

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

Coloured covers/  
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/  
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/  
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/  
Pages endommagées

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

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

Cover title missing/  
Le titre de couverture manque

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

Coloured maps/  
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/  
Pages détachées

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

Showthrough/  
Transparence

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

Quality of print varies/  
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/  
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/  
Pagination continue

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

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

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

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

Title page of issue/  
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/  
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/  
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/  
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

# MONTHLY LAW DIGEST AND REPORTER.

VOL. I.

DECEMBER, 1893.

No. 12.

ACCIDENT INSURANCE — See Insur. Accident.

AGENCY—See Principal and Agent—Election Expenses.

AGREEMENT — See Commercial Traveller.

## APPEAL.

### TO PRIVY COUNCIL.

#### 1. FROM COURT OF REVIEW—RIGHT OF.

*Johnson, O.J.*: In this case, in which we last week confirmed the judgment of the Superior Court at St. Johns condemning the defendant to pay \$500 damages and costs, a motion was made by the defendant for leave to appeal to Her Majesty in Her Privy Council under the amendment by the 37th V., c. 5 to art. 494, C. P. By those provisions an appeal was given to Her Majesty in Her Privy Council direct from this court, in cases where the appeal to the Queen's Bench from this court was taken away, and where it would lie from the Queen's Bench if the judgment had been given by that court. The defendant seemed to rely upon the amendment of 1891 to the Supreme Court Act which has nothing to do with the present case. The Privy Council in the case of *Allan v. Pratt* (*Beauchamp's Jur. P. C.*, p. 76) laid down the rule clearly that the proper measure of value for determining the right of appeal is the amount received by the plaintiff in the action, and against which the appeal could be brought; and that case adopted the rule in *McFarlane v. Leclair* that had

been laid down still more clearly by Lord Chelmsford, that the judgment is to be looked at as it affects the interests of the party prejudiced by it and who seeks to relieve himself of it by appeal. Such cases are limited to the minimum amount of £500 sterling by art. 1178 C. P.

The defendant's motion is therefore rejected. *Marchand v. Molleur*, Court of Review, Montreal, Nov. 11, 1893.

### TO SUPREME COURT

#### 2. JURISDICTION.

*Held*, that a judgment in an action to vacate the sheriff's sale of an immoveable is appealable to the Supreme Court under Sec. 29 (b). *Dufresne v. Dixon*, (16 Can. S. C. R. 591) followed *Lefeuntun v. Veronneau*, Supreme Ct. of Canada, 24 June 1893.

3. JURISDICTION—AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY—R. S. C. c. 135—54 & 55 V., c. 25—COSTS—QUEBEC.

C. brought an action against E. claiming that a certain building contract should be rescinded; \$1,000 damages; and \$515 for the value of bricks in the possession of E., but belonging to C. The case was *en délibéré* before the Superior Court when 54 & 55 V. c. 25, amending c. 135, R. S. C., was sanctioned, and the judgment of the Superior Court dismissed C.'s claim for \$1,000 but granted the other conclusions. On appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench by E., the action was dismissed in 1893.

C. then appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada.

*Held*, that the building for which a contract had been entered into, having been completed over five years ago, there remained but the question of costs and the \$545 claim for bricks in dispute between the parties, in the judgment appealed from, and that amount was not sufficient to give jurisdiction to the Supreme Court of Canada under R. S. C. c. 135, s. 29. The appeal was quashed with costs. *Cowan v. Evans*, Supreme Ct. of Canada, 24 June 1893.

4. JURISDICTION—AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY—54-55 VICT. CAP. 25, SEC. 4—QUEBEC.

On the 30th September, 1891, when the Statute 54-55 Vict., c. 25, s. 4, was passed, enacting that the amount demanded and not that recovered should determine the right to appeal when the right to appeal is dependent upon the amount in dispute, the Superior Court had *en délibéré* an action of damages brought by the respondent against the appellant for \$3,050 of damages. The Superior Court on the 5th December, 1891, dismissed the respondent's action. On appeal to the Court of Queen's Bench for Lower Canada (appeal side) the Court on the 23rd February, 1893, reversing the judgment of the Superior Court, granted \$880 damages to respondent with interest from the 16th June, 1887. On appeal to the Supreme Ct. of Canada.

*Held*, that the Statute 54-55 Vic., c. 25, did not apply to cases pending, and as the amount of the judgment appealed from was under \$2,000 the case was not appealable, following on the question of the non-retroactivity of the Statute, *Williams v. Irvine*, (22 Can. S. C. R. 108) and as to the amount in dispute, *Monette v. Lefebvre*, (16 Can. S. C. R. 357). Gwynne, J., dissenting. Appeal quashed with costs. *Cowan v. Evans*, Supreme Ct. of Canada, 24 June, 1893.

NOTE.—The appeal of the Montreal Street Railway Co. v. Carrière, argued at the October session 1893 was quashed on the same grounds.

5. JURISDICTION—AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY—54-55 V., c. 25, s. 4—NON-RETROACTIVITY.

In an action brought by the respondents on the 25th July, 1889, claiming \$5,000 damages alleged to have been sustained by them by the production of a plea and incidental demand by the appellants in a case before the Superior Court for the district of Montreal, under number 528, the Superior Court on the 27th day of September, 1890, granted \$300 damages to the respondents.

The appellants, defendants, then appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench, and that Court on the 28th February, 1893, confirmed the judgment of the Superior Court.

On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada:

*Held*, following *Williams v. Irvine*, 22 Sc. R. 108, that 54-55 V., c. 25, did not apply to cases pending before the Court on the 30th Sept. 1891, and the appeal should be quashed for want of jurisdiction.—Gwynne, J., dissenting.

The appeal was quashed with costs. *Mitchell v. Trenholme*, Supreme Court of Canada, 24 June 1893.

6. RIGHT OF—54-55 V., c. 25, s. 4—AMOUNT IN DISPUTE—JURISDICTION—QUEBEC.

In an action of damages for \$5,000 brought for the death of a person by a consort, the Superior Court in April 1891, granted \$1,000 damages and the judgment was acquiesced in by the plaintiff, but defendant appealed to the Court of Queen's Bench and that Court affirmed the judgment of the Superior Court in December, 1892. 54-55 V., c. 25, s. 4, declaring that "whenever the right to appeal is dependent upon the amount in dispute such amount shall be understood to be that demanded and not that recovered, if they are different," was sanctioned 30th September, 1891. On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada.

*Held*, that 54-55 Vict. did not apply to such a case, and that the case was not appealable. *Monette v. Lefebvre*, (16 Can. S. C. R. 357); *Williams v. Irvine*, (22 Can. S. C. R. 108). Appeal quashed with costs. *Mills v. Limoges*, Supreme Court of Canada, 24 June, 1893.

7. RIGHT OF—NEW TRIAL.

The judgment of the Court of Appeal ordering a new trial was not a final judgment, nor did it come within any of the provisions of the Supreme Court Act authorizing an appeal from judgments not final. *Cobban Manuf'g Co. v. Can. Pac. Ry. Co.*, Supreme Ct. of Canada, May 1, 1893.

ASSESSMENTS AND TAXES—See Taxation—Mun. Corp. 1.

ASSOCIATION, UNINCORPORATED—See Club.

BED BUGS—See Landlord and Tenant 2.

BILL OF LADING—See Ships, etc., 2.

BILLS AND NOTES—SEE ALSO INSOLVENCY.

AMERICAN CASES

1. PROMISSORY NOTE—PAYABLE WITH EXCHANGE.

*Held*, that the fact that an instrument for the payment of a specific sum of money is made payable with current exchange at a place other than the place of payment does not prevent its being a promissory note. *Hastings v. Thompson*, Supreme Ct. of Minnesota, 55 N. W. Rep. 968.

*Mitchell, J.*, says: The only point raised on this appeal is whether the instruments sued on are promissory notes, for, if they are, they are unquestionably negotiable under the law merchant. They are promises to pay specified sums of money in St. Paul, "with current exchange on New York city;" and the only question is whether this provision as to exchange renders the sums required to discharge them uncertain, within the meaning of the familiar rule that one of the essential qualities of a promissory note is that the amount to be paid must be fixed and certain, and not contingent. In the definitions of a promissory note or bill of exchange it is generally, if not always, stated that the amount necessary to discharge it must be ascertainable from the face of the paper itself, without having to refer to any extrinsic evidence. Construing this definition literally, it must be admitted that the instruments in question do not strictly fall within it, for, of course, extrinsic evidence must be resorted to in order to ascertain the rate of exchange at a given time between two places. Upon examination of the reports and textbooks it is surprising how little direct authority of any value is to be found as to the effect of the addition of such a provision to an instrument for the payment of money. Daniel, Randolph and Tiedeman state in ge-

neral that such a provision does not affect the commercial or negotiable character of the paper, but none of them discuss it at any length, and all of them treat of the question as if it only went to the negotiability of the instruments, whereas the real question lies back of that, and is whether they are promissory notes or bills of exchange at all. Tied. Com. Paper. § 23a; Rand. Com. Paper, § 200; Daniel, Neg. Inst. § 51. We have found no English case directly in point, and none bearing on the question, except *Pollard v. Harries*, 2 Bos. & P. 335, where such an instrument was declared on as a promissory note. If the question was authoritatively settled in the leading commercial States of the Union or in the federal courts, we would be inclined, for the sake of uniformity, to follow their decisions; but we have been unable to find that the Supreme Court of the United States or of either Massachusetts, New York, or Pennsylvania, has ever passed upon the question. The only cases, State, federal or colonial, which we have found which may be considered as having passed on the question, are the following, which may be classified thus: That such instruments are not promissory notes: *Lowe v. Bliss*, 24 Ill. 108; *Read v. McNulty*, 12 Rich. Law, 445; *Bank v. Strother* 28 S. C. 504, 6 S. E. Rep., 313; *Palmer v. Fahnstock*, 9 U. C. C. P. 172; *Saxton v. Stevenson*, 23 U. C. C. P. 503; *Bank v. Newkirk*, 2 Miles, 442; *Bank v. Bynum*, 84 N. C. 24; *Russell v. Russell*, 1 MacArthur, 263; *Fitzharris v. Leggatt*, 10 Mo. App. 529; *Hughtt v. Johnson*, 23 Fed. Rep. 865; *Bank v. McMahon*, 38 Fed. Rep. 233. That such instruments are promissory notes: *Smith v. Kendall*, 9 Mich. 242; *Johnson v. Frisbie*, 15 Mich. 236; *Leggett v. Jones*, 10 Wis. 35; *Morgan v. Edwards*, 53 Wis. 599, 11 N. W. Rep. 21; *Bradley v. Lill*, 4 Biss. 473. In very few of these cases is the question discussed at any length, or considered on principle. Some of them were decided by courts of inferior jurisdiction, and in others the remarks of the court were obiter. Many of those which hold that such instruments are not promissory notes rest, without discussion upon a strict literal construction of the rule that the sum to be paid must appear from the face of the paper without resort to extrinsic evidence. About the only cases where the question is discussed at any length upon principle or authority are *Smith v. Kendall*, *Bradley v. Lill*, *Morgan v. Edwards*, and *Bank v. McMahon*.

In view of this state of the decisions, while in mere numbers the decided weight of authority may be in favor of the contention of the defendant, we feel at liberty to decide the question in the way we deem most in accordance with principle and business usages, and in accordance with the rule which, in view of such usages, the leading courts of the country are most likely to finally settle down upon. The following are, in brief, the considerations which have led us to the conclusion that such instruments ought to be held to be promissory notes under the law merchant.

1. The reason and purpose of the rule that the sum to be paid must be certain is that

the parties to the instrument may know the amount necessary to discharge it, without investigating facts not within the general knowledge of every one, and which may be subject to more or less uncertainty, or more or less under the influence or control of one or other of the parties to the instrument. The provision for the payment of the current rate of exchange between the place of payment and some other place is not within the reason of this rule, or subject to the evils or inconveniences which it was designed to prevent. While the rate of exchange is not always the same, and while it is technically true that resort must be had to extrinsic evidence to ascertain what it is, yet the current rate of exchange between two places at a particular date is a matter of common commercial knowledge, or at least easily ascertainable by any one, so that the parties can always, without difficulty, ascertain the exact amount necessary to discharge the paper. It seems to us that within the spirit of the rule requiring precision in the amount to be paid a provision for the payment of the current rate of exchange in addition to the principal amount named does not introduce such an element of uncertainty as deprives the instrument of the essential qualities of a promissory note. A provision for the payment of exchange is very different from one for the payment of reasonable attorneys' fees in case of suit, as in *Jones v. Radatz*, 27 Minn. 240, 6 N. W. Rep. 800. The latter introduces an element of uncertainty very different both in kind and degree from that introduced by the former. Not only is the amount of the attorneys' fees incapable of either easy or definite ascertainment, but the amount of it is more or less under the control of the holder of the instrument. Moreover, such a provision has never been considered in business circles as properly ancillary or incidental to commercial paper, or any part of its legitimate "luggage."

2. The law merchant, including the law of negotiable paper, is founded upon, and is the creature of, commercial usage and custom. Custom and usage have really made the law, and courts, in their decisions, merely declare it. The law of negotiable paper is not only founded on commercial usage, but is designed to be in aid of trade and commerce. Its rules should, therefore, be construed with general business usages, and as far as possible, with the common understanding in commercial circles. This was the very purpose of the statute of Anne placing promissory notes on the same footing as bills of exchange, and thus setting at rest a question upon which there had been some difference of opinion in the courts. Now, we think we are safe in saying, and justified in taking notice of the fact, that if bankers or other business men accustomed to dealing in commercial paper were asked whether such an instrument is a promissory note, and whether they would deal with it as negotiable paper, the answers would, in almost every instance, be unhesitatingly in the affirmative. We have no doubt but that this is the way in which such paper is generally looked upon and treated in commercial and other business circles; and, if

so, the court should, as far as possible, make their decisions to conform to this general custom and understanding. We recognize the importance of simplicity and certainty in the terms and conditions of commercial paper; and appreciate the objections to permitting it to be loaded down with unnecessary "luggage" but we cannot see, under all the circumstances, and especially in view of what we believe to be the commercial usage, that any practical evil will result from permitting the addition of such a provision for the payment of current exchange on the principal amount. Nor are we disposed, as a rule, to extend the quality of negotiable paper to contracts for the payment of money beyond the strict limits of the already established rules of law; but to exclude from that category paper like that under consideration would be to exclude the very class of paper which ought to be held negotiable, if any promissory notes ought to be so held—paper given and taken in commercial transactions, properly so called; for rarely, if ever, would a provision for exchange be incorporated in any other.

NOTE. — This point is settled by the Canadian Bills of Exchange Act., 1890 Sec. 9 (d) in the same sense as the foregoing case.

## 2. NOTICE OF PROTEST.

In *Jones v. McCorkell*, decided by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, April, 1893, it was held that the fact of depositing in the post-office a properly-addressed prepaid letter is *prima facie* evidence that it was received by the person to whom it was addressed.

## CANADIAN CASES.

### 3. PLEADING — BILL OF EXCHANGE — ACCEPTANCE AS EXECUTOR — EVIDENCE.

The defendant accepted a draft, "A. M., executor of J. P.," and to an action pleaded a denial of the acceptance and an agreement that he was to be liable only as executor. The plaintiff was a holder for value without notice.

Held, on appeal from a County Court, that these defences should have been struck out.

After the decision below the defendant sought to introduce fresh evidence of a letter written by the drawer after the draft had been transferred as above stated.

Held, that this was not receivable. *Campbell v. McKay*, Supreme Ct. Nova Scotia, (Can. L. T.), 1893.

**4. PROMISSORY NOTE — MARRIED WOMAN — ART. 1301 C. C. — NULLITY — THIRD PARTIES HOLDERS IN GOOD FAITH.**

LACOSTE, C. J., giving the judgment of the Court, said the appeal was from a judgment which condemned the appellant to pay the amount of a note made by her in June 1890. The defence relied upon article 1301 of the Civil Code, which says that a wife cannot bind herself either with or for her husband otherwise than as being common as to property. The Court below maintained the action, holding that the fact that the wife bound herself with her husband's authorization did not create a presumption that she bound herself for him; that consideration for the note was presumed, and that it was for her to rebut this presumption. The Court below further laid down the principle that a wife cannot invoke article 1301 against a third party, holder of a note for consideration, unless she proves that the holder was aware of the nullity of the obligation at the time he took the note. The evidence established that the endorsers endorsed the note at the husband's request, for his accommodation, without consideration received by the wife. The cashier of the bank did not recollect who presented the note for discount. It resulted from the proof that the note was signed by the wife for her husband, who received the proceeds of the discount and used the money for his business. The discount was obtained by the husband in the name of the endorsers. The nullity under article 1301, is a matter of public order and may be invoked against third parties in good faith. Third parties should be on their guard. If a wife could not invoke nullity as to third parties, it would be too easy to evade the provisions of article 1301, and the nullity would be only relative.

Judgment reversed. *Ricard v. Banque Nationale*, Queen's Bench in appeal, Montreal Nov., 29 1893.

**CARRIERS.**

**1. HORSE—"INHERENT VICE."**

A tired, excited colt being carried by rail became restive, fell down in its horse-box, and injured itself. It was removed from the box, and the owner was asked to take charge of it but refused. The railway company thereafter having incurred expense in keeping and doctoring it.

*Held*, that they were entitled to repayment. *North British Railway Co. v. Todd*, 9 Scot Law Rev. 326.

**OWNER'S RISK NOTE.**

*Opinion* that an owner's risk note which did not refer to conditions in the time-table did not incorporate

them; and that where conditions of carriage alternatively at owner's or carrier's risk excluded alike the carrier's liability, they were not "just and reasonable" in the sense of 17 & 18 V., c. 31 *North British Railway Co. v. Todd*, 9 Scot Law Rev. 326.

**3. RAILWAYS — ACCIDENT TO PASSENGER — DAMAGES — NEGLIGENCE — ART. 1675, C. C. — CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE.**

L. was the holder of a ticket and a passenger on the company's train from Levis to Ste. Marie Beauce. When the train stopped at Ste. Marie station the passengers alighted, but the car upon which L. had been travelling, being some distance from the station platform, and the time for stopping having nearly elapsed, L. got out at the end of the car, and, the distance to the ground from the steps being about two feet and a half, in so doing he fell and broke his leg, which had to be amputated.

The action was for \$5,000 damages, alleging negligence and want of proper accommodation. The defence was contributory negligence. Upon the evidence the Superior Court, whose judgment was affirmed by the Court of Queen's Bench, gave judgment in favour of L. for the whole amount.

