from—Negligence	206
Equitable—Receiver—Reversionary interest	519	GAMBLING—	
EXECUTOR AND ADMINISTRATOR—		Conviction—Costs	125
Specific appropriation of assets to payment of legacy—Legatee—Transfer	200	GAME LAWS—	
Breach of trust by—Position of innocent par- ties dealing with	414	Changes in	481
Action against—Legacy—Trust—Priorities	474	Digest by A. H. O'Brien	554
Statute of Limitations—Pleading	583	GARNISHEE—	
Sale by, to pay legacies	598	See Attachment of Debts.	
See Probate—Wills.		GIFT—	
EXEMPTIONS—		Of chattels—Delivery	294
Fraudulent preference not applicable to	88	GIFT, <i>inter vivos</i>—	
Insurance money for exempted chattels	179	Quebec law	312
EXTENSION OF TIME—		GOVERNMENT RAILWAY—	
After statutory limit expired	99	See Crown.	

	PAGE
GRAND JURIES—	
Should they be abolished?	5
Changes in the law as to	129
GUARANTY—	
Letter of, by bank—Liability—Proof	344
HABEAS CORPUS—	
See Infant.	
HIGHWAY—	
Obstruction—Damages	211
Dedication—Plan—By-law	541
Summary proceeding to recover for repairs ..	547
See Municipal Law.	
HOTEL KEEPER—	
Negligence—Liability to guest	211
HOUSE OF LORDS—	
Appeal <i>in forma pauperis</i>	396
HUNTER ON INSURANCE CORPORATIONS ACT—	
Review of	463
HUNTER ON POWERS OF SALE—	
Review of	463
HUSBAND AND WIFE—	
Alimony—Condonation of offences—Revival ..	35
Imputed negligence	109
Deed taken in wife's name	122
Conveyance direct—Devise—Curtesy	378
Adverse possession	413
See Alimony—Infant—Married Woman.	
INFANT—	
Custody of Children—Illegitimate child—	
Rights of mother	13, 612
Drunken husband	614
Past maintenance	26
Next friend—Retirement of—Stay of proceed-	
ings	215
Appointment of guardian by mother, father	
being alive	234
Debt during infancy—Ratification—note given	549
Religious education of—Guardian—Jurisdic-	
tion	550
Habeas Corpus to produce—Impossibility—	
Appeal	612
See Marriage Settlement—Ward of Court.	
INJUNCTION—	
Dismissal at trial—Damages	94
Interlocutory—Undertaking as to damages ..	588
INSANITY—	
Acquittal on ground of—Sending prisoner to	
asylum	204
As affecting contracts	522
INSOLVENCY—	
Collateral notes—Collocation—Joint v.	
eral liability	145
Deposit with bank after suspension—Privilege	145
See Preference	

	PAGE
INSURANCE—	
Trustee for infants—R.S.O. c., 136, s. 12.	17
Reinsurance	519
Knowledge of agent imputed to principal	548
Accident—Third party notice—Negligence ..	26
Proximate or sole cause of death	246
External mark of injury	461
Risk incident to employment	154
Fraternal society—License required	213
Immediate notice of death	246
Life—Payable to children	108, 349
Wife murdering husband—Maybrick case	
.....	109, 137
For wife and children—Apportionment by	
will	183
Premium note—Forfeiture—Conditions ..	250
By creditor	326
Direction to company not amounting to	
will—Effect of	350
Insurable interest in life of another	400
Exercise of power—Construction of policy	583
Construction of policy—Children—Repre-	
sentatives	624
See Benefit Society.	
Marine—Collision—Vessel under tow	13
General average—Hull—Abandonment—	
Salvage	6:7
Insurable interest—Interest on advances—	620
Application to agent—Neglect to forward	622
Charter party—Disbursements—Freight	
—Guarantee by part owner	622
Fire—Arbitration—Practice	137
Application—Description—Variance 176, 548	
Application—Representation—Breach of	
condition	505
One agent for two companies—Transfer-	
ring risk	417
Insurable interest—Property in goods ..	505
Contract for sale of insured building—	
Change	600
INTEREST—	
Percentage on taxes is not	22
Money payable on contingent event	198
On tradesmen's accounts	263
Jurisdiction as to, See County Court—Divi-	
sion Court	
See Mortgage—Vendor and Purchaser.	
INTERPLEADER—	
Delay by sheriff—Forfeiture of protection ..	135
Right of sheriff to claim for rent	572
Form of issue— <i>ius tertii</i> —New trial	255
Right of sheriff—Rule 1141 (b)	625
See Prohibition.	