On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada:—

*Held*, reversing the judgments of the Courts below, that, in the exercise of ordinary care, L. could have safely gained the platform by passing through the car forward, and that the accident being wholly attributable to L.'s own default in alighting as he did, he could not recover; Fournier, J., dissenting. *Lavery*, for the respondent. *Lortie v. Quebec Central Railway Co.*, Supreme Court of Canada, 24 June, 1893.

CHARTER-PARTY — See ships, etc., 1, 3.

**CLUB.**

**CONTRACT—BREACH OF — DAMAGES — UNINCORPORATED ASSOCIATION.**

It appeared that the company plaintiff was incorporated by letters patent on the 3rd June, 1887. In March, 1887,

a contract was made between the Fish and Game club and a syndicate represented by Nelson, by which the syndicate undertook to establish and carry on a restaurant in the rooms of the club. An action of damages was brought, founded on alleged breach of contract, and the action was maintained by the court below. The Court of Review reversed this judgment and dismissed the action, holding that the contract was made by an unincorporated association, and even supposing that it was within the powers of the club to enter into such a contract, in the present case the contract was not accepted by the club. The only persons who were entitled to complain of the defendant were the individuals composing the voluntary association. The club had no claim to damages resulting from the temporary closing of the restaurant by the defendant. If the difficulties connected with the restaurant had the effect of deterring some persons from joining the club, such damages would be too remote to be recovered. Upon the whole the court found that the plaintiff had no right of action against the defendant. The judgment was, therefore, reversed and the action dismissed *Montreal Fish and Game Club v. Huot*, Court of Review, Montreal, Nov. 11, 1893.

### COMMERCIAL TRAVELLER.

#### TRAVELLING EXPENSES — FRENCH CURRENCY—FOREIGN CURRENCY.

Where a merchant has agreed to pay his traveller's travelling expenses, these are to include charges for carriage of baggage to and from hotels and stations.

Also the extras incidental to a long sea voyage, such as "tips" etc.

Where a traveller was allowed 25 francs per day for travelling expenses on a trip to the United States, this daily allowance while he is in the States must not be reckoned at the usual equivalent of \$5.00, but on the basis of 25 francs per day at the then rate of exchange, which was in excess of \$5.00, unless there is a contrary intention expressed in the agreement. *Brocheton v. Elissalt*, Court of Appeals,

Paris, 12 July 1893. (Journal des Tribunaux), 8 Nov. 1893.

### COMPANIES—SEE ALSO ESTOPPEL.

#### 1. WINDING-UP — VOLUNTARY ASSIGNMENT FOR BENEFIT OF CREDITORS — APPROVAL OF MAJORITY OF CREDITORS—DISCRETION—R. S. C. c. 129, s. 9.

The 9th section of the Winding up Act, R. S. C. c. 129, gives a wide discretionary power to the Court. Upon an application for a winding-up order, in a case where a company had previously made a voluntary assignment for the benefit of creditors, and it was shown that it was the desire of the great majority in number and value of the creditors that the company should be wound up under the assignment.

*Held*, that this discretionary power should be exercised; and the winding-up order was refused, but leave was given to renew the application if any exigency should arise to justify the intervention of the Court. *In re Hamilton Whip Co.*, Ontario, High Court of Justice, In Chambers, Sept. 1893, (Can. L. T.)

#### 2. WINDING-UP—POWER TO CARRY ON BUSINESS—R. S. O. c. 183, s. 6 s. s. 1.

The power to carry on the business of a company after winding-up proceedings have been commenced under the Ontario Act, and thus to postpone the final winding-up, is one which is not to be exercised unless a strong case of necessity for doing so exists, and it is only for the purpose of administration and realization that such a course should be taken.

That the mortgagees of the company's works, who have foreclosed their mortgage, will be enabled to dispose of the works to greater advantage, and that by affording facilities for procuring repairs to purchasers of machinery manufactured by the company the chances of obtaining payment of outstanding purchase notes will be improved, are not sufficient grounds to justify the carrying on of the business. Judgment of the Court below reversed. *In re Haggart Bros Manuf'g Co.*, Ontario, Ct. of Appeal, July 1893, (Can. L. T.)

COMPENSATION -- See Water Com- (Note).  
pany.

**CONTRACTS** — SEE ALSO CLUB—  
ELECTION EXPENSES — SALE OF DEALS  
— SHIPS, ETC. 2 — SHIPS (BILL OF  
LADING) 2.

**1. FOR PERSONAL SERVICES.**

Where a person agrees with a cer-  
tain firm to exert himself to sell all  
the lumber cut at their mill during a  
certain year, the fact that he, during  
such time, becomes the managing  
partner in a firm which operates a com-  
peting mill, does not of itself consti-  
tute a breach of his contract with the  
former firm, in the absence of an agree-  
ment to give his entire services to  
either firm. *Bender v. Peyton* (Tex.),  
23 S.W. Rep. 222.

**2. FOR PERSONAL SERVICES — IN-  
JUNCTION.**

Unless personal services are indi-  
vidual and peculiar because of their  
special merit or unique character, a  
negative covenant (even when express)  
not to render them to others than the  
plaintiff will not be enforced by in-  
junction in order that the plaintiff may  
have the incidental benefit of an affir-  
mative covenant to serve him exclu-  
sively for a specified time. Hence,  
where one assigned to a firm his inter-  
est in a certain contract of agency  
for an insurance company, and in the  
assignment covenanted to remain with  
the firm as special agent in a named  
State for one year, and to give his  
entire time and attention to the busi-  
ness of that company by procuring for  
it applications for insurance, an in-  
junction will not be granted at the  
instance of the firm to restrain the  
assignor from soliciting insurance or  
transacting business for a rival com-  
pany, the assignment containing no  
express covenant that he would not do  
so, and it not appearing that he was a  
specially skillful, successful, or expert  
insurance agent whose place could not  
be readily supplied by another equally  
competent to attend to the business for  
which his services had been engaged.  
*Burney v. Ryle*, Supreme Ct. of Georgia,  
May 22, 1893.

See in this connection the case of *Star  
Newspaper Co. v. O'Connor* [1893] W. N. 114  
compromised on appeal [1893] W. N. 122. 1  
M. L. D. & R. 571, also next case.

**3. INJUNCTION—SPECIFIC PERFORM-  
ANCE—CONTRACT FOR PERSONAL SER-  
VICE.**

This was a motion by the plaintiff,  
whose professional name is Miss Ger-  
trude Kingston, for an injunction to  
restrain the defendants, Messrs. Agus-  
tino and Stefano Gatti, until the trial  
of the action or until further order,  
from dismissing the plaintiff from her  
engagement at the Adelphi Theatre in  
breach of an engagement dated the  
5th June, 1893, made between the de-  
fendants of the one part and the plain-  
tiff of the other part, and that the de-  
fendants might be restrained by the  
like order and injunction from employ-  
ing any person other than the plaintiff  
during the run of the play "A Woman's  
Revenge" to act the part of Mabel  
Wentworth in such play, or that such  
other order might be made in the pre-  
mises as to the court should seem meet.

*Marten, Q.C.*, and *Martelli*, for the  
plaintiff, said that an actress was in a  
peculiar position, and that in a special  
case like this the bargain should be  
reciprocal. We wish to prevent the  
defendant from depriving the public  
of her services.

*Kennedy, J.*—Have you ever known  
of a case where an injunction has been  
granted to restrain an employer from  
discharging an actor or person employ-  
ed by him?

*Marten.*—*Fisher v. Jackson* (64 L.  
T. Rep. N. S. 782 : (1891) 2 Ch. 84)  
was such a case.

*A. à B. Terrell* for the defendants.

The following cases were referred to :  
*Fisher v. Jackson* (sup.); *Whitwood  
Chemical Company v. Hardman* (64 L.  
T. Rep. N. S. 716 ; (1891) 2 Ch. 416);  
*National Provincial Bank of England  
v. Marshall* (60 L. T. Rep. N. S. 341 ;  
40 Ch. Div. 112) ; *Wolverhampton and  
Walsall Railway Company v. London  
and Northwestern Railway Company*  
(L. Rep. 16 Eq. 433).

*Kennedy, J.*, refused to grant the  
injunction, and said, in giving judg-  
ment : The second part of this applica-



tion—i.e., that part of it which asks for an injunction to restrain the defendants "from employing any person other than the plaintiff during the run of the play 'A Woman's Revenge' to act the part of Mabel Wentworth in such play"—is wider than the claim indorsed on the writ, which merely asks for an injunction to restrain the defendants from dismissing the plaintiff. The agreement in respect of which this action is brought was an agreement made in June of this year. It appears to me that the application which is made on behalf of the plaintiff is in substance an application for specific performance of that agreement. No doubt in form it is an application for an injunction. I heard fully the arguments which were addressed to me by counsel for the applicant. No authority has been cited which gives any real ground for such an order, which is in fact an order that the employer continue the employment of the artist. The cases most relied on were those of *National Bank of England v. Marshall*, *Wolverhampton and Walsall Railway Company v. London and North-Western Railway Company*, *Fisher v. Jackson*, and *Whitwood Chemical Company v. Hardman*. There is no authority which, so far as I can see, justifies me in acceding to this application. *Lumley v. Wagner* (1 De G. M. & G. 604) is the nearest case; but after the case of *Whitwood Chemical Company v. Hardman* it must be looked upon as rather an anomaly to be followed in similar cases, and not to be extended. Assuming for the moment that there has been a breach of contract on the part of the defendants, the Court of Chancery will not grant a remedy of this kind. It seems to me to fall within that class of agreements to which this remedy is not applicable. It is a contract for personal service, skilled, no doubt, but still personal service, and unless it comes within the form of *Lumley v. Wagner*, the remedy by injunction is not applicable. There are no express negative words, as in *Lumley v. Wagner*. Mr. Marten contended that, as on the part of the plaintiff there were negative words, the remedy ought to be reciprocal. There are no negative words; but even if there were, I do

not think the application to enjoin the defendant could be granted. *Fisher v. Jackson* is a totally different kind of case. It was a case of trustees of an endowed school, and the only method of dismissing the school-master had not been fulfilled. I must dismiss the application, leaving the plaintiff to her remedy in damages if there has been a breach of contract. I think this is an application which could not succeed. I think the costs of this application ought to be the defendants' costs in any event. *Silver v. Gatti*, Sept. 21 1893, *Law Times*, (England), 27 *Ir Law Times*, 545.

#### 4. CONTRACT BY CORRESPONDENCE—NEGOTIATION BY TELEGRAM—INCOMPLETENESS—ACCEPTANCE OF OFFER NOT PROVED.

Where the appellants telegraphed "will you sell us B. H. P. ? Telegraph lowest cash price" and the respondent telegraphed in reply. "Lowest price for B. H. P. £900" and then the appellants telegraphed, "we agree to buy B. H. P. for £900 asked by you. Please send us your title deed that we may get early possession" but received no reply.

*Held*, that there was no contract. The final telegram was not the acceptance of an offer to sell, for none had been made. It was itself an offer to buy, the acceptance to which must be expressed and could not be implied. *Harvey v. Facey*, [1893] *App Cas.* 552.

### CONTEMPT OF COURT.

#### I. DISOBEYING INJUNCTION—MOTION TO QUASH APPEAL.

The fact that a party to an action is in contempt is no bar to his proceeding with the action in the ordinary way, but only to his asking the Court for an indulgence.

And where the defendants received certain moneys 'in disobedience to an interim injunction, which was made perpetual by the judgment at the trial, a motion by the plaintiff to quash the defendants' appeal from the judgment was refused. *Ferguson v County of Elgin*, Ontario Supreme Ct. of Judicature. In chambers Sept. 1893.

**2. COSTS — SENTENCE — STAY OF EXECUTION AFTER SENTENCE—APPEAL.**

Proceedings were taken against the defendant for contempt of Court, by reason of his having published articles in his newspaper reflecting upon the conduct of a Judge of this Court, and the defendant found guilty of contempt. Previous to sentence, the counsel for the prosecution asked to have costs allowed to the prosecutor.

On behalf of the defendant it was urged that the granting of costs in criminal and quasi-criminal matters was wholly without precedent.

The defendant was ordered to be imprisoned in the York county gaol for thirty days and to pay a fine of \$200, and also to pay the prosecutor his costs, to be taxed by the clerk and to be paid in ten days after taxation; and the defendant to be detained in prison until the fine and costs were paid.

After the sentence had been pronounced, counsel for the defendant moved to have the sentence suspended to give the defendant an opportunity to appeal to the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council.

*Held*, that this application was too late. If the defendant had wished to appeal, his application should have been made before sentence was passed, but the Court, having pronounced sentence, had no power, under the authorities, to suspend the execution of the sentence. *Regina v. Ellis*, Supreme Court New Brunswick, 14th October, 1893, (Can. L. T).

CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE — See Carriers 3.—Negligence.

COSTS—See Contempt of Court.

CRIMINAL CODE 1892 ss. 845 (3) 847, 857.

DAMAGES — See Club — Estoppel—Landlord and Tenant — Mercantile Agencies—Negligence 3—Sale.

DEMURRAGE—See Ships etc., 3.

**ELECTION EXPENSES.**

DOMINION ELECTION ACT R. S. C., s. 8 — CONFLICTING, SECTIONS 119 & 131—AGENCY.

This was an action against appellant

for the value of printing done in connection with his candidacy for election to the Dominion Parliament.

Two questions presented themselves for consideration :

(1) Has the Election Act taken away the right of action for claims of this kind ?

(2) Is a candidate responsible for work ordered by a committee appointed to secure his election, but without special authorization to incur liabilities ?

*Upon the first point it was held* : That in regard to the apparent conflict between the two sections of the Dominion Election Act 119 and 131, chapter 8 of the Rev. Stat. of Canada, their proper interpretation results in this : that no agreement in regard to election matters can be enforced under any circumstances as a contract, the parties being left only to their ordinary recourse for the real value of the commodity or service furnished ; secondly, that the recourse even upon the *quantum meruit* is taken away, except for bills reported to the electoral agent for public inspection, if required.

In the present case, the evidence, showing that the bill was reported to the appellant's election agent and within the delay stipulated by statute, there is no statutory disability against enforcing the account upon which the present action is based.

*Upon the second point it was held* : (Lacoste, C. J. and Blanchet, J., dissenting). That the theoretical assumption being, that the candidate is,— *quoad* his civil rights and responsibilities only in the position of an ordinary elector, working legitimately for the success of the principles advocated by the party to which he belongs, he cannot be held personally responsible for ordinary civil obligations incurred by a committee of his fellow electors, presumably acting with him for the furtherance of his candidature, not for advantages personal to himself, but only for the assertion of the principles advocated by their party. As there is no evidence in this case to show that the appellant assumed any different position from that, in so far as his candidacy was concerned, he cannot be held responsible for the action of this

committee in incurring civil liabilities, and the appeal therefore should be maintained and the action dismissed. *Guerin* (appellant) & *Taylor et al.* (respondents), Queen's Bench in Appeal. Present, Chief Justice Sir A. Lacoste, and Justice Baby, Bossé, Blanchet and Hall. Montreal, Nov. 27, 1893.

HALL, J.—At the general elections in 1891 for the Dominion House of Commons the appellant was the candidate of one of the political parties for the constituency of Montreal Centre. A central committee from among his supporters was appointed, the most prominent and active members of which were Mr. Greenshields, Q.C., the candidate's brother, Dr. Guerin, and Mr. Keys. The official agent of the candidate was a Mr. Euard, although he does not appear to have attended the meetings of the committee or frequented their room. His appointment was made public by notice in the newspapers in conformity with the Election act. A certain amount of money—part of it contributed by the candidate himself—was deposited in the hands of the committee to meet their necessary expenditure for rent, printing, advertisements, etc. At the termination of the contest it was found that this amount was entirely expended, leaving still unpaid a bill of \$277.25 for printing done for the committee by the respondents. An action to recover the amount was taken against Mr. Guerin, the candidate, based upon the usual assumpsit, counts for goods, wares and merchandise sold, and work and labor done, and performed by plaintiffs to and for defendant, at his request and for his benefit. The defendant pleaded beside the general issue, that the claim, if any there were, was for expenses connected with a Dominion election contest, for which no right of action existed, particularly as plaintiff had not filed the account with the election agent, as required by law, and that under any circumstances the work had not been at defendant's personal instance or request, nor that of any one authorized by him to contract such a liability. The plaintiffs replied specially that the work had been done at the request of defendant's authorized agents and for his benefit, and that the claim had been filed with his election agent within the delay stipulated by law. The evidence and admission show that the printing in question was done by the plaintiffs for the committee appointed and acting to secure defendant's election; that the defendant knew of the exertions of this committee in connection with the election, although he had given no special instruction or authorization to incur liabilities, and had not supposed that any would be incurred in excess of the fund provided in advance by himself and others for necessary expenses. The proof, too, was fairly satisfactory that the claims had been regularly filed with the election agent. Judgment went against the defendant in the Superior court for the amount of the account. Two questions pre-

sent themselves for consideration. First, has the Election Act taken away the right of action for claims of this kind? And, second, is a candidate responsible for work ordered by a committee appointed to secure his election, but without special authorization to incur liabilities?

Upon the first point there has been some difference of opinion among the judges, both of this and the Superior court, but a uniformity in the decisions. The difference of opinion arises from what is considered to be a contradiction between sections 119 and 131 of the Election Act (R.S.C., cap. S), and it has been considered necessary in order to overcome the alleged inconsistency of the two sections to interpret section 131 as referring to "a contract, promise or undertaking" for a corrupt purpose under the terms of the Election Act.

The two clauses are in these words: 119 "All persons who have bills, charges or claims upon any candidate for or in respect of any election shall send in such bills, charges or claims within one month after the day of the declaration of the election, to such agent as aforesaid; otherwise such persons shall be barred of their right to recover such claims." (131) "Every executory contract or promise or undertaking in any way referring to, or arising out of or depending upon any election under this act, even for the payment of lawful expenses, or the doing of some lawful act, shall be void at law." The alleged inconsistency is that section 119 recognizes a class of claims as valid, if sent in within a stipulated delay to the agent, while section 131 asserts that such claims are absolutely void at law.