JAPAN—	
Evidence in courts of	325, 552
JOINT OWNERS—	
Of Chattel—Possession—Conversion	488
JOINT STOCK COMPANY—	
Application of payment on shares partly paid ..	24
Implied power to borrow money	71
Surrender of shares—Issue of new in exchange	
—Preference	71
Sale of land to director	178

	PAGE		PAGE
JOINT STOCK COMPANY—Continued.		KEARSEBY ON ELECTRIC WIRES IN STREETS—	
Director's liability—Dividends out of capital	198	Review of	513, 525
Wrongful act of secretary	237, 427	KINGSFORD ON HISTORY OF CANADA—	
Qualification shares—Prosecutor indemnifying director	258	Review of	144, 171
Implied contract to take shares	456	LANDLORD AND TENANT—	
Liability of, for misrepresentation	520	Covenant for quiet enjoyment	39, 401
Unpaid capital—Debentures on—Conflict of laws	200	Relief against re-entry—Misrepresentation	150
Misrepresentation in prospectus	581	Action for arrears of rent and recovery of premises—Payment—Election to forfeit lease	250
Shares assigned in trust—Duty of transferee to enquire	343	Covenant to repair—Liability for injury	414
Issued at discount illegal	397	Relief against forfeiture	457
Extent of liability on subscription for	540	Covenant to cultivate farm—Farm converted into market garden	458
Application for, before company formed—Misrepresentation	581	Distress—Chattel mortgage by wife	469
Mortgage of—Right of mortgagee as against receiver	585	Re-entry on condition broken—Severance of reversion	500
Loss of capital—Payment of dividends—Writing off losses	428	Apportionment of rent	476
Sale of part of undertaking—Capital or profits	457	Executory agreement for a lease	490
Lien on member's shares for his indebtedness	460	Distress for taxes by—Effect of	543
Debenture-holders—Modifying rights—Mortgage—Priority	584	See Lease.	
Surplus assets—How distributable	612	LAND TITLES ACT—	
Winding up—Debenture-holder—Priority	41, 261	Report of Master for 1891	299
Sale by liquidator—"Final order"	178	LAND TRANSFER—	
Fraudulent conveyance—Jurisdiction of Master	211	Defects and remedies	35
Liquidator's remuneration	212	LARCENY—	
By shareholder in default—Contributory	261	Money or goods obtained by fraud	401
Custody of books and documents	262	LAW OFFICERS OF THE CROWN—	
Sale by tender—Extending time	412	Refraining from practising at Bar	417
Debenture-holder who has commenced suit	515	LAW REFORM—	
See Misrepresentation.		In England	97
JOINT TORT FEASORS—		LAW SOCIETIES—	
Effect of discharge of one, as to other	519	Upper Canada—Résumé of proceedings.	
JUDGES—		Trinity Term, 1891	51, 82, 113
Actions against	235	Michaelmas Term, 1891	328
Power of Governor to appoint	613	Half-yearly meeting of convocation	361, 560
See Bench and Bar.		Hilary Term, 1892	402, 433
JUDGMENT DEBTOR—		Easter Term, 1892	497, 526, 557
Order committing for fraud	185	County of York—Annual report	45
Unsatisfactory answers—Refusal to commit—Costs	255	City of Hamilton—Annual report	50
Company—Examining officer—Scope	476	County of Carleton—Annual report	80
Refusing to be sworn	576	County of Frontenac—Annual report	243
JURIES—		Examination papers	186, 282
In India	588	Deputation to Minister of Justice	193
JURISDICTION—		Additions to libraries	52, 156, 220, 479, 604
Trespass to land in foreign country	516	LEASE—	
JURY NOTICE—		Renewal of—"Usual custom"	94
Application to strike out	574	Forfeiture—Breach of covenant—Notice	494
Equitable cause of action	600	Unusual covenants—Commencement of term	582
Action to establish will	216	See Landlord and tenant.	
JUSTICE OF THE PEACE—		LEGISLATION—	
Disqualification by interest	196, 239	In Ontario for 1892—Review of	290
Review of decision	253	LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY—	
Qualification of	412	Power to change ownership of lands	624
Stating case for Court of Appeal	596	LEGITIMACY, DECLARATION OF—	
		Costs—R.S.O., c.113, s. 33	455

	PAGE		PAGE
LIBEL—		LORD CAMPBELL'S ACT—	
Notice before action—Statement of claim	351, 381	Quebec code	615
Criminal prosecution—"Criminal proceedings"	132	LORD'S DAY ACT—	
Particulars—Justification—Practice	37	Breach of, by Tramway Co.	2
Newspaper criticism	110, 551	LUNATIC—	
Provisions relating to newspapers	147	Declaration of lunacy—Disposition of property and custody of lunatic	176
Examination of officer—Editor—Discovery	153	Maintenance of—Inspector of prisons—Moneys in court	152
Fair comment—Justification	154	Sale of property of	259
Falsehood—Words not actionable <i>per se</i>	548	Contract by—Onus of proof	295
Damage to trade—Discovery—Particulars	184	Married woman—Right of husband to be committed	582
Injunction	298	LYNCH LAW—	
Advertising account for sale	210	Origin of the term	203
Publishing list of judgments	452	MACLAREN ON BILLS AND NOTES—	
See Slander.		Review of	274
LIEN—		MAJESTIC PROSECUTION—	
See Solicitor and Client.		Reasonable and probable cause—Jury	180
LIEUTENANT-GOVERNORS—		MANDAMUS—	
Their use	162	See Electoral Franchise Act.	