We all agree with Mr. Justice Taschereau who rendered the judgment in this case in the Superior Court, in accepting the jurisprudence established by this court in 1877 in *Workman vs. The Herald Publishing Company*, 21 L. C. J. 268, and Q. R. L. 38, which was followed by the Court of Review in *Jalbert vs. De Lery* in 1879, 5 Q. L. R. 20, although it seems possible to place the reasons for those decisions upon a more harmonious and satisfactory basis. It is to be borne in mind that our statutory provisions in regard to election expenses present attempts to prevent different forms of bribery, although consolidated in one statute. Contracts in connection with elections, whose sole consideration was bribery or corruption, have always been void, but this result was often evaded by a partial consideration to which no legal exception could be taken. A frequent kind of corruption at elections was the undertaking by the person soliciting votes to pay to the elector an exaggerated price for some service or commodity as a disguised method of bribery. To render this less effective clause 131 also was enacted, making every such contract or promise or undertaking absolutely without legal effect—unlike a contract, but still leaving to the elector, as I interpret the statute, his recourse for the provable value of the effects sold or the services rendered by him, in an action upon the *quantum meruit*. For instance, if a candidate or his agents had contracted

with an elector to pay him \$20 per day for the use of a horse, the hire of which was only worth \$2, per day, the \$20, rate could not be enforced under the contract, but the real value could still be recovered upon the quantum meruit. Payments for real purchases and services at exaggerated prices were sometimes the only evidence of compensation for bribery and as a check upon this method of evasion, section 119 of the Election Act was passed making it obligatory that all bills or claims against any candidate for or in respect of any election, even for necessary expenses, should be sent in within a limited delay to the election agent for public inspection, and failing compliance with this condition the creditor should be barred of his right to recover upon such claim. The result of the two enactments is, therefore, this: That no agreement in regard to election matters can be enforced under any circumstances as a contract, the parties being left only to their ordinary recourse for the real value of the commodity or service furnished; secondly, that the recourse even upon the quantum meruit is taken away except for bills reported to the electoral agent for public inspection, if required. This interpretation leaves no conflict between the two clauses of the statute and harmonizes with every reported decision. The claims set upon in the *Herald Publishing Company vs. Workman*, and *Jalbert vs. DeLery* are maintained by the courts to the extent their proved value, and not upon contract, while the action was dismissed in *Dausereau vs. St. Louis* (M.L.R., 5 Q.B., 332), because it was based solely upon a contract "referring or arising out of or depending upon" an election contest. It goes without saying that quite independently of these two sections an account for commodities actually distributed to secure votes will be disallowed, in the case of *Brunelle vs. Begin*, Rap. Dec., 1 Q.B., 570, recently decided by this court, without reference to the observance or nonobservance of formalities stipulated by the electoral act. We are all agreed, therefore, that there is no statutory disability against enforcing the account upon which the present action was based, although the act in question was done in connection with an election contest, provided only, the account was reported, to the appellant's election agent within the delay stipulated by the statute, and this formality appears to have been complied with, as Mr. Boudreau, one of the plaintiffs, swears positively to that fact, and the election agent can only say that he does not remember the circumstance. The second ground of defence to the action—lack of authorization on the part of those who ordered the work—there is more than a division of opinion among the members of the Court. It is admitted that the work was not ordered by the appellant himself, but by a committee appointed to secure his election. There is no evidence that this committee was appointed by the appellant. Probably the meeting of electors which selected him as their candidate named the central committee which should have the management of the campaign. The candidate recognized

this committee by contributing to the necessary expenses which would have to be incurred—rent of rooms, stationery, printing, advertising, etc.—but there is no evidence that he deputed to them any authority to incur liabilities for which he was to be, or to be considered, personally responsible. The burden of proof is in the opposite direction: his contribution in advance of a certain sum toward expenses; the understanding testified to both by him and Mr. Greenshields that expenses were to be paid as fast as incurred, and that none should be incurred unless there was cash in hand with which to meet them, and the infrequency of appellant's visits to the committee room and his consequent ignorance of the details of what occurred there, all go to confirm an assumption that the committee was one acting in the interest of a party, of which the appellant was accidentally and temporarily the candidate, and that they were not in any sense his personal agents. Mr. Greenshields, whom the plaintiffs examined as their witness and whose testimony they specially invoke, when questioned upon this point of authorization answers as follows:

"Were you authorized by Mr. Edmund Guerin (appellant) to order what you considered necessary?" Answer—"I never had any special instructions or authorization to order. Question—"He knew of the printing and did not repudiate it?" Ans. "I suppose he knew as any other citizen knew." "Were you not in that committee room as one of a number of friends giving their services gratis for the advancement of the party?" Ans.—"Yes."

The evidence clearly shows, in my opinion, that the defendant only acted, in so far as establishing responsibility for any civil obligation, as one member of his party, "as any other citizen," as Mr. Greenshields puts it; and that he performed no act and made no representation which placed him in any other position—in so far as civil responsibility was concerned—either toward the plaintiff or any one else, and therefore that he is free from any such liability or responsibility, unless his position as the candidate of his party for the time being, implies that degree of personal interest in the result as to make him civilly responsible for the acts and promises of his supporters upon the ground that such acts and promises procured results which were for his direct and personal advantage. That candidates often do place themselves in such a position by their acts and representations, is undoubtedly true; but under the theory of our system of representative government that assumption cannot, in my opinion, be invoked without proof. The electoral law holds the candidate to a strict degree of moral responsibility both for his own acts and promises and those of his agents, and annuls his election when those acts or promises are proved to have violated those provisions of the law enacted in the general interest of the State to secure purity in elections, but it has not modified, and never was intended to interfere with the ordinary rules of interpretation of civil liability of electors among themselves. The theoretical assumption being, as I have said,

that the candidate is,—*quoad* his civil rights and responsibilities only in the position of an ordinary elector, working legitimately for the success of the principles advocated by the party to which he belongs, he cannot be held personally responsible for ordinary civil obligations incurred by a committee of his fellow electors, presumably acting with him for the furtherance of his candidature, not for advantages personal to himself, but only for the assertion of the principles advocated by their party. As I find nothing in the evidence in this cause to show that the appellant assumed any different position from that, in so far as his candidacy was concerned, I think he cannot be held responsible for the action of this committee in incurring civil liabilities, and that the appeal therefore should be maintained, and the action dismissed.

It is a significant confirmation of this view that the original invoices are proved to have been made out not in the name of the appellant, but of Mr. Greenshields, who was either considered by the respondents as the most prominent member of the committee, or was the one who personally gave the particular order upon which the work was done.

LACOSTE, C. J., and BLANCHET, J., differed from the majority on the question of agency. Lacoste, C. J., on this question, observed that there was no special authorization to the respondents for the printing in question. Was there a general agency? There is a difference between agency in election matters and ordinary civil agency. Agency is presumed more easily in election matters. The responsibility of the candidate for the acts of his agent, is that of the master for the acts of his servant rather than that of the principal for the acts of his agent. The rules of the civil law have to be applied, but in the application of these rules the candidate must be given the position which the constitution gives him in the election. The constitution makes the election the undertaking of the candidate. The jurisprudence is unanimous on this point. If, then, the candidate gives the direction of the election to any one, if he entrusts him with a sum of money for legitimate and necessary expenses, he makes him a general agent, and he is responsible to third parties for his acts and expenses. In this case, the appellant confided the direction of the election to Mr. Greenshields, and to his brother, Dr. Guerin. Mr. Greenshields admits it, but he says that he designedly kept the candidate out of the business affairs. He admits, however, having received funds from him. The candidate admits that he, his family and his friends formed an election fund which he entrusted to Dr. Guerin and to Mr. Greenshields for expenses. This constitutes a general authorization. The appellant adds that he did not authorize them to incur debts, and that it was understood that everything should be paid for in cash. This is a question to be settled between them. If they have not followed his instructions he can exercise his recourse against them. To pay cash does not mean to pay before the work is done. A candidate is not presumed to have intended to violate the law which requires that payments be made by his elec-

tion agent. The authorization extended to the giving of orders for expenses which Mr. Greenshields and Dr. Guerin might consider useful or necessary, and Mr. Greenshields tells us that the expenses which they ordered he believed to be useful and even necessary.

I would confirm the judgment.

Judgment reversed, Lacoste, C. J., and Blanchet, J., dissenting.

### ESTOPPEL.

COMPANY — SHARE CERTIFICATE — CERTIFICATE UNDER COMPANY'S SEAL — COMPANIES ACT 1862 (25 & 26 V. c. 89) s. 31 — DAMAGES.

P., the owner of numbered shares in a joint stock company, transferred them to persons who were registered in the company's books as proprietors of the shares. P. afterwards fraudulently executed a transfer of the shares for value to T., who sent the transfer to the company, and received from them a certificate under the common seal stating that he was proprietor of the shares. T., acting *bonâ fide* on the faith of the certificate sold the shares; but the company refused to register the purchaser as proprietor, on the ground that after granting the certificate to T. they had discovered that he was not the owner of the shares. T. then, to fulfil his contract with the purchaser, bought other shares in the market and sold the company for the price.

*Held*, affirming the decision of the Court of Appeal [1891] 2 Q. B. 661, that the company were estopped by their certificate from denying that T. was the proprietor of the shares and that he was entitled to recover from the company the damages which he had in fact sustained owing to his refusal to register the purchaser. *Bank of Montreal Consolidated Company v. Tomkinson*, L. (E.) [1893] App. Cas., 396.

EVIDENCE—See Bills and Notes

EVIDENCE—See Partnership.

FINAL JUDGMENT—See Jury Trial

FIRE INSURANCE—See Insur. Fin.

FORGED DEED—See Prin. and Ag.

HOTELKEEPER—See Innkeeper.

INJUNCTION—See Contracts, for Social Services 2 — 3 — Contemp. Court 1.

**INNKEEPERS.**

**LIABILITY FOR GOODS DESTROYED BY FIRE—GUESTS AND BOARDERS.**

*Held*, that the fact that an hotel has a rule to charge a guest a less rate *per diem* by the week than by the day, and that, if a guest had been there longer than a week, he got the benefit of the rule, does not show that one who had been at the hotel more than a week was a "boarder," rather than a "guest" it not being shown that he had any notice of the rule, or any knowledge of the charges, or that any arrangement for a permanent stay had been made, and the fact that one has made a special arrangement at an hotel for boarding and lodging by the week is not determinative of the question whether he is a guest or a boarder, but merely evidence on the issue. *Magee v. Pacific Improvement Co.*, Supreme Court of California, 1893.

**INSOLVENCY.**

**INSOLVENCY — OF PARTNER — PROMISSORY NOTE SIGNED BY BOTH PARTNERS — HOLDER OF NOTE CAN RANK ON THE PRIVATE ESTATE OF THE INSOLVENT PARTNER—ART. 1899 C. C., BILLS OF EXCHANGE ACT 1890, S. 84.**

*Andrews, J.*—Alfred Blouin made an abandonment of his property. George Demers claims to rank on his estate for the amount of a promissory note made in the following terms.

Quebec, April 14, 1893.

One month after date I promise to pay to the order of George Demers at his office here, seven hundred dollars for value received.

ALFRED BLOUIN,  
ANTOINE GAGNÉ.

The curator refused to collocate him for this amount on the ground that he was charged with the liquidation of Blouin's personal estate, and Demers was a creditor of the partnership formed between Blouin and Gagné for the performance of a certain undertaking.

The curator maintains that by the terms of Art. 1899 Civil Code, the pro-

perty of the partner should be applied to the payment of his personal creditors and that the creditors of the partnership could only rank thereon in event of the partnership property being insufficient, and after Blouin's personal creditors had been satisfied.

Art. 1899 of the Civil Code says: The property of the partnership is to be applied to the payment of the creditors of the firm, in preference to the separate creditors of any partner; and in case such property be found insufficient for the purpose, the private property of the partners or of any one of them is also to be applied to the payment of the debts of the partnership; but only after the payment out of it of the separate creditors of such partners or partner respectively.

The creditor Demers pleads (1) that Art. 1899 is not applicable to this case, which relates to the liquidation of Blouin's personal estate and not of a partnership (2) that Blouin is personally indebted to him.

It is true that article 1899 C. C. relates to the liquidation of partnership property, but an examination of chap. 65, sec. 6, Rev. Stats. Lower Canada will render much clearer the intention of the legislator than the above article.

This statute lays down the law as follows:—The net products of the partnership property shall first go to the payment of the partnership creditors and the net products of the private property of each partner shall go to the payment of their personal creditors and any surplus left from this private property shall be added, if necessary, to the products of the partnership property in payment of the partnership creditors.

Thus according to the terms of the Rev. Stat. of Lower Canada, the curator is right in maintaining that the property to be liquidated by him, being Blouin's personal property, should go to the satisfaction of his personal debts.

(2) Is the claim of Demers against Blouin a personal one, or is it a debt against the partnership which existed between Blouin and Gagné?

Art. 84 of the Bills of Exchange Act, 1890, says:

"A promissory note may be made

by two or more makers, and they may be liable thereon jointly, or jointly and severally, according to its tenor."

"(2) Where a note runs "I promise to pay" and is signed by two or more persons, it is deemed to be their joint and several note."

The note in this case is exactly in those terms, and therefore the holder is the creditor of each of the signers individually, and as such must be collocated on the dividend sheet of the Estate Blouin. *Demers v. Blouin*, Superior Court, Quebec, Nov. 15, 1893,

## INSURANCE.

### ACCIDENT.

#### I. CONDITIONS.

Where an accident insurance policy is, by its terms, made payable in case of death "received through external, violent, and accidental means," the intent is that the means, or that which caused the injury must be external. *American Acc. Co. of Louisville v. Reigart*, Ky., 23 S. W. Rep. 191.

#### 2. DISABILITY.

Under an accident policy insuring one against loss of time resulting from bodily injuries effected through external violent and accidental means, which shall, independently of all other causes, immediately, wholly, and continuously disable "the insured" from transacting any and every kind of business pertaining to his occupation," the insurance company is not liable to the policy holder for loss of time resulting from a physical injury, when it affirmatively appears that 30 days elapsed from the time the injury was received before the insured was disabled so he could not attend to his business; that he, being a merchant, was probably in his store every day during this period, giving more or less attention to his business, and did not till the end of that period abandon all attention to the same. *Williams v. Preferred Mut. Acc. Ass'n.*, Ga., 17 S. E. Rep. 982.

3. NOTICE OF DELAY, CAUSE OF—FORFEITURE OF POLICY—INSURANCE AGAINST ACCIDENTS TO THIRD PARTIES—FOR WHICH INSURED LIABLE.

Where a policy required that the insured (against accidents happening to third parties for which he would be held liable) should give notice to the company of such accidents within a certain date from the moment the accident came to his notice, under pain of forfeiture of the policy.

*Held*, that the trial judge could find that there was no forfeiture, although the information had been given to the company after the delay had expired, where the injury arising from the accident had only then become serious enough to give rise to a cause of action against the insured. *Compagnie d'Assur. La Prévoyance v. Hubert*, Court of Cassation, 21 Dec. 1891, Dalloz, 1892—1—460.

### FIRE.

#### 4. MUTUAL — WAIVER OF FORFEITURE.

The levy and collection of an assessment by a mutual fire insurance company on the premium note of a member after the forfeiture of his policy and knowledge of such forfeiture by the company, does not constitute a waiver thereof, where such assessment is made to pay losses occurring prior thereto. *Farmer's Mut. Fire Ins. Co. of Dug Hill v. Hull*, Md., 27 Atl. Rep. 169.

#### 5. BREACH OF CONDITIONS.

Where a fire insurance policy provides that it shall be void if the interest of the insured in the property "be other than unconditional and sole ownership," the fact that one of the insured articles is held merely under a contract of sale, with the title outstanding in the seller, invalidates the whole policy. *McWilliams v. Cascade Fire and Marine Ins. Co.*, Wash... 32 Pac. Rep. 140.

#### 6. CONTRACT FOR SALE—CHANGE OF TITLE — CHANGE MATERIAL TO THE RISK—R. S. O. C. 167, s. 114—DAMAGES.

That the owners of an insured building have entered into an executory contract for the pulling down of the building in question and for the sale of the materials to the contractors at a sum very much less than the amount

of the insurance is no bar to their right to recover the full amount of the insurance when the building is burnt down before the time fixed by the contract for the transfer of possession. Judgment of McMahon, J., 22 O. R. 529, affirmed. *Ardill v. Citizen Ins. Co.* *Ardill v. Ethna Insurance Co.* Ontario Ct. of Appeal, Oct. 1893 (Can. L. T.)

7. PREMIUMS PAYABLE AT OFFICE OR AT DOMICILE — CONDITIONS OF POLICY — PAYMENT OF PREMIUM AFTER LOSS.

Where the policy states that the premium is to be paid at the company's office, such a stipulation can be derogated from by a tacit agreement between the parties thereto, to the effect that it shall be paid at the domicile of the insured.

Such a tacit agreement can arise where, previous to the forfeiture claimed in this case, it was customary for the company to collect the premiums at the domiciles of their insured.

But where the insured has, in the policy, expressly renounced his right to this usage, the clause stipulating for the premium to be paid at the company's office must have full force, and no subsequent conduct of the company toward the insured can be implied as derogating therefrom.

The company can validly stipulate that the policy shall be absolutely forfeited in the event of the premiums being not paid.

Payment to and reception by the agent of the overdue premium, after the fire, would not avoid forfeiture in this case, even where it was proved that the insured never refused to pay the premium to the agent in his district, and it was customary for the insured of the district to pay their premiums to the agent at their convenience, or wait for him to call upon them, even when overdue, without their policies being in anyway rendered invalid thereby.

And the fact that it was known in the district that the company allowed their local agent to act beyond the scope of his power of attorney, and that their inspector, after payment of the overdue premium, agreed to an appraisal of the damages under certain reservations, would not avoid forfei-

ture in this case. *Compagnie d'Assurance l'Union v. Martin*, Court of Cassation, 4th Nov., 1891, Dallog. 1892-1-313.

GENERAL.

S. INSURANCE—HORSE—SUCCESSIVE ACCIDENTS — RATE OF INDEMNITY.

When a succession of accidents befall to the object insured, the insured cannot receive indemnities amounting to a sum greater than that insured for.

And where the owner of a horse who insured it for 2,000 francs received 500 francs indemnity for injuries happening thereto, he cannot, upon the death of the horse, a year afterwards, claim an indemnity which, added to the 500 francs, would exceed the sum of 2,000 francs. *Compagnie d'Assur. l'Urbaine et la Seine v. Leroux*. Ct. of Appeal, Paris 1892, Dallog 92—2—271.

Note.

The editors of Dallog in a note to this case find fault with this holding. They say (translation) "in effect, what elements in the case should serve as a basis for fixing the indemnity? Both the extent of the actual loss to which the insured is subjected and the amount stated in the policy.

If the value of the object insured be reduced by an accident by one quarter its total value, and if this depreciation in value remains, undoubtedly this must be taken into account, the insured upon the happening of a second accident resulting in a total loss, could only receive the full amount less the one-quarter. It would be otherwise when the depreciation had ceased. If a house were burnt in part, and reconstructed into its former condition, or if a horse, being wounded, received such care as to restore it to its former value, that is the value which should enter into consideration in fixing the indemnity. This is what occurred in the present case; it appears that the insurer did not plead depreciation.

Now, as to the second element in the case; the amount insured for. At the time of the accident which gave rise to this action, the parties thereto were under the force of the original contract of insurance, and the insured had paid the premium stated therein; the judgment specially admits these two points. Under these conditions the rights of both parties must be determined by the policy, that is to say the indemnity, in case of accident, continues to be the measure of the sum fixed by the policy. Now, the premium for each year is the guarantee for that year, just as the rents for each term are the price of the enjoyment of the term: therefore during the year covered by the premium the indemnity cannot exceed the amount insured for. If several accidents happen in the one year, the sum insured for will be the maximum that can be received



for the successive indemnities; if these accidents occur in different years (which was the case in the present action), this sum will be the maximum of each indemnity.

### INTEREST.

MONEY PAYABLE AT TIME DEPENDING ON A FUTURE CONTINGENT EVENT — TIME DEPENDING ON A VERIFICATION OF ACCOUNTS — DAMAGES FOR DETENTION OF DEBT — 3 & 4 Wm. 4, c. 42, s. 28.

An award made upon a joint traffic agreement between two railway companies determined that accounts should be rendered by each company to the other in May; that a payment of not less than 75 per cent. should be made on account of the balance appearing to be due on the face of the accounts so exchanged, and that this payment should be made as soon after the 1st of June as possible and not later than the 15th of June. A large balance became due from one of the companies to the other, to recover which an action was brought and interest claimed:

*Held*, affirming the decision of the Court of Appeal ([1892] 1 Ch. 120), that no interest could be recovered under 3 & 4 Wm. 4, c. 42, s. 28; since there was no "debt or sum certain payable by virtue of a written instrument at a certain time," within the meaning of that statute: nor had any demand of payment claiming interest been made in writing: and that interest could not be given by way of damages for detention of the debt, the law upon that subject, unsatisfactory as it is, having been too long settled to be now departed from. *London, Chatham and Dover Railway Company v. South Eastern Railway Company*, H. L. (E.) [1893], App. Cas. 429.

### INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT—APPLICATION OF FINES — MUNICIPAL CORPORATION — DISCRETION — MANDAMUS.

This was an application for a *mandamus* to compel the municipal council of the city of Fredericton to pay to the applicant certain expenses incurred

in prosecutions for violation of the Canada Temperance Act in the city. The applicant had laid some eighteen informations before the police magistrate, and had employed counsel to conduct the prosecutions thereon. Out of the eighteen informations, sixteen convictions were made, and the fines from these collected and paid into the city treasury, and it was not disputed that the city had a fund in hand from the fines collected under the Act.

*Held*, that the order-in-council of the Dominion Government authorized the fines collected for violations of the Canada Temperance Act to be handed over to the city for the purposes of the Act; but that the manner of applying these funds was in the discretion of the city authorities; and therefore a *mandamus* would not lie to compel the city to make a particular expenditure. *Ex parte Hooper*, Supreme Court of New-Brunswick, October 1893 (Can. L. T.).

### JUDICIAL SALE.

VENDITIONI EXPONAS — ORDER OF COURT OR JUDGE—VACATING OF SHERIFF'S SALE—ARTS. 553, 662, 663 714 C. P. C.—JURISDICTION—QUEBEC.

A petition *en nullité de décret* has the same effect as an opposition to a seizure, and under arts. 662 and 662 C. C. P. the sheriff cannot proceed to the sale of property under a writ of *venditioni exponas* unless said writ is issued by an order of the Court or a judge. *Bissonnette v. Laurent* (15 Rev. Leg. 44) approved.

*Per Fournier, J.*: Where the text of the law is clear and positive, a practice even long established should not be followed.

Taschereau and Gwynne, dissented.

On the question of want of jurisdiction raised by respondent it was *held* that a judgment in an action to vacate the sheriff's sale of an immovable is appealable to the Supreme Court under section 29 (b). *Dufresne v. Dixon* (16 Can. S.C.R., 596) followed. Appeal allowed with costs. *Lefeuntun v. Veronneau*, Supreme Ct. of Canada. 24 June 1893.

JURISDICTION—See Appeal.

**JURY TRIAL.**

**1. VERDICT—RIDER BY THE JURY—REPARATION.**

In an action by a widow for damages for the death of her husband caused by the alleged fault of the defenders in not firmly securing a disused gate, the jury returned a unanimous verdict for the defenders, but added this rider, "While accepting unanimously the law as laid down by your Lordship, we do not think that a due measure of supervision and care over the gate in question had been exercised by the defenders." The verdict was entered for the defenders. The pursuer moved for a rule to show cause why a new trial should not be granted.

*Held*, that the verdict of the jury negatived fault on the part of the defenders, and that the rider was not inconsistent with the verdict, and the rule refused. *Burns v. The Steel Co. of Scotland, Lt.*, 31 Scot. Law Rep. 41.

**2. DISAGREEMENT OF JURY—QUESTIONS RESERVED BY JUDGE—MOTION FOR JUDGMENT—AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS—NEW TRIAL—RULE 799—APPEAL—JURISDICTION—FINAL JUDGMENT—ONTARIO.**

In an action brought to recover damages for the loss of certain glass delivered to the defendants for carriage, the Judge left to the jury the question of negligence only, reserving any other questions to be decided subsequently by himself. On the question submitted the jury disagreed. The defendants then moved in a Divisional Court for judgment, but, pending such motion, the plaintiffs applied for and obtained an order of the Court amending the statement of claim by charging other grounds of negligence. The defendants submitted to such order and pleaded to such amendments, and new and material issues were thereby raised for determination. The action as so amended was entered for trial, but had not been tried when the Divisional Court pronounced judgment on the motion, dismissing the plaintiffs' action. On appeal to the Court of Appeal from this judgment of the Divisional Court it was reversed.

On appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada:—

*Held*, affirming the judgment of the Court of Appeal, that the action having been disposed of before the issues involved in the case, whether under the original or amended pleadings, had ever been passed upon or considered by the trial Judge or the jury, a new trial should be ordered, and that this was not a case for invoking the power of the Court, under Rule 799, to finally put an end to the action.

*Held*, also, that the judgment of the Court of Appeal ordering a new trial was not a final judgment, nor did it come within any of the provisions of the Supreme Court Act authorizing an appeal from judgments not final. *Cobban Manufacturing Co. v. Canadian Pacific Railway Co.*, Supreme Court of Canada, May 1, 1893.

**JUSTICE OF THE PEACE.**

**SUMMARY CONVICTION—INFORMATION—TWO OFFENCES—"DEFECT IN SUBSTANCE OR IN FORM"—ADJOURNMENT—CRIMINAL CODE, 1892, SS. 845 (3), 847, 857.**

An information stating that the defendant "within the space of thirty days last past, to wit on the 30th and 31st days of July, 1892,.....did unlawfully sell intoxicating liquor without the license therefor by law required" does not charge two offences, but only the single offence of selling unlawfully within the thirty days; but, even if an information so worded can be said to contravene the provisions of s. 845 (3) of the Criminal Code, 1892, the defect is one "in substance or in form" within the meaning of the curative section, 847, and does not invalidate an otherwise valid conviction for the single offence.

The provision of s. 857 that no adjournment shall be for more than eight days is matter of procedure, and may be waived; and a defendant who consents to an adjournment for more than eight days cannot afterwards complain in that respect. Judgment of the Court below 23 O. R. Reversed. *Regina v. Hazen*, Ontario, Court of Appeal, Oct. 1893, (Can. L. T.)

**LANDLORD AND TENANT.****1. STOPPAGE OF ELEVATOR—DAMAGES.**

The plaintiffs, a firm of advocates, claimed \$150 damages on account of the stopping of the elevator in defendant's building, where they have their offices. The defence was to the effect that the lease alleged did not exist at the time of the stoppage complained of. Further that the plaintiffs made no objection to the work, and moreover they had an easy and convenient access to their office by the staircase. The defendants further alleged that the elevator was in a bad condition and improvements were absolutely necessary, and defendants wished to substitute electric power. They employed skillful workmen, and the work was done with all possible diligence. The court maintained defendant's pretensions, and the action was dismissed. *Cooke v. Royal Insur. Co.* Montreal, Nov. 22. Superior Court, Caron, J.

**2. LIABILITY FOR INTRODUCING BED BUGS INTO THE HOUSE.**

This was an action by a landlord against his tenant. The landlord noticed some time after his tenant had left that his house was full of bugs.

Defendant pleaded that the insects had long been in the premises.

Plaintiff denied this.

The justice of the peace decided in favor of the landlord and condemned the defendant to pay him 600 francs to defray the expenses indicated by the architect as necessary for the occasion and 237 francs for loss of rent since the tenant left the premises. *Département du Nord, Valenciennes*. 3 Aug. 1893. *Gazette des Tribunaux*, 5 Aug. 1893.

**LIBEL AND SLANDER.****1. WORDS ACTIONABLE PER SE.**

In *Continental National Bank of Memphis v. Bowdre*, decided in the Supreme Court of Tennessee, in August, 1893 (22 S. W. Rep. 131), it appeared that a postal card was sent by a bank to a correspondent, from whom it had received a draft on B. Bros. & Co., a mercantile firm, for collection, which read, "B. in hands of notary." As mat-

ter of fact, the draft had been paid to said bank. It was held that such words were libellous *per se*.

**2. STATEMENT THAT DIRECTORS OF A COMPANY WERE SELF APPOINTED—LIBEL ON THE COMPANY.**

The defendant published an article in which he stated that the directors of the plaintiffs' company were self-appointed men. Upon this the company brought an action of libel, charging that the innuendo was that by such unlawful, illegal, and irregular appointing, the directors were unable to transact the business of the company.

*Held*, affirming the decision of Rose, J., that this was a libel on the company. *Owen Sound Building and Savings Society v. Meir*, Ontario, Chy. Div. 1893.

"MANAGER IN TRUST"—See Shares.

MANDAMUS.—See Intox. Liq.—Mun. Corp. 4.

MARRIED WOMAN.—See Bills and Notes 4.

**MASTER AND SERVANT.****1. COMPENSATION FOR INJURY—CONTRACT BY WORKMAN NOT TO RECOVER COMPENSATION AT COMMON LAW OR UNDER EMPLOYERS LIABILITY ACT 1880 (43 AND 44 VICT. C. 42).**

A company of contractors effected an insurance against accidents for their workmen, the premium being paid partly by sums deducted weekly or fortnightly from the workmen's wages, and partly by a contribution from the contractors themselves. On the pay-box and in other places about the works printed posters, headed in large type, "Notice to Workmen—Accident Insurance," were posted up. These posters set forth—(1) that the contractors had effected an accident insurance for the benefit of their workmen; (2) that contributions on a certain scale would be deducted from their wages; (3) that certain benefits would be derived from the insurance, one of which was, that if injury should be sustained from an accident to the workman during the course of his employment, and should not prove

fatal, compensation would be paid to him weekly at a certain rate, and for a certain period; and (4) that the workman's acceptance of the benefits thereby provided for should be equivalent to a discharge of all claims against the employer at common law or under the Employers Liability Act 1880.

A workman who had been nine or ten months in the employment of the contractors, and from whose wages a deduction had been made as a contribution to the Accident Insurance Fund, was injured by an accident while in the employment of the contractors, and thereafter accepted a weekly allowance in terms of the insurance scheme.

*Held*, that he had thereby discharged all claims against his employers at common law and under the Employers Liability Act 1880. *Wright v. Howard Baker & Co.*, 31 Scot. Law Rep. 27.

## 2. DISOBEDIENCE—DISMISSAL.

Circumstances in which *held* that a farmer was within his legal rights in ordering his servants to work during the night on the ground of emergency, but was equitably barred from founding on the servants' refusal to obey the order as an act of disobedience justifying their dismissal. *Greig, &c., v. Moir*, 9 Scottish Law Review, Sheriff Court Reports, 341.

## MERCANTILE AGENCIES.

### LIABILITY TO SUBSCRIBERS FOR FALSE REPRESENTATIONS.

By the contract between the defendants who conducted the business of a mercantile agency, and the plaintiff, it was agreed that the defendants, at the request of the plaintiff, as an aid to it in determining the propriety of giving credit, should communicate to the plaintiff such information as they might possess concerning the mercantile credit of merchants, etc.; that such information should be obtained and communicated by sub-agents appointed in behalf of the plaintiff by the defendants; that the defendants should not be responsible for any loss caused by the neglect of any sub-agent, and that the defendants in no manner

guaranteed the actual verity or correctness of any such information.

In consequence of a request for such information concerning Kitts of Oswego, a report concerning him was made up by Burchard, the defendants' agent at that place, and was by him sent to the defendants, and by them to the plaintiff. Burchard and Kitts were connected in business, and for the purpose of promoting his own interests, Burchard made false statements in that report. The plaintiff, relying on the report, discounted the acceptances of Kitts, which were valueless.

*Held*, that the defendants were not liable for the loss; that in transmitting the information which they had obtained they completely fulfilled the terms of their contract with the plaintiff; that the accuracy of the information so obtained was at the risk of the plaintiff; that in making the report, Burchard was not acting within the scope of his authority as agent of the defendants; that he was not employed as the agent of either party in reference to the discounts which he caused to be effected; that he was merely an agent under the agreement of subscription to furnish information; that the defendants were agents of the plaintiff, and as it appeared from the agreement that the service required could not be rendered by the agent, but must mainly be rendered by sub-agents, the defendants were not liable for the errors or misconduct of the sub-agent, if they had used due care in his selection. *City National Bank of Birmingham, Alabama v. Dun*, United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, October, 1893, 48 Alb. L. J. 371.

## MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS

—SEE ALSO INTOX. LIQ.—TAXATION 1.

### 1. IMPROVEMENTS—ASSESSMENT.

Special assessment for a local improvement is void where a portion of the property benefited is arbitrarily and intentionally omitted from the assessment, and that, too, though the property assessed is benefited the amount it is assessed. *Masters v. City of Portland*, Supreme Ct. of Oregon, 33 Pac. Rep. 540.

## 2. TOWNSITES—PUBLIC SQUARES—DEDICATION.

A county owning land platted it as a town site, located a town thereon, and recorded the plat, which in the center showed a tract marked "Public Square." This was surrounded by streets. Outside of it were blocks subdivided into lots. When the lots were sold, the county reserved two, facing the public square, on which it built its Court House. For fifty years the county has asserted no right to the use or occupancy of the square, but it has been used as public grounds in a city ordinarily are used.

*Held*, that it was the intention to dedicate the square to the town for park purposes, and that it was so accepted by the town, and that, whether or not the legal title was in the county, assessments against the square for paving the street around it were payable by the city, and not the county. *Young v. City of Oscaloosa, Iowa, 56 N.W. Rep. 177.*

## 3. FIREWORKS DISPLAY—NUISANCE.

A large display of fireworks, including heavily-charged explosives, held at the junction of two narrow and completely built streets of a large city, and managed by private persons under no official responsibility, is an unreasonable and dangerous use of the streets, and a public nuisance. 19 N Y. Supp. 665, affirmed.

While a display of fireworks in a city street may be in fact a nuisance, the city cannot relieve itself of liability for damages caused by such a display, licensed by the mayor or under the authority of an ordinance, on the ground that the ordinance is *ultra vires*, since the council, admittedly, has regulating powers in the premises. *Speir v. City of Brooklyn, New York, Court of Appeals, October 3, 1893.*

## 4. ONTARIO MUNICIPAL ACT OF 1887 (R. S. O. C. 184)—CONSTRUCTION—DAMAGES FOR NON-FEASANCE—MANDAMUS—NOTICE IN WRITING—REMEDY BY ARBITRATION.

Under the Ontario Municipal Act of 1887 (R. S. O. c. 184) an action for damages lies against a municipality at the suit of any person who can shew

that he has sustained injury from the non-performance of the statutory duty of maintaining and repairing its drainage works.

*Held*, that sect. 583, sub-sect. 2, applies to a case which falls within sect. 586, and, while prescribing a notice in writing as a condition precedent to a mandamus, does not on its true construction preclude an action for damages without such notice.

In an action brought without notice in writing against a municipality for damages for injury caused to the plaintiffs' lands and for a mandamus to prevent a recurrence of the injury.

*Held*, that so far as such injury was occasioned by the municipal drain and embankment being out of repair, or from their not being kept in such a state as to carry off in relief of plaintiffs' land all the water which the drain was capable of carrying off as originally constructed, the action was maintainable.

*Held*, further, that so far as the injury was occasioned by the negligent construction by the municipality under its statutory powers of another drain the action must be dismissed. The remedy in such case (see sect. 591) was by arbitration as directed by the statute. *Corporation of Raleigh v. Williams, [1893] App. Cas. 540.*

## 5. NEGLIGENCE—ACCIDENT—OBSTRUCTION ON STREET—ACTION CLAIMING DAMAGES—CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE.

The defendant corporation was engaged in laying water pipes on one of the streets of the town, and caused excavations to be made for that purpose. The plaintiff, while on her way home on a dark and stormy night, fell into one of these excavations, which the defendants were charged with having negligently left open and unguarded, and was severely injured.

In an action claiming damages for the injuries sustained, the jury found all questions submitted in favour of the plaintiff except the question whether on the night in question the plaintiff, by taking reasonable precautions could have avoided the mischief, which was found in favour of the defendants

There was no evidence that the plaintiff knew of the particular excavation into which she fell, but she had general knowledge that men were engaged in digging trenches in the street. Her evidence on this point was: "They were excavating so often in putting down water pipes that I did not remember."

On a motion on behalf of the plaintiff to set aside the finding in question and the judgment for the defendants entered thereon the Court was equally divided in opinion. *Fraser v. The Town of New Glasgow*. Supreme Court, Nova Scotia, 1893.

6. ONTARIO MUNICIPAL ACT — CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES — LIABILITY FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE — WIDTH OF STREAM — R. S. O. (1887) CH. 184, s. 532, 534 — ONTARIO.

By the Ontario Municipal Act, R. S. O. (1887) p. 184, sec. 532, the council of any county has "exclusive jurisdiction over all bridges crossing streams or rivers over one hundred feet in width within the limits of any incorporated village in the county and connecting any main highway leading through the county," and by sec. 534 the county council is obliged to erect and maintain bridges on rivers and streams of said width. On rivers or streams of one hundred feet or less in width bridges must be constructed and maintained by the respective villages through which they flow.

The river Nith flows through the village of New-Hamburg and in dry seasons when the water is low the width of the river is less than one hundred feet, but after heavy rains and freshets, it exceeds that width.

*Held*, reversing the decision of the Court of Appeal (20 Ont. App. R. 1) and of the Divisional Court (22 O. R. 193) that the width at the level attained after heavy rains and freshets in each year should be considered in determining the liability under the act to construct and maintain a bridge over the river; the width at ordinary high water mark is not the test of such liability. Appeal allowed with costs. *Village of New Hamburg v. County of Waterloo*. Supreme Court of Canada. 24 June 1893.