LIGHT—		MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE—	
Implied grant of injunction	586	Correspondence on	466, 556
LIMITATIONS—		Act of 1890, valid	605
See Statute of Limitations.		MARITIME COURT—	
LIQUIDATOR—		Jurisdiction—Claim for wages under \$200—Sale of vessel	474
See Joint Stock Company.		MARITIME LAW—	
LIQUOR LICENSES—		Demurrage—Delay caused by strike	38
Sale by druggist—Omitting entry	59, 214, 413	General average—Salvage	93
Sale of proceeds of bar for the day	124	Collision—Latent defect in steering gear	34, 425
Permitting drunkenness on premises—Sale to drunkard	132, 454	Salvage—Lien—Towage	307
Evidence by defendant	151	Principal and agent—Power of attorney by crew	316
R.S.O., c. 194, s. 91—Transfer—Election time	182	Agreement to sell vessel—Insolvent—Non-registration	474
Resolution fixing hours for sale—Quashing	213	Master's wages and disbursements—Right of master to bind owners—Lien	506
Evidence of commissioner taking part in trial	213	Barge sunk while at dock	581
Evidence of inspector and defendant—Admissibility	543	MARRIAGE—	
Sale to lodger during prohibited hour	213	Nullity—Intimidation—Consent	40
Salaries of inspectors	316	By telegraph	495
Sale by retail—Quantity—Locality	415	With deceased wife's sister	495
Sale of liquor in Indian reserve	543	See Bigamy.	
Jurisdiction of Reeves in unorganized districts	543	MARRIAGE SETTLEMENT—	
See Local Option.		By infants—Repudiation	106, 493
LITERARY THEFT—		Agreement to settle after acquired property	106
Under pretence of criticism	325	MARRIED WOMAN—	
LIVERY STABLES—		Summary judgment—Separate estate	59
License for—Restriction to place	59	Action against—Practice	133
Power of municipality to restrict number	468	Act of 1882—Rights and liabilities—Separate estate	378, 481
LOCAL IMPROVEMENT—		After acquired property—Will	493
See Municipal Law.		See Husband and Wife—Infant—Lunatic—Sheriff.	
LOCAL OPTION—			
Ry-law—Publication—Polling place	415		
Appointment of agent—Declaring result of poll	415		
Interference of returning officer	596		

	PAGE		PAGE
MASTER IN CHAMBERS--		MUNICIPAL LAW-- <i>Continued.</i>	
Jurisdiction--Benefit Society.....	95	Maintenance and establishment of county buildings.....	375
MASTER AND SERVANT--		Right to remove county town.....	375
Liability of workman for unskilful work.....	43	Bonus to factory--Repayment--Consideration.....	377
Clerk communicating information gained during service.....	551	To street railway--Petition--Assent.....	380
<i>See</i> Negligence.		Local improvement--Assessment.....	596
MECHANICS' LIEN--		By-law different from notice.....	596
Jurisdiction--County or Division Court--		By-law--Signature and seal.....	379
Mortgage.....	179	If increased power is given by legislature new by-law is necessary.....	468
Jurisdiction of Master.....	119, 447	Voting on--Interference of returning officer.....	596
Actual or constructive notice.....	119	Quashing--Costs of appeal.....	20
Form of claim--Name and residence omitted.....	125	Expropriating land for sewer.....	413
Meaning of "payment".....	380, 447	"Party to the action"--Municipal Act, s. 531, s-s. 5.....	507
"Owner"--Computation of 10 per cent. under Act.....	475	By-law for street railway--Raising money on construction.....	539
Suspension--Waiver--Taking note.....	623	Omnibus license--Drivers.....	542
MEDICAL PRACTITIONER--		Liability of city for negligent firemen.....	589
Malpractice--Liability--Limitation of action.....	379	<i>See</i> Assessment.	