NEGLIGENCE—SEE ALSO MUN. CORP. 5. — 3. — CARRIERS 3.—JURY TRIAL 1.

1. PROXIMATE CAUSE — DANGER VOLUNTARILY INCURRED — ONTARIO.

C. having driven his horses into a lumber yard adjoining a street on which blasting operations were being carried on, left them in charge of the owner of another team, while he interviewed the proprietor of the yard. Shortly after a blast went off, and stones thrown by the explosion fell on the roof of a shed in which C. was standing and frightened the horses, which began to run. C. at once ran out in front of them and endeavoured to stop them, but could not, and in trying to get away he was injured. He brought an action against the municipality conducting the blasting operations to recover damages for such injury.

*Held*, affirming the decision of the Court of Appeal (20 Ont. App. R. 49), Gwynne, J. dissenting, that the negligent manner in which the blast was set off was the proximate and direct cause of the injury to C.; that such negligent act immediately produced in him the state of mind which instinctively impelled him to attempt to stop the horses; and that he did no more than any reasonable man would have done under the circumstances. Appeal dismissed with costs. *Town of Prescott v. Connell*, Supreme Court of Canada, 24 June 1893.

2. HIGHWAY—HORSE.

It is not negligence *per se* for the driver of a horse of a quiet disposition standing in the street to let the reins go while he alights from the vehicle to fasten a head weight, there being at the time little traffic and no noise or disturbance to frighten the animal; and the owner of the horse is not responsible for damages caused by the horse in running away when frightened by a sudden noise just after the driver has alighted.

Judgment of the Court below reversed. *Sullivan v. McWilliam*, Ont. Court of Appeal, October 1893 (Can. L. T.).

**3. PASSENGER VESSEL — USE OF WHARF — INVITATION TO PUBLIC—ACCIDENT IN USING WHARF—PROXIMATE CAUSE—EXCESSIVE DAMAGES—NOVA SCOTIA.**

A company owning a steambot making weekly trips between Boston and Halifax occupied a wharf in the latter city leased to their agent. For the purpose of getting to and from the steamer there was a plank sidewalk on one side part way down the wharf and persons using it usually turned at the end and passed to the middle of the wharf. Y. and his wife went to meet a passenger expected to arrive by the steamer between seven and eight o'clock one evening in November. They went down the plank sidewalk and instead of turning off at the end, there being no lights and the night being dark, they continued straight down the wharf, which narrowed after some distance and formed a jog, on reaching which Y's wife tripped and as her husband tried to catch her they both fell into the water. Forty-four days afterwards, Mrs. Y. died.

In an action by Y. against the company to recover damages occasioned by the death of his wife, it appeared that the deceased had not had regular and continual medical treatment after the accident, and the doctors who gave evidence at the trial differed as to whether or not the immersion was the proximate cause of her death. The jury when asked:—Would the deceased have recovered, notwithstanding the accident, if she had had regular attendance? replied, "very doubtful." A verdict was found for the plaintiff with \$1,500 damages, which the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia set aside and ordered a new trial. On appeal from that decision:

*Held*, that Y. and his wife were lawfully upon the wharf at the time of the accident; that in view of the established practice they had a right to assume that they were invited by the company to go on the wharf and assist their friends in disembarking from the steamer; and that they had a right to expect that the means of approach to the steamer were safe for persons using ordinary care, and the company

was under an obligation to see that they were safe.

*Held*, further, that it having been proved that the wharf was only rented to the agent because the landlord preferred to deal with him personally, and that it was rented for the use of the company whose officers had sole control of it, the company was in possession of it at the time of the accident.

*Held*, also, that the evidence and finding of the jury having left it in doubt that the accident was the proximate cause of Mrs. Y's death, the jury not having been properly instructed as to the liability of the company under the circumstances, and the damages being excessive under the evidence, the order for a new trial should be affirmed. Appeal dismissed with cost. *York v. Canada Atlantic Steamship Co.*, Supreme Ct. of Canada, June 24, 1893.

**NEW TRIAL**—See Jury Trial.

**NUISANCE**—See Mun. Corp. (Fireworks) 3.

**ONTARIO MUN. ACT**—See Mun. Corp. 4 — 6.

**PARTNERSHIP** — SEE ALSO INSOLVENCY — RAILWAY COMP.

**SETTLEMENTS — IMPEACHMENT.**

A partner who has knowledge of entries in the partnership books by his copartner, charging him with items for which he is not liable, is guilty of laches in settling up the partnership business on the showing made by the books, without examining them to see they have been corrected to conform to his contention, and he cannot thereafter impeach the settlement on the ground that the books were not correct. *Kneeland v. McLachlen*, Tex., 23 S.W. Rep. 309.

**PIPES OF WATER COMPANY** — See Taxation 3.

**PLEADING**—See Bills and Notes 3.

**PRINCIPAL AND AGENT.**

**EXCESS OF AUTHORITY—LIABILITY OF PRINCIPAL—MORTGAGE—AUTHORITY TO PLEDGE TITLE-DEEDS FOR A**

**PARTICULAR SUM—FORGED DEEDS—REDEMPTION.**

The owner of land deposited the title-deeds with the U. Bank to secure an advance of £750. Being desirous of obtaining a further advance of £1500, he authorized his son to borrow £2200 from another bank and gave him a written authority to receive the deeds from the U. Bank on payment of the sum due to them. The son fraudulently pledged the deeds to a different bank from that which had been proposed for a much larger advance than he was authorized to borrow, forging his father's name to a promissory note and deposit note. Out of this advance he paid £750 to the U. Bank, and £1500 to his father, and kept the rest for his own use. The son afterwards induced the defendants to advance him a still larger sum, out of which the advance by the bank was paid off, and the land was conveyed to the defendants by forged deeds by way of mortgage for securing the advances. The defendants had no notice of the fraud, and the dealings with the property were kept secret from the father. Subsequently the son absconded, and the facts then became known to the father. He brought an action against the defendants claiming to redeem the property on payment of the sum of £2200 which he had authorized his son to borrow.

*Held*, (affirming the decision of Wright, J.), that the plaintiff, having placed the deeds in the control of his son, could not redeem the property without paying the whole amount which his son had raised upon them; although the son had exceeded his authority in raising more than he was instructed to raise, and had effected his purpose by forgery. *Brocklesby v. Temperance Permanent Building Society*, C. A. [1893] 3 Ch. 130.

PRIVY COUNCIL—See Appeals.

PROMISSORY NOTE—See Bills and Notes 1—2—4.

**RAILWAY COMPANIES—SEE ALSO CARRIERS 1—2—3—TAXATION 2.**

LEASE OR PARTNERSHIP.

A contract by which a number of

railroad companies "lease" their roads and other property to one company for 99 years, the latter company agreeing to operate and maintain the lines and pay to each of the other companies a certain proportion of 93 per cent. of the net profits from such operation, is a contract of partnership and not a lease. *Galveston, H. & A. S. Ry. Co. v. Davis*, Tex., 23 S.W. Rep. 301.

**SALE.**

**OF DEALS—CONTRACT—BREACH OF—DELIVERY—ACCEPTANCE—QUALITY—WARRANTY AS TO—DAMAGES—ARTS. 1073, 1473, 1507 C. C.—QUEBEC.**

In a contract for the purchase of deals from A. by S. *et al*, merchants in London, it was stipulated *inter alia*, as follows:—"Quality—Sellers guarantee quality to be equal to the usual Etchemin Stock and to be marked with the Beaver Brand," and the mode of delivery was f.o.b. vessels at Quebec, and payment by drafts payable in London 120 days sight from date of shipment. The deals were shipped at Quebec on board vessels owned by P. & Bros. at the request of P. & P. intending purchasers of the deals. When the deals arrived in London they were inspected by S. *et al*, and found to be of inferior quality, and S. *et al*, after protesting A. sold them at reduced rates. In an action of damages for breach of contract.

*Held*, reversing the judgment of the Court below, that the delivery was to be at Quebec, subject to an acceptance in London, and that the purchasers were entitled to recover under the express warranty as to quality, there being abundant evidence that the deals were not of the agreed quality. Arts. 1507, 1473, 1073 C. C. The Chief Justice and Sedgewick, J., dissenting. Appeal allowed with costs. *Stewart v. Atkinson*, Supreme Ct. of Canada, 24 June, 1893.

**SHARES—(SEE ALSO ESTOPPEL.**

**TRANSFER OF SHARES SUBJECT TO A TRUST—CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE—SIGNATURE OF BANK MANAGER AS "MANAGER IN TRUST."**

Where the respondent had tran-



sferred shares as security for a loan, *held*, that the appellants, as derivative transferees from the lender, were not affected by a trust in favour of the respondent, unless such trust was clearly disclosed on the face of their author's title, or was otherwise notified to them.

The words "manager in trust," appended to the signature of a bank manager, import that he held and transferred the shares in trust for his employers, the bank, and are not calculated to suggest that he stood in a fiduciary relation to some third person, so as to affect a transferee for value with constructive notice of such relationship. *London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company v. Duggan*, [1893]. App. Cas. 506.

## SHIPS AND SHIPPING.

### 1. CHARTERPARTY—TIME FOR DISCHARGE OF CARGO—DESPATCH MONEY—SUNDAYS AND FÊTE DAYS EXCEPTED.

The plaintiffs' steamer was chartered by the defendants to carry a cargo of coals, "to be discharged at the rate of 200 tons per day weather permitting (Sundays and fête days excepted) according to the custom of the port of discharge and if sooner discharged to pay at the rate of 8s. 4d. per hour for every hour saved."

*Held*, that Sundays and fête days were excluded both in the computation of the time allowed for discharging, and in that of the time saved, so that despatch money, by way of set-off to a claim for freight, was only payable, by the plaintiffs to the defendants, on the difference between the number of hours actually occupied by the defendants in the discharge, and the total number of hours which the charterparty allowed them. *The Glendevon*, [1893], P. 269.

### 2. BILL OF LADING, CONSTRUCTION OF—DEVIATION CLAUSE—PRINTED WORDS—LIBERTY TO DEVIATE FROM SPECIFIED VOYAGE—EXTENT OF DEVIATION AUTHORISED.

Oranges were shipped on board a steamship under a bill of lading which stated that the ship was then "lying in the port of Malaga, and bound for

Liverpool, with liberty to proceed to and stay at any port or ports in any station in the Mediterranean, Levant, Black Sea, or Adriatic, or on the coasts of Africa, Spain, Portugal, France, Great Britain and Ireland, for the purpose of delivering coals, cargo, or passengers, or for any other purpose whatsoever." The bill of lading contained a clause whereby the shipper expressly agreed to all its stipulations whether written or printed. The deviation clause was printed with the name of the port of shipment left blank and filled up in writing.

The ship left Malaga for a port on the east coast of Spain and out of her course for Liverpool, then returned and made for Liverpool, where the oranges were delivered in a damaged condition owing to the delay. In an action by the shipper against the shipowner for damages for breach of contract:—

*Held*, affirming the decision of the Court of Appeal ([1892] 1 Q. B. 337), that the printed clause must not be construed so as to defeat the main object and intent of the contract, which was to carry the oranges from Malaga to Liverpool; that the liberty must be restricted to ports which were in the course of the voyage; that the deviation in question was therefore not justified, and that the shipowner was liable. *Glynn v. Margetson & Co.* H. L. (E.) [1893] App. Cas., 351.

### 3. CHARTERPARTY—RESTRAINTS OF PRINCES AND RULERS—DEMURRAGE—CUSTOMARY MODE OF LOADING.

The defendants chartered the plaintiffs' vessel to load a cargo of 3000 tons of nitrate at Iquique in Chili at the rate of 200 tons per working lay day, to be reckoned from the day the vessel was ready to receive cargo to the day of her dispatch, "restraints of princes and rulers, political disturbances or impediments.....during the said voyage always mutually excepted." There was at Iquique only storage room for a small quantity of nitrate, and the customary mode of loading there was to send the nitrate by rail from the mines direct to the ship's side as required for loading.—The vessel arrived at Iquique on January 29: but at that

time a civil war had broken out in Chili, and by reason of the existence of a state of war in the town itself it was impossible up to March 5 to load any nitrate from the port. After that date it was possible to load from the port; but in consequence of the railway from the mines to Iquique being in the hands of the troops, no nitrate from the mines could reach Iquique until March 23, on which day the loading commenced, and finished on April 4. The vessel sailed on April 8. She was then short of coal, and it being very dear at Iquique she put in to another Chilian port for it. She was there detained for ten days in consequence of her refusal to pay over again to the Chilian government in power at that port the export duties which she had already paid to the government in power at Iquique. An action having been brought by the plaintiffs for demurrage.

*Held*, that the delay in both cases fell within the exception in the charter-party. *Smith & Service v. Rosario Nitrate Company*, [1893] 2 Q. B. 323.

### STREET RAILWAY.

STREET RAILWAY — CANADIAN ACT 24 V., c. 83—ONTARIO ACT 53 V., c. 105—CONSTRUCTION.

Where by Act of the legislature the appellant company was authorized to construct a railway upon and for that purpose to use the streets of a city and its adjoining municipalities, which by the same Act were authorized to grant an exclusive privilege for that purpose upon such conditions and for such period as might be agreed upon; and thereafter, by certain resolutions, agreement, and by law such privilege was limited to thirty years, at the expiration of which the corporation of the city might assume the ownership.

*Held*, that the Act could not be construed as granting a perpetual privilege to use the streets for the purpose of the railway, but that the privilege thereby granted was limited to thirty years by the agreement and by-law. That limit of time applied, not merely to the original railway, but to the various extensions thereof authorized in pursuance of the same pri-

vilage. *Toronto Street Ry. Co. v. Corporation of the City of Toronto*, [1893] App. Cas. 511.

SUMMARY CONVICTION—See Justice of the Peace.

SUNDAYS—See Ships, etc. 1

### TAXATION.

1. ONTARIO ASSESSMENT ACT, R. S. O., c. 193, SECTIONS 15, 65 — ILLEGAL ASSESSMENT — COURT OF REVISION — BAR — BUSINESS CARRIED ON IN TWO MUNICIPALITIES — PLACE OF BUSINESS — BRANCH — ONTARIO.

Section 65 of the Ontario Assessment Act, R. S. O., c. 193, does not enable the Court of Revision to make valid an assessment which the statute does not authorize.

Section 15 of the Act provides that "where any business is carried on by a person in a municipality in which he does not reside, or in two or more municipalities, the personal property belonging to such persons shall be assessed in the municipality in which such personal property is situated."

W., residing and doing business in Brantford, has certain merchandize in London stored in a public warehouse used by other persons as well as W. He kept no clerk or agent in charge of such merchandise, but when sales were made a delivery order was given upon which the warehouse keeper acted. Once a week a commercial traveller for W., residing in London, attended there to take orders for goods, including the kind so stored, but the sales of stock in the warehouse were not confined to transactions entered into at London.

*Held*, affirming the decision of the Court of Appeal, 19 A. R. 675, that W. did not carry on business in London within the meaning of the section, and his merchandize in the warehouse was not liable to be assessed at London. *Watt v. City of London*, Supreme Ct. of Canada, 24 June, 1893.

2. TAX ON RAILWAY — NOVA SCOTIA RAILWAY ACT—EXEMPTION — MINING COMPANY—CONSTRUCTION OF RAILWAY BY — R. S. N. S., 5TH SER., c. 53.

By R. S. N. S., 5th ser., c. 53, s. 9,

ss. 30, the road bed, etc., of all railway companies in the Province is exempt from local taxation. By s. 1, the first part of the Act, from ss. 5 to 33, inclusive, applies to every railway constructed and in operation or thereafter to be constructed under the authority of any Act of the legislature; and by s. 4, the second applies to all railways constructed or to be constructed under authority of any special Act, and to all companies incorporated for their construction and working. By s. 5, ss. 15, the expression "the company" in the Act means the company or party authorized by the special Act to construct the railway.

The International Coal and Railway company was incorporated by 27 V. c. 42 (N. S.), for the purpose of working coal mines in Cape Breton, and for the further purpose "of constructing and making such railroads and branch tracks as might be necessary for the transportation of coals from the mines to the place of shipment, and all other business necessary and usually performed on railroads," and with other powers connected with the working of mines "and operation on railways." Under these powers a railway twelve miles in length was built and used to carry coal from Bridgeport to Sydney Harbour, and the company having become involved, its property, including the railway, was sold at a sheriff's sale, and the purchasers conveyed the same to the International Coal Company.

By 48 & 49 V. c. 29 (D.) it was enacted that the International Coal Company might hold and work their railway for the purposes of their own mines and operations, and might hold and exercise such powers of working the railway for the transport of passengers and freight generally for others for hire as might be conferred on the company by the legislature of Nova Scotia, and by 49 V. c. 145, s. 1 (N.S.), the company were authorized to hold and work the railway "for general traffic and the conveyance of passengers and freight for hire, as well as for all purposes and operations connected with said mines," in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the

second part of R. S. N. S., 5th ser., c. 53, entitled "of railways."

The municipality of Cape Breton having assessed the company for local taxes in respect of the railway:—

*Held*, reversing the decision of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, Gwynne, J., dissenting, that the company were exempt from such taxation; that the railway was one constructed under authority of an Act of the legislature of Nova Scotia, 27 V. c. 42, and in operation under the authority of another Act, 49 V. c. 145; that the company was a "railway company" with the meaning of s. 9, ss. 30 of c. 53; that the first part of that chapter applies to railways constructed under any Act of the legislature and not only under Acts exclusive of those to which the second part applies; and that the reference in 49 V. c. 145, s. 1, to the second part does not prevent said railway from coming under the operation of the first part of the Act. *International Coal Co. v. County of Cape Breton*. Supreme Court of Canada, 24 June 1893.

### 3. TAXATION — REALTY — PIPES OF WATER COMPANY.

The water pipes, hydrants, and conduits of a water company, laid to the streets of a city or town, are taxable as real estate to the company in possession of them, under our statute, in the city or town where they are laid. *Inhabitants of Paris v. Norway Water Co.* Supreme Judicial Court of Maine, February 25, 1893. 37 Cent. L. J., 309.

HASKELL, J.: Debt for a tax laid upon defendant's aqueducts, conduits, pipes, and hydrants, as real estate, within the town of Paris. These appliances are used to distribute water among the citizens of Paris, supplied by a pumping station and reservoir in Norway, where the defendant corporation has its place of business. By charter (Acts 1885, ch. 369; Acts 1887, ch. 46.) the defendant is authorized to supply the inhabitants of Paris and Norway with water, and to lay pipes necessary for the purpose through the streets of both towns. The charter does not locate the corporation in either town.