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT--		MURDER--	
<i>See</i> Parliament.		Statistics as to, in U.S.....	193
MERCANTILE AGENCY--		MORTGAGE--	
Giving false report of merchant.....	496	Ancient--Short form.....	73
MERGER--		Rectification--Property not included.....	343
Intention--Life estate and estate <i>pur autre vie</i>	586	Deed absolute in form, intended as mortgage.....	346
MILL DAM--		Of reversion in fund in court.....	105
License to dam back water.....	121	Payment of interest by stranger after conveyance to purchaser.....	123
Damage by breakage.....	121	Statute of Limitations--Possession.....	123
MINING LAW--		Covenant by purchaser to pay off--Rights of mortgagee.....	123
Barrage--Injunction--Appraisal.....	619	Redemption--Sufficiency of tender.....	135
MISREPRESENTATION--		Several subsequent mortgages--Practice.....	185
Estoppel--Share certificate.....	38	After time appointed.....	105
Fraud--Deceit--Damage.....	180	Power of sale--Sale by way of exchange.....	212
MUNICIPAL LAW--		Obligation to carry out sale--Effect on subsequent purchasers.....	414
Water rates--Discount except to government institutions.....	24	Sale of timber only--Notice of sale.....	600
Natural gas--Boring for on highways.....	25	Mortgages and third persons.....	225
Quebec--School law.....	90	Policy of insurance collateral to--Rights to policy money.....	234
Corporation--Contract--Seal--Acceptance..	92	Equitable, by deposit--Six months' notice or interest.....	260
Sale--Necessity for by-law.....	121	Fixtures, "now or hereafter to be placed".....	261
Must act under seal, etc.....	379	Removal of building from mortgaged lands..	324
Powers of--Entering adjoining municipality for sewerage purposes.....	175	Two, held by same party--Paying off one only	350
Dedication--Plan--By-law to open.....	541	Surplus after mortgage--County Court jurisdiction.....	446
Sale of lots by plan--Highway.....	624	Foreclosure--Several debts--Default--Noting <i>pro confesso</i>	451, 468, 476, 576, 601
Jurisdiction over bridges.....	250	Parties--Lessee of mortgagor.....	473
Crossing watercourse--Width of stream.....	250	<i>See</i> Amendment.	
Vicuailling-houses--Forfeiting license.....	280	NAVY, ROYAL--	
Streets--Control over--Duty to repair--Notice.....	345	Right of officer to resign.....	454
Repair of--Excavation causing injury.....	347	NEGLECT--	
Duty to light--Negligence--Obstructions.....	375	Employers' Liability Act--"Volenti non fit injuria".....	11
Negligence--Plan--Joint liabilities of municipalities.....	180	Common employment--Separate contractors.....	12
Effect of registering plan.....	415	Manual labour--Grocer's assistant.....	166
Tree planting.....	540	Machinery--Defect--"Arrangement".....	179

PAGE	PAGE
	NEGLIGENCE—Continued.
375	Employers' Liability Act—Builder pulling down wall..... 196
375	Employment of child to run machines, 44, 251
377	Knowledge of employer of servant's danger..... 251
380	Plaintiff obeying order of foreman..... 399
596	Defect in "way"..... 453
596	Imputed—Husband and wife..... 109
379	Bursting of timber boom—Extraordinary casualty..... 252
468	Street railway—Neglect to stop car..... 252
596	Road company—Toll-keeper—Lessee..... 344
20	Damage to adjoining property by electricity.. 621
413	Lord Campbell's Act..... 615
507	See Hotel-keeper—Master and Servant—Railway Company.
539	NEWSPAPERS—
542	See Libel.
589	NEW TRIAL—
	Delegation of judicial function..... 348
193	NONSUIT—
	On counsel's opening address..... 134
73	NOTARIES—
343	Quebec law..... 618
346	NOTICE OF ACTION
105	Statement of place..... 295
123	NOTICE OF MOTION—
123	Short—Leave of court..... 62
123	O'BRIEN ON GAME LAWS—
135	Review of..... 554
185	OMNIBUS—
105	License for, restricted to owners..... 542
212	ORDNANCE LANDS—
414	Sale of, in Quebec..... 595
600	OSGOODE HALL LIBRARY—
225	Latest additions to..... 62, 156, 479 602
234	OVERHOLDING TENANT—
260	Reviewing finding of County Judge..... 214
261	PARDON—
324	Right of governors to grant..... 386
350	PARLIAMENT—
46	Privilege of member..... 195
101	Insanity of member..... 205
73	Payment of in England..... 448
54	PARTNERSHIP—
11	Action by partner to recover share..... 125
22	Foreign—Service—Practice..... 133
56	Execution against individual partner—Sale of share..... 216
79	

PAGE
PARTNERSHIP—Continued.
Determination by efflux of time—Partnership at will..... 233
Evidence of..... 253
Dissolution—Receiver—Practice—Arbitration 299
PATENT—
Infringement—Parties—Practice..... 298
Mortgage of his share by one co-owner—Redemption..... 425
Notes given for purchase of patent right..... 540
Prior publication—Prior use..... 613
PHOTOGRAPHY—
Unreliability, as evidence..... 16
Use of, in criminal cases..... 74
PLAN—
See Municipal Law.
PLEADING—
Rule 423—"Embarrassing"—Striking out—Practice..... 152
Defence arising after action—Rule 440..... 447
Demurrable—Striking out..... 507
POLICE OFFICERS—
Privilege as witness..... 57
Weapons for..... 577
POSSESSION—
By caretaker—Statute of Limitations..... 18
POWER OF APPOINTMENT—
Release of—Death of object of power..... 201
Among children—Transfer of deceased child's share..... 201
POWER OF ATTORNEY—
Authority to settle claim—Right to receive payment..... 347
PREFERENCE—
Preferential judgment—subsequent creditors. 60
See Assignment and Preferences Act—Fraudulent conveyance—Voluntary conveyance.
PRINCIPAL AND AGENT—
R. W. Co.—Carriers—Neglect of foreman—Damages..... 185
Trustees—Fraud..... 539
PRINCIPAL AND SURETY—
Release of debtor—Consent..... 211
Counter security given by debtor to surety—Rights of creditor..... 298
Alteration of surety's position..... 518
Bond—When liability arises..... 597
PROBATE—
Locality of debts—Duty..... 15
Administration with will annexed—Executrix and legatee not to be found..... 134
Executors named after attestation clause..... 134
Torn will—Copy..... 197
Will proved in foreign country—Copy..... 197

	PAGE		PAGE
PROBATE—Continued.		QUEEN'S COUNSEL—	
Presumption of survivorship—Mutual wills of husband and wife.....	401	Precedence at the bar.....	485
Will showing insanity.....	402	QUO WARRANTO—	
Administration—Lunatic widow—Grant to receiver.....	402	Acceptance by official of incompatible office..	487
Given to persons named "Trustees".....	455	<i>See</i> Elections.	
Codicil—Mistake in date.....	455	RAILWAY COMPANY—	
Joint grant to next of kin and another.....	455	No power to grant privileges outside its charter	279
Evidence of solicitor.....	461	Using another railway as agents.....	598
<i>See</i> Executor and Administrator—Wills.		Construction bonus—Breach of condition....	181
PROHIBITION—		Construction under charter of another company	
County Court—Interpleader—Rule 1141 (a) ..	181	—Rights and liabilities.....	18
<i>See</i> Division Court.		Deposited plans—"Delineated".....	42
PUBLIC WORKS—		Expropriation—Quebec law.....	90, 91
Liability for injury to workman on.....	594	Compensation—Life tenant.....	181
PRACTICE—		Liability to passenger without ticket.....	110
Need of uniformity in.....	306	Passenger travelling in wrong class.....	203
Receiver—Right of way—Obstruction.....	70	Passenger placed in apparent peril—Consequent injury.....	138
Patent actions—Defendant's particulars—Costs	70	Assaulted by fellow passenger—Duty of company.....	236
Writ of summons—Service out of jurisdiction	71, 195, 398, 448	Injury to free.....	389
Special endorsement—Application for judgment.....	37	Accident at crossing—Notice of danger.....	182
Amendment.....	59	Negligence—Limitation of action.....	183
Interest—Summary judgment.....	281, 296, 430	Interference with highway—Neglect to ring bell	245
Action on money bond.....	429	Liability for foreman—Contract—Damages..	185
Action for indemnity against mortgages—Equitable obligation—Implied covenant.....	508	Unpunctuality—Liability.....	207
Endorsement of characters of parties—Rule 224—Claim—Conformity.....	507	Condition in ticket.....	596
Extending time for service—Rescinding order for—Jurisdiction of Master.....	576	Ticket spreading smallpox.....	303
Service of warrant on absent defendant.....	507	Limitation of action.....	597
Proceedings in equity—Parties.....	92	Bonus for locating shops—Amalgamation with other company.....	379
Appearance—Default—Noting pleadings closed	451, 468, 476, 576, 601	Action for fare—Ticket sold subject to condition.....	579
Motion to commit—Service.....	104	Government railway—Their rights and liabilities, <i>see</i> Crown.	