Taxes on real estate are to be assessed "in the town where the estate lies, to the owner or person in possession thereof" (Rev. St. ch. 6, § 9); and real estate, for the purposes of taxation, includes "all lands . . . and all buildings erected on or affixed to the same," (*Id.* § 3); and the words "lands" includes "all tenements and hereditaments

connected therewith and all rights thereto and interests therein" (*Id.* ch. 1, § 6, rule 10.)

Under these provisions, a boom across the Kennebec river, fastened to permanent piers in the river and to the shores by chains, was held to be real estate, for the purposes of taxation. *Hall v. Benton*, 60, Me. 346. So was that part within the State of a toll bridge across a river that marks the boundary line. *Kittery v. Portsmouth Bridge*, 78 Me. 93, 2 Atl. Rep. 847. Water pipes were assessed in *solido* with personal property in *Rockland v. Water Co.*, 82 Me. 188, 19 Atl. Rep. 163, and in a suit for the tax it was contended that they were real estate, and improperly included in an assessment with chattels; but the court, without deciding the question, held it immaterial, as the controversy was one of overvaluation, merely.

It will be seen from these authorities that the court gives very wide scope to the definition of "real estate," for the purposes of taxation, and it is best that it should be so. Subjects of public revenue should contribute to the public burdens so that they may lie as equally as possible among all the people; and, in these days, when capital accumulates in commercial centers, many times representing contrivances, local and permanent in character, that contribute an income, it is just that such source of profit pay its tax where its location may be.

Aqueducts above or under ground are but conditions suited for carrying water, undeffiled, through or over the soil. They are fixtures, permanent in character, and part of the land that sustains them. Size, capacity, and the material used in their construction, do not change their nature. They are a constituent part of the freehold, and, so long as they remain the property of the owner of the fee, their character as real estate will not be questioned. It is only when they are constructed and occupied by persons or companies having no title in the soil that their classification as property becomes doubtful; that is, the interest of such persons or companies in them becomes of doubtful classification, rather than their generic character, regardless of ownership. The owner of a fee may, by sale of some structure upon it, and by granting license for it to remain, as between himself and the vendee, make it a chattel, while as a whole, in a generic sense, it would be classified as real estate.

The proper classification, under the rules of the common law, of this species of property, is not a new question. It has been many times considered in England during the last century; and water mains and underground conduits have there been considered as fixed to, included in, and a part of the soil. They have been considered real estate, and have uniformly been held locally taxable as such to the "occupiers of lands," under the statute of 43 Eliz., or, as our statute puts it, "to the person in possession thereof." *King v. Mayor*, etc., of Bath, 14 East, 610; *King v. Waterworks*, 1 Maule & S. 634; *King v. Gaslight & Coke Co.*, 5 Barn. & C. 466.

Under the statute of 28 Geo. III., laying taxes upon the owners of "lands and hereditaments," the pipes of a water company in street were held to be not taxable as land

to the owners of them. Lord Campbell says: "The right in question, where exercised, appears to us to be in the nature of an easement, and neither land nor hereditament. The right is to convey water through the land of another, and whether the water is to be conveyed upon the surface of the ground, or in covered drains, or in pipes, appears to us, for this purpose, to be immaterial. The mere power to lay the pipes in land cannot be considered land or hereditaments: nor do we think that the pipes, when laid, can be so considered, within the meaning of the land-tax acts. . . . The company are not the owners of the land where the pipes lie, nor are they the tenants of the land. . . . The moment the company take up their pipes which had been laid under the streets of any particular parish, all pretense for saying that they have or held land in the parish would be gone: but, after the pipes are removed, all the land in the parish would remain, and it would be had and be held as before. . . . But 'land,' like the word 'inhabitant,' which likewise occurs in 43 Eliz. ch. 2, has various meanings; and it may, in that statute, passed to throw a charge upon the occupier, mean the ground on which a chattel is deposited in the exercise of an easement, although, in other acts of parliament, it means a legal interest in the soil. This is the meaning which we think it bears in the land tax acts." *Waterworks v. Bowley*, 17 Q. B. 358.

The city of Providence laid a tax on the pipes of the gas company in the streets, as real estate, under a statute authorizing such a tax against those, "who hold or occupy the same," and it was held a valid tax, like those laid under the statute of Elizabeth. *Gas Co. v. Thurber*, 2 R. I. 15.

So a pipe line laid through the soil of New Jersey, under grants from the owners of the fee, is not only real estate, when considered as a part of the fee, but is held, for the purposes of taxation, to be real estate of the company owning it, under a statute defining "real estate" as including all lands, and all buildings or erections thereon or affixed thereto. *Pipe Line Co. v. Berry*, 52 N. J. Law, 308, 10 Atl. Rep. 665.

Gas mains and pipes are sometimes distinguished from the class of property now under consideration, as apparatus for the delivery of the manufactured article, and are considered machines or chattels. *Com. v. Gaslight Co.*, 12 Allen. 75; *Memphis Gaslight Co. v. State*, 6 Cold. 310. Water pipes, etc., are not machinery. *Dudley v. Aqueduct Corp.*, 100 Mass. 183.

The public has an easement in land, over which streets and roads are laid, coextensive with the necessities of public use. No title in the soil is acquired thereby, and when the ways are discontinued the easement is extinguished. Private corporations, like gas companies, water companies, and street railway companies, by legislative authority, are sometimes allowed the use of the public easement to serve the necessary demand of society, and without any additional compensation to the owner of the soil. Such companies therefore, by the public license accorded them, take no title

in the land. They are simply allowed to use it for the public convenience as a counterbalancing consideration for their expenditure, giving opportunities to gather tolls from its use. In using the street or road, they place their pipes or rails in or upon the ground, there permanently to remain. They occupy land with appliances that become valuable for what they yield. These appliances are fixed, permanent, used in connection with the soil that supports and sustains them. When considered as the property of the irrelative companies, they are not land, within the common law rule. But, when considered as if owned by the same person who has title to the soil they may properly enough be so considered. Suppose the street, with these appliances in it, bediscontinued, and they be abandoned, without removal, and pass to the owner of the soil, who should then lease them, in gross or singly, to tenants or persons desiring to operate them. Would they not be real estate, when considered with the property as a whole? Would they not pass by a deed of the land? Why, then, may they not properly enough be assessed as real estate, and to the person in possession of them? Their value as chattels would be nominal. Water pipes buried in the ground as chattels would be of little or no value. It is the use that gives them value, and that use is strictly of a fixture,—a permanent appliance. As bearing upon this view, see *Water Co. v. Lynn*, 147 Mass. 31, 16 N. E. Rep. 742; *City of Fall River v. Bristol*, 125 Mass. 567; *People v. Cassity*, 46 N. Y. 46.

In the last case cited, in considering the validity of a tax upon a street railway as land, under a statute very similar to ours, Folger, J., says: "The statute means, for its purpose, to make two general divisions of property,—one, all lands; another, all personal estates,—and then, to be more definite, it declares that by 'land' is meant the earth itself, and also all buildings and all other articles erected upon or affixed to the same. We do not think that, when buildings or other articles are erected upon or affixed to the earth, they are not, in the view of the statute, land, unless held and owned in connection with the ownership of a fee in the soil. We are of the opinion that the statute means such an interest in real estate as will protect the erection or affixing thereon, and the possession, of buildings and fixtures, which will bring those buildings and fixtures within the term 'land,' and hold them to assessment as the lands of whomsoever has that interest in the real estate, and owns and possesses the buildings and fixtures. The defendants are right, then, in considering the track of the railroads as land, and liable to assessment as such."

In our opinion, water mains, pipes, etc., may be considered real estate, and taxable, where they are located, to the person or company owning them. The idea that they may be considered appurtenances to the place of supply and taxable there is untenable. There is no principle upon which it can rest. *King v. Bath*, *supra*, and *King v. Gaslight & Coke Co.*, 5 Barn. & C. 466. See *Manufacturing Co. v. Newton*, 22 Pick.

22. The Iowa doctrine, that waterworks are real estate, and taxable as an entirety at the place of supply, is not supported by authority. *Oskaloosa Water Co. v. Board of Equalization (Iowa)*, 51 N. W. Rep. 18. Defendant defaulted.

(NOTE BY CENTRAL LAW JOURNAL).—Not long ago (35 Cent. L. J. 261), this Journal, called attention to the case of *The Badger Lumber Co. v. The Marion Water Supply Electric Light and Power Co.*, decided by the Supreme Court of Kansas, which among other things, decided that the poles, wires and lamps of an electric light plant, beginning at the power house and extending throughout the city are appurtenances to the power house within the mechanic's lien law of Kansas. The court below had awarded the plaintiff a personal judgment against the defendant for the amount claimed, but refused to enforce a lien upon the real estate and appurtenances of the defendant for the reason "that no part of the material for which plaintiff claims a lien was on the real estate of the defendant or attached thereto in any manner except by the wires stretched from the poles of the defendant's electric light machinery situated on the said estate. The Supreme Court reversed that ruling upon the ground that the poles and wires may be regarded as an appurtenant to the power house. Viewed in the light of the principal case, which seems to be supported by ample authority, the Kansas court in the above case though practically reaching a correct conclusion placed it upon the wrong ground, for a mechanic's lien upon the poles and wires would have been proper, not because they were appurtenant to, but because they were real estate. This view is suggested by a recent editorial on the subject in the *New York Law Journal* wherein after calling attention to the fact that at the time of the Kansas decision it expressed doubts as to the soundness of the principle laid down, says: "None of the materials furnished by the plaintiff was actually placed upon the defendant's real estate, but the poles in question were all used in the streets of the city. While recognizing the equitable purpose of the Supreme Court, it seemed to us that the theory of appurtenance had been strained beyond warrantable limits. Many of the cases in the books relate to such appurtenance as drain pipes. No matter how far from a building its drain pipe extends, such pipe is, nevertheless, originally a part of the building, and necessary for its use and enjoyment as a building; and the courts have very properly ruled liberally in enforcing mechanics' liens in cases of that class. See, for instance, *Beatty v. Barker* (141 Mass. 533). But the poles and wires of electric light companies and the pipes of water companies, and the tracks of cable road companies while their physical connection with the power house or pumping house is necessary for the operation of the entire plant, are still not parts or adjuncts of the building itself, but independent real estate interests, and independent portions of such plant. "The recent case of *Inhabitants of Paris v. Norway Water Co.*, in the Supreme Judicial Court of Maine. 27 Atl. Rep. 143, substantially sup-

ports this view." The Texas courts seem to have fallen into the same error, holding poles and wires in the street real estate because appertenant thereto. See *Hutchins v. Masterson*, 46 Tex. 534, and *Keating Implement & Machine Co. v. Marshall Electric Light & Power Co.*, 74 Tex. 605.

TELEGRAM—See Contracts 4.

TOWNSITE—See Mun. Corp. 2.

## TRADE MARKS.

### INFRINGEMENT — DECEPTION BY OWNER.

A trade-mark will not be protected if the owner has knowingly misrepresented the article to the public, and it is immaterial that the adverse party fails to allege such misrepresentations. The fact that in one year, eight years before bringing suit, and forty years after the business was established, complainant issued a circular misrepresenting the character of the article sold by him, will not prevent his obtaining relief against infringement of the trade-mark or trade-name borne by such article. The fact that complainant falsely stated on his packages that the trade-mark was registered November 11, 1843, will not deprive him of his right to protect from infringement, when he in fact on that date filed the name of the article as a book title under the copyright law, and since the public could not have been deceived by such statement, there being no provision for registering trade-marks at that early date. Innocent misrepresentations are not ground for refusing complainant relief. The words "Liver Medicine" being purely descriptive, cannot be appropriated as a trade-mark. The name "Simmons" cannot be appropriated as a trade-mark, when it has become merely descriptive of medicine prepared under the formula of a Dr. Sim-

mons, and is used by many people in connection with such medicines. Where it appears that defendant put on the market packages of medicine labeled "Dr. M. A. Simmons' Liver Medicine," in packages so substantially similar to those in which complainant's "Simmons' Liver Medicine," had been previously sold as to deceive the public, and that this was done with the purpose of selling it in place of complainant's medicine, the latter is entitled to an injunction to restrain the use of such labels and packages by defendant. The fact that defendant put his packages on the market a year before complainant filed his bill to restrain such competition does not deprive complainant of his right to an accounting. *C. P. Simmons Medicine Co. v. Mansfield Drug Co.*, Supreme Ct. of Tennessee, 23 S. W. Rep. 165.

TRUSTS—See Shares, Transfer of.

VENTIONI EXPONAS — See Judicial Sale.

VERDICT—See Jury Trial, 1.

WARRANTY—See Sale of Deals.

## WATER COMPANY.

WATER SUPPLY ACT, 1886, SS. 11, 23 — COMPENSATION — PAST AND FUTURE PROFITS — BARBADOES.

Where certain streams of water had been abstracted from the appellant's property by a water company acting under the Water Supply Act, 1886:—

*Held*, that the compensation due to the appellant included the value of his proprietary interest therein, and was not limited to the amount of pecuniary benefits obtained by past user thereof in disregard of possible benefits in the future. *Trent-Stoughton v. Barbados Water Supply Company, Limited*. [1893] App. Cas., 502.

## SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE, (IRELAND)

COURT OF APPEAL.—27 *Jr. Law Times Rep.* 125.MALLON *v.* G. S. & W. RY. CO.

July 19, 1893. — DOG BITE—CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE — REMOTENESS OF DAMAGE — EVIDENCE OF ACTIONABLE NEGLIGENCE — SCIENTER.

*The plaintiff passing along the platform of the defendants' railway station came into contact with a chain that he had not observed, and was immediately bitten by a dog. The dog was attached by the chain to a luggage barrow, which was being drawn by a porter in the employment of the defendants. The plaintiff brought an action against the defendants for negligence. The jury awarded £100 damages to the plaintiff. The Queen's Bench Division (GIBSON J., diss.), having set aside the verdict on the ground of there being no evidence of actionable negligence fit to be submitted to a jury. Held (reversing the Divisional Court) that there was evidence of actionable negligence fit to be submitted to a jury, and that the verdict for the plaintiff should stand :*

*Held, also that no question of scienter arose ; and that the damage was not remote. The court considering the damages excessive intimated that unless the plaintiff assented to the reduction of the damages from £100 to £50, there should be a new trial.*

The plaintiff arrived at Portarlington station on 1st July, 1892, in the evening, while there was full light. A dog was delivered at the station while the plaintiff was there. The dog was booked from Athlone to Kilkenny, and therefore it became necessary to put it

in a train proceeding to Kildare, so as to be there transferred to a train for Kilkenny. Cochrane, a porter in the employment of the defendant company, who had a number of duties to discharge, according to his own evidence, was on this day engaged conducting a barrow loaded with parcels, and at the same time he had charge of the dog, a terrier, on which there was a muzzle, a chain being attached to the muzzle ; the porter fastened the chain between the leg of the barrow and the iron support going from the shaft to the leg, the dog having thereby a range from the barrow of about two feet. With the barrow thus laden and the dog thus attached the porter proceeded along the platform, which platform was about 16 feet in width, the porter drawing the barrow. The platform was crowded with passengers. The plaintiff was going along the platform to buy a ticket ; he was moving quickly, being in a hurry ; he did not perceive the dog or the chain because of the crowd obscuring the view, and he tripped on the chain but did not fall. There was no evidence to show whether the plaintiff trod on the dog, but as soon as the plaintiff tripped he was bitten by the dog. It was not shown that the dog was vicious. At the trial

the counsel for the defendant company asked for a direction, stating that there was no evidence of negligence to go to the jury; also that the dog's biting was not a reasonable and natural consequence of the negligence, if there was any.

*R. Meredith, Q.C. (Phil. White with him), for the plaintiff.*

*Atkinson, Q.C. (Mathew Bourke, Q.C., with him), for the defendants.*

WALKER, C. — On the argument before us it was first contended that there was no evidence of negligence on the part of the defendant company. The duty of the defendants towards the plaintiff, a lawful passenger, was to keep the platform reasonably safe for him, and not to expose him to risks that he naturally could not anticipate. I cannot but think that the conveying of a dog along a platform, with a chain which became an obstacle, two feet in length, and in a manner that persons approaching could see neither the chain nor the dog, was some evidence of negligence. The defendants cannot find refuge in their having imposed on the porter so many duties. No doubt, if the plaintiff's conduct amounted to contributory negligence, directly causing the accident, the case should have been withdrawn from the jury. The use of the word "contributory" often causes difficulty. I cannot think that the plaintiff caused the injury by not seeing or expecting a dog on his path abnormally chained to a barrow. It has been said here that the damages were too remote. It was stated that there was no proof of knowledge that the dog was likely to bite—that is so; but I think the doctrine of *scienter* has no application to this case. Once it is shown that the defendant company by their negligence caused the plaintiff to trip over a chained dog, whether the animal be a dog, or a horse, or a cow,

if the animal be put into a position in which it may be made aggressive, the defendant, whose conduct so affects the disposition of the animal, is liable for the natural consequences of such change of disposition. This is illustrated in reference to one of these animals, a horse, in *Lee v. Riley* (18 C. B., N. S. 722). In this case I think the bite was not unreasonably the consequence of the act of negligence of the defendant company. The question of the damages has already been dealt with. It is only because we differ from the majority of the Judges in the court below that we have thought it necessary to state the reasons that have led us to a different conclusion; and that is, that there shall be a new trial if the plaintiff does not consent to take the verdict with the damages reduced to £50.

FITZGIBBON, L.J.—The first question is whether there is evidence to support the finding of the jury that the defendants are guilty of negligence, and the second, and only other question, is, whether the fact of the biting is too remote a consequence of the way in which the dog was being led to involve the defendants in any liability. These questions must be kept quite distinct. I can see no necessary evidence of negligence in the hurry of the plaintiff going for his ticket, nor any demonstrable negligence on his part because he fell over the chain. The negligence point being out of it, there is remaining the question of remoteness. There is no distinction between tripping over a chain with which the dog was being towed and tripping over the animal itself. It is conceivable that the dog could, in a canine sort of way, plead *son assault demesne*. The *scienter* does not apply to a case such as this, where a quiet dog, being irritated, snaps at and bites



the person taken to be the instrument of the irritation; no foresight on the part of the plaintiff would have prevented the biting. The verdict cannot be entered for the defendants, but we will give them a new trial, for which also they ask in the alternative, on the ground of excessive damages, unless the plaintiff consents to our reducing the amount from the £100 to £50.