New trial—Misdirection—Trespass.....	176	RAPE—	
Negligence.....	346	Male under 14 and girl under 13.....	380
Ejectment by heir at law—Particulars.....	195	RECEIVER—	
Breach of covenant to repair—Rule 271.....	195	Trustee—Remuneration.....	166
Summary judgment—Leave to defend—Payment into court.....	216	Manager—Mortgagee.....	167
Jury notice—Action to establish will.....	216	Damages for detention by.....	458
Notice of trial by defendant—Rule 654..	216, 217	Property out of jurisdiction.....	494
Notice of motion for judgment.....	216	RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS—	
"Next sitting of court"—Assizes or Chancery sittings.....	217	Owner resuming possession.....	580
Reference—Delay—Rule 51.....	256	REGISTRY ACT—	
Parties—Counterclaim—Rule 374.....	281	Judgment—Mortgage—Privy—Rectifying mistake.....	248
Adding defendant—Patent case.....	296	RELEASE—	
Refusal of leave to appeal—Appeal from this.	295	Joint tortfeasors—Release of one.....	519
Trial—Charge to jury—Misdirection.....	34	Covenant not to sue.....	519
Mandamus—Second application after discharge of first.....	431	<i>See</i> Principal and Surety.	
Motion for judgment on default.—Costs—Appeal.....	456	RESTRAINT OF TRADE—	
Judgment—Subsequent order to take account.	573	<i>See</i> Contract.	
Striking out jury notice—Expediting trial...	574	REVIEWS—	
<i>See</i> Appeal—Arbitration—Bond—Discovery—Judgment Debtor—Married Woman—Mortgage—Partnership—Pleading.		Monthly Law Digest and Reporter.....	111
		Canada under British Rule—Kingsford ..	144, 171
		Manual of County Court Practice—Gorman ..	144
		Exchequer Court Reports—Morse.....	274
		Bills and Notes and Cheques—Maclaren ..	274

PAGE	REVIEWS—Continued.	PAGE
485	Law of Sales—Travis	275
	Newspaper Libel—King	411
	Insurance Corporations Act—W. H. Hunter.	463
	Power of Sale in Mortgages—A. T. Hunter.	465
487	Electric Wires in Streets, etc.—Keasbey.	513, 525
	Medical Jurisprudence—Chapman	525
	History of the Law of Real Property—Digby.	526
	Ontario Game and Fishing Laws—O'Brien ..	554
	The Canadian Constitution—Clement	555
279		
598		
181		
18	REVISED STATUTES—	
42	Corrigenda to	111
91	REVISING OFFICER—	
181	Prohibition to—Jurisdiction of High Court of	
110	Justice	94
203		
138	REVIVOR—	
	Lapse of time—Agreement of solicitor	254
236	RITCHIE, SIR W. J.—	
389	Obituary notice	483
182		
183	SALE OF GOODS—	
245	Market overt—Custom	132
185		
207	SCHOOL LAW—	
596	Division of section	379
303	Procedure in Quebec	90
597	Taxation	93
379		
579	SECURITY FOR COSTS—	
	See Costs.	
580	SEPARATE SCHOOLS—	
	In Manitoba	23, 466 566
166	SETTLEMENT—	
167	Eldest son—Anticipation—Double portion ..	69
458	Election—Infant—Married woman—Restraint	260
494	For benefit of mother—Valuable consideration	446
	See Marriage Settlement.	
580	SHELLEY'S CASE—	
	Rule in—"Leirs"	475
48	SHERIFF—	
	Action by officer for fees	238
	Poundage— <i>Ex. fa.</i> lands	280
	Liability for acts of officer	412, 516
	Action against for seizing goods—Justification	
	—Married woman	621
	See Interpleader.	
19	SHIPS—	
19	See Maritime Law.	
71	SLANDER—	
71	Privilege—Actual malice—Evidence—Justi-	
14	fication	150, 238
74	Injury where only question of reputation in-	
74	volved	207, 400
	Of municipal councillor	263, 400
	See Libel.	

SOLICITOR—	PAGE
Inquiry into unfounded charge of misconduct	
—Costs	398
Summary jurisdiction over—Unqualified per-	
son acting as	490
Failure to pay over moneys—Judgment	
no bar	517
London agent—"Client"	519
See Costs.	
SOLICITOR AND CLIENT—	
Discharge by client	169
Settlement by parties—Lien on fruits of action	626
Power of attorney to compromise after judg-	
ment	155
Causes of action which could have been joined	
—Duty of attorney so to advise	448
Agreement to pay lump sum for costs	454
Lien on title deeds	261
Priority as between successive solicitors ..	516
Taking note and leaving country—Waiver ..	573
See Attorney and Client—Costs.	
SPECIAL ENDORSEMENT—	
See Writ of Summons.	
SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—	
Of contract for hiring	261
See Contract—Vendor and Purchaser.	
STATUTE, CONSTRUCTION OF—	
<i>Ejusdem generis</i> —"Lawful purpose"	165, 400
Intention clear, wording defective	212
STATUTE OF ELIZABETH—	
See Voluntary Conveyance.	