BARRY, L.J.—This case has been tried and argued largely upon one question, and one only: whether there was evidence of negligence in the manner in which this interesting dog was towed, as FitzGibbon, L.J., has felicitously described it. I cannot agree with O'Brien, J., that it was quite as safe to carry the dog in that way as holding him directly by the chain. In the latter method obviously the porter would have more control over the acts of the animal, whereas he had no control over the dog by the mode of conducting him resorted to in the present instance. The porter had not the dog in view, nor could the dog see the porter. It has been contended for here that the plaintiff ought to have produced evidence of the unsafety of such a mode of leading a dog across a crowded station. When the case was at trial the absence of expert evidence on that subject was not pointed out. But it is most unreasonable to raise any such objection, as if the men on the jury could not be as good judges of that as anybody else. Another objection taken by O'Brien, J., was that this

was not directly owing to the negligence of the defendants, but to a combination of circumstances. That, however, is all subject to the question, was there negligence on the part of the company? O'Brien, J., asks is the company bound to have a special staff of porters for the purpose of taking dogs across the station? No such proposition has been put forward here. The only allusion to the insufficiency of the staff has been on the part of the defendant's own witnesses—this poor man, the porter, in order to exonerate himself, has enumerated his various functions. If a company maintain a staff that happens on some occasions to be insufficient, they must do so at their own risk. The judgment delivered by Andrews, J., shows that he hesitated greatly. I think it is sufficiently proved that in this case there was a question to go to the jury, for while Holmes, J., and O'Brien, J., thought that it was a good way to carry a dog across the station, Gibson, J., was of opinion, as we three here are, that it was a bad method. There is no question of *scienter* here, for that only arises where the biting is of a voluntary character, and unprovoked. A clearer case for asking a jury their opinion rarely has come into a Court. There is no principle involved in the case. We say to the defendants take a verdict against you for £50, or a new trial.

Solicitor for the plaintiff: J. J. O'Hara.

Solicitor for the company: C. Barrington.

CONTRACTS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE.

MELVIN L. GREENFIELD, Respondent, v. GEORGE W. GILMAN et al., as Executors, etc., Appellants.

New York Court of Appeal, Nov. 28, 1893, 140 N. Y. 168.

While contracts between vendor and vendee in restraint of trade will be upheld, they are not to be treated with special indulgence. They are intended to secure to the purchaser of the good will of a trade or business a guaranty against competition by the vendor. When this object is accomplished, in the absence of any further precise and clear stipulation, it will not be presumed that more was intended.

G., defendant's testator, and plaintiff, who were practicing physicians and surgeons, in 1884 entered into a co-partnership agreement for the practice of their profession for one year, at the expiration of which G. agreed to execute to plaintiff an agreement and guarantee that he would not thereafter practice medicine or surgery in the village of D., their place of business, or within five miles thereof. At the expiration of the year G. executed the agreement called for, by which he covenanted not to practice said professions within either of two towns in which said village is situated. The contract provided that "to practice medicine and surgery, as above mentioned shall be construed to mean to prescribe for, to compound medicine for, advise or visit any person sick or disabled." G. thereafter became a member of a firm which engaged in the business of selling drugs, books, etc., in another village in one of said towns, two miles distant from D., and he continued in that business until 1889. In an action to recover a

sum fixed in said contract as liquidated damages for its violation, it appeared that defendant purchased drugs at the store of the firm, and made no objection to the conducting of the business by G. The only acts proved claimed to be violative of the agreement were that G. on one occasion attended as counsel with other physicians upon a person in extremis, for which he made no charge, but received and accepted a small fee. In eight other cases he furnished persons calling at his store medicines kept in stock suitable for their respective ailments. No charge was made for medical advice, only the medicines being paid for. Held, that a violation of the contract was not established; that it prohibited the practice of the profession by G., not the doing of isolated acts such as were proven; that the definition of what should constitute such practice did not enlarge the meaning of that term, but was designed simply as a specification of the acts which, if systematically, habitually or frequently done, would be a breach of the agreement.

MAYNARD, J.—The plaintiff has recovered in this action for an alleged breach of a covenant with defendants' testator not to practice medicine or surgery within a prescribed territory for a period of five years. For convenient description the defendants' testator will be referred to as the defendant. The contracting parties were physicians and surgeons at Durhamville, Oneida county. The defendant had been practicing medicine at that place for ten or twelve years, and the plaintiff had but recently moved there, when, on April 11th, 1884, they entered into an agreement by the terms of

which they were to practice medicine and surgery as co-partners for the term of one year, at the expiration of which the contract provided that the defendant would execute to the plaintiff a valid written agreement and guarantee that thereafter he would not practice medicine or surgery in Durhamville, or within a radius of five miles thereof, or if he did he would forfeit and pay to the plaintiff a sum double the consideration named in the agreement with an amount double the fees usually charged in such cases. The special consideration of the agreement so to be executed was the sum of \$500 then paid by the plaintiff; and it was stipulated that in case of failure to execute such agreement the defendant should forfeit and pay to the plaintiff the sum of \$1,500 as liquidated damages agreed on by the parties. At the expiration of the year the further agreement was made by the defendant in which he covenanted that he would not practice medicine and surgery for five years either in the town of Verona, Oneida county, or the town of Lenox, Madison county, in which towns the village of Durhamville is situated. The agreement then contained the following provision: "*Second.* It is mutually agreed by and between the parties hereto that to practice medicine and surgery as above mentioned shall be construed to mean to prescribe for, to compound medicine for, advise or visit any person sick or disabled, or to perform any act or service which the laws of the state of New York at present require to be done by a person legally qualified to practice medicine and surgery."

The agreement further provided that owing to the impossibility of obtaining sufficient evidence on which to base the measure of damages for a violation of it, the defendant should forfeit and

pay to the plaintiff the sum of \$1,000 which was not to be regarded as a penalty for such violation, but as a measure of liquidated damages agreed on by the parties.

After the execution of this agreement the defendant remained at Durhamville for nearly a year, but did not practice his profession, and no claim is made for any breach of the agreement during that time. He then removed to the village of Oneida in the town of Lenox and two miles distant from Durhamville, and entered into a partnership there with another in the business of selling drugs, books, stationery, law blanks, wall paper, pictures and picture frames and artists' materials, in which he was engaged until 1899, when he retired from the business, and died in July of that year. The plaintiff purchased drugs at the store, and it is not shown that he made any objection to the conduct of the business by the defendant. After the latter's death the plaintiff presented a claim against his estate to the executors of his will for the sum of \$1,500 damages for the breach of the defendant's covenant not to practice medicine and surgery, and upon the rejection brought this action. During the four years and over which intervened between the execution of the agreement and the death of the defendant only nine different acts were proven which it is insisted constituted the breach complained of and made his estate a debtor to the plaintiff in the sum of \$1,500. The first of these occurred in April, 1885, when he attended as counsel with other physicians upon a person *extremis* for which he made no charge but was paid and accepted a small fee. This was the only professional business proven. In all the other cases persons prescribed for came to the

drug store and were furnished with medicines suitable for their respective ailments. Some of these medicines were what are known as patented remedies and such as are kept in stock and for sale at all drug stores. No charge was made for medical advice; only the medicines were paid for; and the aggregate of all was less than \$10. It is not contended by the plaintiff that this proof is sufficient to establish the fact that the defendant was engaged in the practice of medicine and surgery within the prohibited period or radius according to either the popular or legal signification of these terms, but it is insisted that the parties have by their agreement, defined what shall constitute such practice, and that the performance by the defendant of a single act, such as that described in the second paragraph of the article above quoted, rendered him liable for the full amount of damages recoverable for a breach of its conditions. Undoubtedly the parties might so stipulate and they would be bound by their contract and the courts could not refuse to enforce it; but before such a meaning should be given to an agreement of this kind it should appear, upon a fair and reasonable interpretation of its provisions, in the light of the circumstances under which it was made and of the evident intent and object of its execution, that no other inference is justly permissible. While the law, to a certain extent, tolerates contracts in restraint of trade or business when made between vendor and purchaser and will uphold them, they are not treated with special indulgence. If they are intended to secure to the purchaser of the good will of a trade business a guaranty against the competition of the former proprietor. When this object is accomplished it

will not be presumed that more was intended. Construing this agreement in accordance with its obvious purpose, we think the definition in paragraph two of the acts, which shall be construed to constitute the practice of medicine and surgery did not enlarge or restrict the meaning of that term, but was regarded by the parties as a specification of the things which, if systematically, or habitually, or frequently done, would be a breach of the agreement. If the plaintiff's contention prevails it would follow that the visitation of a single patient and as an act of charity would render the defendant liable for the full penalty of the contract. Even the filling of a physician's prescription would be a breach, if this literal and technical construction is to be adopted, for it would be a compounding of medicine for a sick person and thus within the description of the prohibited acts. It was evidently the purpose of the second paragraph of the agreement to explain and illustrate the meaning of the generic terms employed in the first paragraph and not to subvert or destroy their ordinary signification. Effect should be given to both paragraphs, otherwise the first was superfluous. A covenant not to do any act described in the second would have been sufficient.

The agreement should also be read in the light of the previous one by which the defendant had bound himself to execute it, and which specifically described the terms of the obligation he was to assume and which supplied the consideration for it. That required a guaranty not to practice medicine and surgery and nothing more. There was no hint or suggestion of a covenant which would render the defendant liable for an isolated act which would not in law be deemed to constitute the practice of medicine. Unless

the language employed in the later agreement imports an irreconcilable variance it will be presumed that the executed covenant was not intended to have a different meaning or a wider scope from that required by the terms of the agreement which compelled its execution.

It was not necessary to wait until the expiration of the five years named in the contract before asserting a claim to the liquidated damages. If the respondent's position is tenable the making of a single professional visit, or the giving of medical advice in a single case constituted a breach of the entire covenant, and rendered the defendant liable for the full sum stipulated. No more could be recovered if the defendant made daily calls upon the sick, and administered professional treatment to all who applied for relief. Neither reason nor justice favors such a view of the rights of the parties under this contract.

The defendant was not restrained by his covenant from engaging in the business of a druggist. At the present day the occupation of a pharmacist and that of a physician are essentially distinct. An agreement not to engage in the one does not preclude the party from engaging in the other, so long as the one is not used as a cover for the operations of the other. There is no sufficient evidence in the record to support the conclusion that the defendant made use of his business as a druggist for the fraudulent purpose of escaping liability for a violation of his covenant. The business was conducted in the usual manner, and the plaintiff suffered no damage on that account.

The judgment must be reversed and a new trial granted, with costs to abide the event. All concur. Judgment reversed.

---

## HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

---

### CHANCERY DIVISION.

---

SMITH *v.* HANCOCK — *November 22, 23.*

RESTRAINT OF TRADE—AGREEMENT NOT TO "CARRY ON OR BE IN ANYWISE INTERESTED IN" BUSINESS—BREACH OF AGREEMENT—BUSINESS CARRIED ON BY WIFE OF DEFENDANT TRADING SEPARATELY.

In 1886 the defendant, who had been carrying on the business of a grocer at K. under his name of T. P. H., sold the business to the plaintiff, and entered into an agreement not to "carry on or be in anywise interested

in" any similar business. In 1893 the wife of the defendant, desiring (against his wishes) to start a nephew of hers in business, opened a grocer's shop at K., in which business was carried on under the style of "Mrs. T. P. H." The business was managed by the nephew, and the wife took some small part in carrying it on; but the defendant took no part. The money necessary for carrying on the business was found by the wife out of her

separate estate, and no money what-  
 ever was contributed by the defendant,  
 nor did he share in the profits. He  
 however assisted his wife in obtaining  
 the lease in her name, and, as she was  
 disabled by rheumatism from writing,  
 he wrote for her a circular inviting  
 "old friends" to come to the shop.  
 He also handed copies of the circular  
 to some few persons, including a tenant  
 of his own; introduced the nephew  
 to some provision merchants, and  
 attended at the bank when his wife  
 opened the business banking account  
 in her own name. The plaintiff brought  
 this action for an injunction and  
 damages for breach of the agreement.

*Warmington Q. C.*, and *Tyssen*, for  
 the plaintiff.

*Renshaw Q. C.*, and *Brinton*, for the  
 defendant.

KEKEWICH, J., held that there had  
 been no breach of the agreement, and  
 that the action must therefore fail.  
 His Lordship said that an agreement  
 by the vendor of a business not to  
 "carry on or be in anywise interested  
 in" a business of a similar character  
 was not broken if the vendor had an  
 interest of a merely domestic or senti-  
 mental character in such a business,  
 as, for example, where it was carried  
 on by his wife with her separate estate  
 trading separately from him. To con-  
 stitute a breach of such an agreement  
 the vendor must have an interest, not  
 necessarily in the profits of the busi-  
 ness, but such as touched him directly,  
 and gave him some right to interfere  
 therein, or some means of gaining an  
 advantage therefrom. 1893, Weekly  
 Notes 182.

---

SUPERIOR COURT.

---

CORAM :—HON. MR. JUSTICE GILL.

Montreal, November 29th, 1893.

MADAME CORINNE LABBÉ & VIR.,

PETITIONER FOR CERTIORARI ;

v.

FERDINAND FICHAUD,

RESPONDENT.

&

LA VILLE DE ST-HENRI,

MISE EN CAUSE.

This is a *certiorari* issued against a judgment rendered against the present petitioner in favor of defendant by the Commissioners' Court for small cases of St. Henri, condemning petitioner to pay \$25 imposed by a local by-law on any person carrying on the trade of a peddler in St. Henri. The petitioner contends that the Commissioners' Court had no jurisdiction, because by the

Code of Procedure it is limited to personal action of \$25 or less based on a contract or a quasi contract, and that Art. 951 of the Municipal Code extending that jurisdiction to actions for municipal taxes and fines does not apply in this case as the said Municipal Code is not in force in St. Henri, a town having a private charter, and governed when its charter is silent by the Towns and Villages General Clauses' act and not by the Municipal Code. Neither the General Clauses' act nor the charter having an enactment similar to the Municipal Code's amendment relating to the jurisdiction of the Commissioners' court, it follows that

in St. Henri the only jurisdiction that court has is the one determined by the Code of Procedure and limited to obligations created by a contract or a quasi-contract and not to those arising from the law as in the present case. The court adopting the views of the petitioner on the above grounds maintained the writ of *certiorari*. A precedent in the same sense by the late Mr. Justice Rainville in *Meunier and Hardy v. Burel* (September, 1893) was cited.

RAINVILLE, ARCHAMBAULT  
& GERVAIS, for Petitioners.  
MADORE & LA ROCHELLE,  
for the Defendant & mise-en-cause.

## ACCIDENT INSURANCE—NOTICE OF DEATH.

MARY L. TRIPPE AS ADMINISTRATRIX, ETC., RESPONDENT, v. THE PROVIDENT FUND SOCIETY, APPELLANT.—140 N. L. 23.

An accident insurance certificate issued by defendant to T., plaintiff's intestate, contained a condition to the effect that notice of an accident for which a claim is to be made must be given in writing within ten days from its occurrence "with full particulars of the accident and injury," and that failure to give such notice would invalidate all claims under the certificate. In an action upon the certificate it appeared T. was killed by the fall of a building in which was his place of business; his body was not found until three days after the accident, and up to that time it was not known that he was dead. The required notice was served more than ten days after the accident, but within ten days after discovery of the body.

Held, that there was a sufficient compliance with the condition; that the intent of the contract was that notice should be

given when and after the manner of death became known to the party required to act, and so that the time began to run from the date of the discovery of the body.

The notice served was retained by defendant without objection; forty days thereafter, upon written application, defendant furnished the necessary blanks for proofs of loss, which proofs were made and forwarded to defendant and were retained by it without objection: more than five months thereafter defendant called for further information.

Held, that conceding the notice was not served in time, the condition was waived.

O'BRIEN, J. The defendant is an accident insurance company, upon the co-operative or assessment plan, and on the 13th day of March, 1891, issued its policy or certificate to Frederick W. Trippe, the plaintiff's intestate, where-

by it agreed upon the considerations referred to in the instrument to pay to him certain sums specified as a weekly indemnity on account of disability from accidents within the terms of the contract, and also the sum of \$5,000 in case of death "through external, violent and accidental means." The place of business of the insured was in a building near Park place, in the city of New York, which, on the 22nd of August, 1891, fell, crushing to death in the ruins several of the occupants, and among them the insured. The destruction of this building, and the consequent loss of life, is known in the events of that year as the "Park place disaster." The claim is resisted by the defendant upon the ground that certain conditions expressed in the certificate, which were warranties or conditions precedent to liability, have not been complied with. The most important question and that most strenuously insisted upon by the defendant arises upon the following condition :

"Notice of any accidental injury for which claim is to be made under this certificate, shall be given in writing, addressed to the president of the society at New York, stating the full name, occupation and address of the injured member, with full particulars of the accident and injury, and failure to give such written notice within ten days from the date of either injury or death, shall invalidate any and all claims under this certificate."

There is nothing in the case to create any doubt as to the fact that the insured was killed on the day of the accident, but the fact was not known until the 25th, when the body was found among the ruins and identified. Notice of the death was given to the defendant on the 2nd day of September, which was within the ten days from the dis-

covery of the body. but not within ten days from the day of the accident, when, as the defendant insists, the death must have occurred. The condition upon which the defense is based was to operate upon the contract of insurance only subsequent to the fact of a loss. It must, therefore, receive a liberal and reasonable construction in favor of the beneficiaries under the contract. (*McNally v. Phoenix Ins. Co.*, 137 N. Y. 389.) The provision requires not only notice of the death, but "full particulars of the accident and injury." It is quite conceivable that in many cases of death by accident the fact cannot be and is not known until days and even weeks after it has occurred. Such conditions in a policy of insurance must be considered as inserted for some reasonable and practical purpose, and not with a view of defeating a recovery in case of loss by requiring the parties interested to do something manifestly impossible. The object of the notice was to enable the defendant, within a reasonable time after the death or injury, to inquire into all the facts and circumstances while they were fresh in the memory of witnesses, in order to determine whether it was liable or not upon its contract. The full particulars of the death which the condition requires cannot ordinarily be furnished until the fact of death and the manner in which it occurred are ascertained. In this case all that was known prior to the 25th of August, when the body was found, was the fact that the deceased had his place of business in the building and that it had been destroyed. But it did not follow from these facts that the insured was dead, as he might have been absent from the building at the time or in some way escaped from the result of the accident, and a notice served upon the defend-



ant prior to the time when the body was found and the fact of death ascertained, would not be within the object or terms of the condition. The parties having contracted that the notice of death should be accompanied by full particulars of the manner in which it occurred and the attendant circumstances, they evidently intended that it should be given only when the fact and manner of death became known to the parties who were required to act. The fair and reasonable construction of this condition, therefore, is that the ten days within which the notice is to be given did not begin to run from the date of the accident or the disappearance of the insured, but from the time when the body was found, and the important fact of death, with the circumstances and particulars under which it occurred, ascertained. This construction secures to the defendant every benefit and advantage that was intended by this provision of the policy, and it cannot, therefore, complain if the very harsh and technical meaning which it now seeks to put upon a condition subsequent is rejected. The plaintiff was the widow of the deceased and the beneficiary named in the certificate. She was the only party interested in the enforcement of the contract, and who could give the notice, and she could not give it, within the meaning of the condition, until she had knowledge of the facts which she was bound to communicate. To hold that the plaintiff was bound to give notice of the death of her husband, with full particulars, before she had any knowledge of the facts, would be to require her, by a technical and literal construction, to do an impossible thing, which was not within the intention of the parties when the contract was made. (*Insurance Companies v. Boykin*, 12 Wall. 433.)