STATUTE OF FRAUDS—	
Acceptance and receipt	267
Agreement not to be performed within year ..	294
STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS—	
Possession by caretaker	18
Will—Express trust	245
Constructive trust	244
Acknowledgment—Payment by stranger	123
See Wills.	
STAYING PROCEEDINGS—	
Abus. of process of court	255
STEWART, T. B. P.—	
Bequest of late, to Law Society	193, 449
STIPULING PROSECUTION—	
See Contract.	
STREETS—	
See Highways—Municipal Law.	
STREET RAILWAYS—	
Necessities of travel—Appointment of receiver	240
Franchise—Property—Road-bed	279
Use of streets by	337
Negligence in laying tracks	496
Rights and duties of conductors	571

	PAGE		PAGE
STRIKE—		TRADE MARK—	
Delay caused by.....	38	Infringement—Innocent purchaser.....	298
STRONG, MR. JUSTICE—		Rectification of register—Jurisdiction of Ex- chequer Court.....	594
Appointed C.J. of Supreme Court.....	609	TRAVIS ON LAW OF SALES—	
SUBROGATION—		Review of.....	275
Quebec law.....	20	TREE-PLANTING—	
SUBSTITUTION—		Highway—Telephone wires.....	540
Quebec law.....	313	TRESPASS—	
SUMMARY CONVICTION—		Title—Misdirection—New trial.....	176
Under by-law—Costs.....	468	TROVER—	
Information disclosing two offences.....	258	Conversion of chattels—Auction.....	238
With consent—Appeal—Practice.....	295	Joint owners.....	488
Appeal from—Deposit in lieu of recognizance.....	452	TRUSTS AND TRUSTEES—	
SUMMONS, WRIT OF—		Devolution of Estates Act—Right of retainer.....	94
<i>See</i> Practice.		Investment of fund—Particular trust.....	104
SUPREME COURT—		No power given to vary.....	397
Vacant Chief Justiceship.....	481, 609	Remuneration—Receiver.....	166
Appeal—Quebec law.....	619	Public trustee in England.....	168
<i>See</i> Appeal.		Incumbrance on trust fund by <i>cestui que trust</i> —Priority—Notice.....	199
SURVEY		Constructive trust—Purchase by executor at sale under execution.....	244
Road allowance between counties.....	149	Trustee <i>de son tort</i> —Persons assisting executrix in breach of trust.....	458
Not conclusive—Evidence.....	149	New trustee—Security.....	476
TAXATION—		Trustee not liable for embezzlement by clerk.....	502
<i>See</i> Costs.		Principal and agent—Fraud.....	539
TAX SALE—		Personal representative out of jurisdiction.....	583
Right of purchaser to timber cut during re- demption period.....	311	Breach of trust—Request or consent of bene- ficiary.....	585
Deed—Description—Right of entry.....	349	New trustees—Appointment by court.....	586
TELEGRAPHS—		UNCLAIMED MONIES—	
Delivery of messages.....	108	Advertising for.....	432
<i>See</i> Electricity.		UNLICENSED CONVEYANCERS—	
TELEPHONES—		Action of Law Society.....	1
Conversations by—Evidence.....	497	VENDOR AND PURCHASER—	
<i>See</i> Electricity.		Purchase, subject to mortgage—Rate of in- terest.....	58
TENANT FOR LIFE—		Right of way—Rescission—Conditions of sale.....	69
Waste.....	68	Possession at once—Payment of interest until deed given.....	122, 541
Remainderman—Income of securities.....	73	Delay in completing sale.....	122
TENDER—		Rescinding contract—Delay—Interest on pur- chase money.....	122, 348, 541
Conditional.....	241	Right of purchaser to—Non-delivery of abstract.....	234
TEXAN LAW—		Specific performance—Parties—Strangers— Title.....	151
Wonders of.....	240	Agreement—Evidence—Agency—Statute of Frauds.....	244
TIME—		Conditions of sale—Time—Good title.....	598
Power to extend—Statutory limit expired.....	99	Sale of adjoining parcels—Overhanging build- ings.....	426
Computation of—"Within" one calendar month after.....	138	Doubtful title—Vendor and Purchaser Act.....	456
TIMBER LIMITS—		Parol contract—Possession—Partner's share.....	572
Sale of—License—Description.....	312	Restrictive covenant against building.....	587
TOLLS—		Lands vested in trustee—Execution against <i>cestui que trust</i>	599
Private act—Conflict.....	180	Conveyance to trustee—Power to sell and mort- gage.....	599
TOBACCO—		Conveyance by all parties interested during life of life tenant.....	599
Legislation as to use of, by minors.....	130		
Whether "victuals" or "driak".....	202		

PAGE	VENUE, CHANGE OF—	PAGE
... 298	Convenience—Discretion.....	152, 601
Ex. ... 594	County Court action—Intituling of papers....	575
	Refusal—Trial judge to apportion costs....	626
	VETERINARY SURGEON—	
... 275	Unqualified person—Shoeing smith.....	258
	VOLUNTARY CONVEYANCE—	
... 540	Under statute 27 Eliz., c. 4.....	418, 614
	VOLUNTEERS—	
.. 176	As jurymen.....	239
	WAGES—	
. 238	Execution—Priority.....	412
. 488		
	WARD OF COURT—	
er 94	Marriage after twenty-one—Settlement—Con-	
. 104	tempt	41
. 397		
. 166		
. 168		
	WAREHOUSE RECEIPT—	
	Promise to transfer—Goods in transit.....	122
	WATERCOURSE—	
. 199	Riparian rights—User—Malice	210
. 244	Diversion by R.W. Co. — Easement — Pur-	
	chaser for value—Compensation.....	249
. 458		
. 476		
. 502		
. 539		
. 583		
	WIDOWS—	
	In India.....	590
	WILSON, SIR ADAM—	
. 585	Obituary notice.....	3
. 586		
	WINCHESTER, MR.—	
	Appointment as Master in Chambers.....	417
432		
	WINDING-UP ACT—	
	Dominion and Provincial laws.....	542
	See Joint Stock Co.	
1		
	WITNESS—	
	See Evidence.	
58		
69		
	WOMEN—	
	As lawyers—Action of Law Society....	205, 609
541		
122		
	WRIT OF SUMMONS—	
	See Practice.	
541		
	WILLS—	
34	Informal—Drawn by beneficiary.....	13
51	Codicil—Revocation—Revival of will.....	15
	Revival of revoked will by reference.....	492, 493
44	Codicil—Unattested interlineations.....	493
98	Revocation of.....	523
	Interest on legacy.....	544
26	Limitation to action for legacy—Trust.....	549
56	Execution of—	
2	Signed by mark.....	13
7	“Foot or End.”.....	581
	See Executors and Administrators—Probate.	
9	Construction of—	
9	Gift—“Relatives”—Illegitimate relatives....	11
9	Gift over on a compound event.....	40, 613
9	Legacy—Charity—Condition.....	41

WILLS—Continued.	PAGE
Estate tail—Barring—Remainder expectant .	48
“Effects”—Real estate, when included... 68,	259
Legacy to debtor of testator.....	70
Appointment of debtor as execu'or.....	70
Accumulation of income—Repairs—Thellusson	
Act.....	72
Power of appointments—General devise.....	72
Terminable life interest—“Become payable to	
some other person.”.....	135
Devise of adjoining properties to different	
devisees—Light.....	135
“As joint tenants and not as tenants in com-	
mon and survivor,” etc.....	163
Endowment of church—Continuing condition	167
Legitimate and illegitimate nephews of same	
name.....	197
Conversion—Trust to invest in lands.....	233
Devise to children and their issue—Per stirpes	
on per capita.....	245
Express trust—Statute of Limitations.....	245
Description—Lot facing on two streets.....	252
Devise to wife and children—Period of vesting	254
Forfeiture clause—Annuity—Fruivolous action	
against trustees.....	259
Trust for sale—Partial failure—Conversion... 260	
Devise to sons—“Survivor”—“Die without	
lawful issue”.....	316
Devise—Unintentional omission.....	350
Direction to devisee to pay legacies—Charges	
on land—Registration—Priority.....	378
Right to remain on place while unmarried.... 380	
Devise to wife, in event of death to children. 446	
Devise to children legitimated by subsequent	
marriage.....	585
Annuity in lieu of dower—Insufficiency to pay	
in full.....	494
Mortmain—Legacy to promote temperance	
legislation.....	544
Joint tenancy, or in common—Lapse.....	583
Gift contained in direction to pay—Time of	
vesting.....	598
Devise—Postponement of enjoyment—Vested	
interest.....	625
Gift of income—Implied gift to children.... 613	
WORDS, CONSTRUCTION OF—	
Acceptance.....	267
Anything done.....	238
Assigns.....	587
Client.....	519
Criminal malice.....	37
Delincaeted.....	42
Delivery as required.....	241
Defect.....	179
Discreditable.....	199
Effects.....	68, 259
Floating security.....	261
Heirs.....	457
Lawful purpose.....	165, 400
Legal heirs.....	280
Necessary.....	181
Next sitting of the court.....	217
Owner.....	475
Payment.....	380, 447
Proceeding.....	184
Special case.....	127
Survivor.....	316
Unusual covenants.....	582
Usual custom.....	94
Way.....	263