But even if the defendant's construction of this condition was correct, we think by its acts the objection has been waived and cannot now be urged as a defense. The notice served on the 2d of September was retained without objection, and another served on the 15th of October, after the plaintiff had been appointed administratrix. On the 12th day of October upon written application to the defendant it furnished the necessary blanks for proofs of loss. These proofs were made and forwarded to the defendant in compliance with the terms of the contract, and were retained without objection. On the 19th of March following, the defendant called for further information, which was given. It is well settled that such defenses are waived when the company, with knowledge of all the facts, requires the assured by virtue of the contract to do some act, or incur some expense or trouble inconsistent with the claim, that the contract had become inoperative in consequence of a breach of some of the conditions. (*McNally v. Phoenix Ins. Co.*, *supra*; *Roby v. Am. Cent. Ins. Co.*, 120 N. Y. 510; *Titus v. Glens Falls Ins. Co.*, 81 id. 410, 419; *Benninghoff v. Ag. Ins. Co.*, 93 id. 495; *Goodwin v. Mass. Mut. Life Ins. Co.*, 73 id. 480; *Brink v. Hanover Fire Ins. Co.*, 80 id. 108; *Jones v. Howard Ins. Co.*, 117 id. 103; *Armstrong v. Ag. Ins. Co.*, 130 id. 560; *Travelers' Ins. Co. v. Edwards*, 122 U. S. 457.)

The acts of the defendant in receiving and retaining these papers without objection, and calling for others, are consistent only with the theory that the contract was still considered in force, and as the plaintiff acted accordingly in performance of its conditions subsequent to the loss, the defendant ought not to be permitted now to change its position and assert that

after ten days from the accident the obligations of the policy virtually ceased by reason of failure within that time to serve notice of death.

The deceased stated in his application, which is part of the policy, and a warranty that his business was that of a "wholesale drug merchant." It is now urged that the contract is avoided for the reason that this statement or representation was untrue. This point is based upon evidence tending to show that some of the articles that the deceased kept in his store and dealt in were of such a character as to deprive him of the right to be classified for accidental insurance as a wholesale druggist. Without further reference to the merits of this objection it is sufficient to say that it is not available to the defendant in this court for the reason that the testimony introduced did not conclusively establish any breach of warranty in this respect. At best the

question was one of fact and the disposition made of it by the learned trial judge was sufficiently favorable to the defendant when he submitted it to the jury. No exception was taken by the defendant to this course or to the instructions given by the court to the jury upon the submission of the question, and obviously none could have been. In fact the only question submitted to the jury was whether this statement was true. The only objection that the defendant made to this disposition of the case was to request a submission also of the question as to the date of the death of the insured, which request was properly refused as the sufficiency of the notice of death served presented a question of law.

The other exceptions in the record have been examined, and as they disclose no error prejudicial to the defendant the judgment should be affirmed. All concur. Judgment affirmed.

## SUPREME COURT OF NEW YORK.

(62 HUN 477).

OCTOBER TERM 1893.

MARY MENNEILEY, PLAINTIFF, v. THE EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ASSURANCE CORPORATION (LIMITED), DEFENDANT.

### ACCIDENT INSURANCE.

EXCEPTION FROM THE POLICY OF DEATH OR DISABLEMENT "ARISING FROM ANYTHING ACCIDENTALLY INHALED" — ILLUMINATING GAS.

A policy of insurance "against personal injuries caused by accident within the meaning of this policy," contained the following, among other "agreements and conditions" upon which it was issued: "This policy does not insure \* \* against death or disablement arising

from anything accidentally taken, administered or inhaled, contact of poisonous substances, inhaling gas or any surgical operation," etc. The insured died from accidentally inhaling illuminating gas which accidentally escaped into the room where he was sleeping in a hotel.

Held, that the cause of death came within the exception of "anything accidentally inhaled," and consequently was taken out of the provision of the policy so

that no recovery could be had therefor under the policy.

DWIGHT, P. J. :—The action was on a policy or contract of insurance payable to the plaintiff, which insured her husband, Samuel D. W. Menneiley, “against personal injuries caused by accident within the meaning of this policy.” The insured died from accidentally inhaling illuminating gas which accidentally escaped into the room where he was sleeping in a hotel. The only question in the case is whether that accident was “within the meaning of this policy.”

The policy contained the following, among other “agreements and conditions” upon which it was issued: “This policy does not insure \* \* \* against death or disablement arising from anything accidentally taken, administered or inhaled, contact of poisonous substances, inhaling gas or any surgical operation,” etc.

It has been held by the court of last resort in this State that, by the words “inhaling gas” in a similiar exception contained in the contract of another insurer against accidents, “the company can only be understood to mean a voluntary or intelligent act by the insured and not an involuntary and unconscious act.” (Paul v. The Travelers’ Ins. Co., 112 N. Y., 472). So that if the exception of death or disablement by “inhaling gas” was the one relied upon by the defendant here, the authority cited would be conclusive against its contention. But

such is not the case. The exception here relied upon, which was not in the policy in the case of Paul, expressly describes an act not voluntary and intelligent, but, on the contrary, accidental. The death or disablement excepted is one “arising from anything accidentally inhaled.” And here was the death of the insured arising from illuminating gas accidentally inhaled.

It seems difficult to elaborate or prolong an argument upon this statement. Here is no room for interpretation; the words employed interpret themselves, and unquestionably apply to the facts presented by the stipulation of the parties. The exception here relied upon, if expressly framed to avoid the construction put upon that in the case of Paul (*supra*), could not more successfully have accomplished the purpose. It would be a contradiction in terms to apply the words “accidentally inhaled” to the voluntary and intelligent act of inhaling an anæsthetic in aid of a surgical operation, which the court say was apparently the reference in that case.

The facts in this case bring it, unavoidably, within the exception, and, consequently, take it out of the provision of the policy in suit.

The motion for judgment upon the verdict must be denied, with costs, and, upon the facts agreed upon judgment ordered for the defendant dismissing the complaint. All concurred. So ordered.

# INDEX TO DIGEST.

## LIST OF CASES DIGESTED.

A	PAGES.	B	PAGES.
Abram v. Gulf C. & S. F. Ry. Co. ....	264	Babbage v. Powers. ....	161
Accident Ins. Co. of North America v. Duncan McFee .....	150	Badger Lumber Co. v. Marion Water Supply & Elec. Light & Power Co. ....	401
Accident Ins. Co. of N. Amer. v. Young. ....	341	Bagot, <i>In re</i> .....	460
Adams v. Noonan .....	329	Baie des Chaleurs Ry. Co. v. MacFarlane .....	165
Adams, Radiator & Boiler Works v. Schnader .....	504	Bailey v. The Ocean Mutual Marine Ins. Co. ....	220
Adriance v. McCormick Machine Co. ....	501	Baines v. Babcock .....	11
Ahalt v. Hersperger .....	253	Baker v. Wentworth .....	238
Ahern v. Oreg. Telephone and Teleg. Co. ....	553	Balkis Consolidated Co. v. Tomkinson. ....	626
Akersloot v. Second Avenue Ry. Co. ....	304	Ball v. McCaffrey .....	376
Alcock v. Smith .....	140	Ballow v. Earle .....	73
Alden v. Wright .....	15	Baltzinger v. Cie "La Confiance" .....	486
Alexander v. Jenkins .....	398	Bank of British North Amer. v. Stewart. ....	222
Algie v. Township of Caledon .....	252	Bank of Commerce v. Hart .....	520
Allan and others v. Johnstone .....	246	Bank of Jamaica v. Jefferson .....	423
Allan v. State S. S. Co. Ltd. ....	363	Bank of State of Georgia v. Porter .....	19
Allen, In the Goods of .....	460	Bank of Montreal v. J. E. Potts Salt & Lumber Co. ....	272
Alliance Marine Ass. Co., <i>In re</i> .....	138	Bank of Nova Scotia v. McKinnon .....	274
Alston's Trustees v. Royal Bank of Scotland .....	423	Bank of Ottawa v. Lomer .....	509
American Accident Co. of Louisville v. Reigart .....	628	Bank of Scotland v. Dominion Bank (Toronto) .....	71
American Accident Ins. Co. v. Norment. ....	213	Banque Jacques-Cartier v. Leblanc .....	192
American Exchange Nat. Bank v. Gregg. ....	67	Banque Nationale v. Guy .....	227
American Exchange National Bank v. Oregon Pottery Co. ....	423	Banque Nationale v. Merchants' Bank of Canada .....	68
American Loan & Trust Co. v. Toledo. C. & S. Railway Co. ....	40	Banque Nationale v. South American Trading Co. ....	112
American Manufact'g Co. v. Klarquist. ....	106	Banque du Peuple v. Bryant, Powis & Bryant .....	37
American Nat. Bank v. Oriental Mills .....	273	Barbour v. Connecticut Mut. Life Ins. Co. ....	154
American Steam Boiler Co. v. Anderson. ....	159	Barclay v. Pearson .....	443
American Tobacco Company v. Guest .....	274	Barnard v. Faber .....	438
Anyot v. Labrègue .....	208	Barnes v. Smith .....	534
Anderson v. Smyth .....	241	Barrett v. City of Winnipeg. ....	78
Anderson v. West. Union Telegraph Co. ....	414	Barrett v. South Pacific Railway Co. ....	31
Anglo Continental Guano Works v. Emerald Phosphate Co. ....	91	Barton v. Kinning Park Commissioners and others .....	237
Annett v. Glenburn Hydropathic Co .....	490	Barry v. Ross .....	80
Antes v. Western Assurance Co. ....	215	Batchelder v. Council Grove Water Co. ....	201
Appleton Iron Co. v. British American Assurance Co. ....	216	Baumgart v. Modern Woodmen .....	543
Aplin v. Porritt .....	576	Baunvoll Manufact. Von Scheibler v. Furness .....	457
Archibald v. Reginam .....	9	Beal v. City of Roanoke .....	551
Ardill v. Citizen Insurance Co .....	629	Beal v. Nat. Exchange Bank of Dallas. ....	520
Argenteuil Election Case .....	203	Bean v. Employer's Liability Assurance Corporation .....	577
Arizona Lumber Co. v. Mooney .....	551	Beasley v. San Jose Fruit Packing Co. ....	210
Armstrong, <i>In re</i> .....	130	Beauchamp v. City of Montreal .....	110
Armstrong v. Agricultural Insurance Co. of Watertown .....	219	Beckham v. State .....	529
Armstrong v. Agricultural Insurance Co. ....	236	Bédard v. Casson .....	294
Arnott v. Prudential Insurance Co. ....	290	Beer v. Clifton .....	475
Arp v. State .....	482	Behan Bros. v. Grand Trunk Railway Co. ....	331
Ashtown v. Manitoba Free Press. ....	224	Belair v. La Ville de Maisonneuve & The Royal Electric Co. ....	351
Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co. v. Headland. ....	478	Bell v. Sansalite Land & Ferry Co. ....	563
Atchison, T. & S. F. R. Co. v. Shean .....	479	Bell Telephone Co. v. City of Quebec. ....	327
Attorney General for Canada v. Attorney General for Ontario. ....	199	Bellechasse Elec. Case .....	338
Attorney General for Canada v. Foster. ....	199	Benard v. McKay .....	440
Auge v. Cornicillier .....	428	Bender v. Peyton .....	621
Au Sable Lumber Co. v. Detroit Manufacturers' Mut. Fire Ins. Co. ....	152	Benedict v. Columbus Const. Co. ....	301
Australian Investment Co. <i>Ex parte</i> .....	77	Benedict v. Grand Lodge A. O. U. W. ....	291
Ayres v. Dutton .....	8	Bennett v. Bennett .....	507
Ayers v. McCandless .....	243	Bennett v. Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. ....	312

	PAGES.		PAGES.
Bennett, <i>In re</i> .....	76	Brocklesby v. Temperance Permanent Building Society.....	637
Bennett v. State.....	83	Bromilow v. Phillips.....	79
Benning v. Atlantic & North-West Ry. Co.....	129	Brooke v. Toronto Belt Line Ry. Co....	38
Benning <i>et al</i> v. Thiбаudeau.....	212	Brooks v. Cooper.....	575
Benson v. Baltimore Traction Co.....	551	Brossard v. Dupras.....	130
Bentick v. London Jt. Stk. Bank.....	422	Brown v. Bigne.....	197
Bentzen v. Taylor Sons & Co.....	561	Brown v. Durham.....	517
Bergman's Claim.....	363	Brown v. Foot.....	257
Bergman v. Com. Union Assur. Co.....	216	Brown v. Leclerc.....	445
Bernard v. Allaire.....	161	Brown v. Mayer.....	488
Bernardine v. Municipality of North Dufferin.....	143	Brown v. Moss.....	388
Berrigan v. New York L. E. & W. R. Co.....	296	Brown v. Peters.....	243
Berry v. Amer. Cent. Insur. Co. of St. Louis.....	343	Brown v. State.....	82
Berstein v. Meech.....	142	Brown v. Vannaman.....	441
Bessand, Blanchard & Co. v. Godard.....	431	Brownell Street, <i>In re</i> .....	298
Bigelow v. Norris.....	67	Browning v. Hinkle.....	279
Biggs v. Board of Commis.....	563	Brungrer v. Smith.....	258
Bill v. Montgomery Iron Works.....	521	Brunton v. Electrical Engineering Corp.....	266
Bing v. Willey.....	267	Brush Elec. Illuminating Co. v. The Consol. Tel. & Electric Subway Co.....	16
Bishop v. Agricultural Ins. Co.....	215	Brush Elec. Illum. Co. of N. Y. v. Wemple.....	44
Bissonnette v. Nadeau.....	300	Bryant v. Smith.....	8
Blackwell v. Ins. Co.....	150	Bryant, Powis & Bryant v. Banque du People (Que.).....	452
Blaechinska v. Howard Mission & Home for Little Wanderers.....	226	Buchanan v. Drivers' National Bank....	423
Blalock v. Kernersville Manuf'g Co.....	271	Budd v. People of the State of New York.....	267
Blatchford v. McBain.....	128	Bullen v. Dawson.....	312
Blatchford v. McBain.....	334	Bury v. Murphy.....	557
Blount v. Kimpton.....	253	Burlington Ins. Co. v. Brockway.....	94
Board of Health of Township of Portage v. Van Hoesen.....	89	Burns v. Davidson.....	211
Boden v. Hensley.....	246	Burns v. Steel Co. of Scotland.....	631
Bodman, <i>re</i> .....	45	Burroughs v. Reginam.....	396
Bohn Manuf'g. Co. v. Hollis.....	585		
Bolton v. Natal Land & Colonization Co. (Lim.).....	332	<b>C</b>	
Bond v. Terrell Cotton & Woolen Manuf'g Co—Corp.....	269	Cahill v. Cincinnati N. O. and T. P. Ry. Co.....	240
Bonnar v. Perryman.....	97	Cahn v. Western Union Tel. Co.....	249
Borden v. Berteaux.....	87	Caldwell v. Robertson.....	211
Borden v. Delaware L. & W. Ry Co.....	403	Caledonia Insurance Co. v. Gilmour.....	436-438
Bosworth v. Cleary.....	21	Calhoun v. Phillips.....	30
Bourassa v. Drolet.....	294	Camden Fire Ins. Ass'n v. Jones.....	144
Bound v. Lawrence.....	158	Cameron v. French.....	504
Bourgeau v. Brodeur.....	103	Cameron v. Nystrom.....	496
Boute v. Emmer.....	24	Campbell v. Bostick.....	547
Bowell v. De Wald.....	20	Campbell v. Campbell.....	451
Bowes v. City of Boston.....	231	Campbell v. Glasgow & Lond. Insurance Co.....	511
Bowker v. Launmeister.....	278	Campbell v. Grieve.....	339
Bowless v. State.....	84	Campbell v. McKay.....	618
Bowyer v. Percy Supper Club.....	579	Campbell v. Roche.....	150
Boyd v. Bank of New Brunswick.....	131	Can. Atl. Ry. Co. v. Norris.....	434
Boyd v. St. Louis & S. F. Ry Co.....	582	Canada Atl. Ry. Co. v. Sauv�.....	30
Boyd v. United States.....	206	Can. Pac. Ry. v. Rabinson.....	185
Boyer, <i>Ex-parte</i> .....	346	Canada Shipping Co.'s Case.....	69
Bradley Fertilizer Co. v. South Pub. Co.....	270	Canada Southern Ry. Co. v. Town of Niagara Falls.....	350
Bradshaw v. Agricultural Insurance Co.....	151	Canfield v. Great Camp of Knights of the Maccabees.....	20
Brady v. Mayor, etc., of New York.....	404	Capital City Gas Light Co. v. Charter Oaks Ins. Co.....	169
Brantford, Waterloo & Lake Erie Railway Co. v. Huffman.....	72	Caproni and another v. Alberti.....	82
Breck v. Ringler.....	282	Cardinal v. "La Patrie" Co.....	589
Bressler v. Wayne County, Nebraska.....	43	Carlill v. Carbolic Smoke Ball Co.....	432
Brewster v. State.....	433	Carlson v. Phenix Bridge Co.....	403
Brice v. Marquette Opera House Building Co.....	561	Carr v. State.....	550
Brigella, The.....	439	Carrico v. West Virginia Cent. and P. Ry. Co.....	160
Bristol v. Equitable Life Assur. Society of United States.....	333	Carroll v. Campbell.....	247
Britton v. Milson.....	263	Carson v. Federal St. and P. V. P. Ry. Co.....	234
Brocheton v. Elissalt.....	620		
Brock <i>et al.</i> v. Gourley.....	106		

	PAGES.
Carswell v. Collard.....	596
Carter v. Carter.....	250
Carter v. Grant.....	590
Case Threshing Machine Co. v. Peterson	522
Casey's Patents, <i>In re</i> .....	165
Cassa Maritima v. Syndic Catuogno.....	477
Cassidy v. Brooklyn Daily Eagle.....	488
Castlegate Steamship Co. v. Dempsey & Co.....	317
Catholic Knights of America v. Kuhn.....	221
Chabot v. Quebec Steamship Co.....	457
Cedar Shingle Co. v. Cie d'Assur. de Ri- mouski.....	577
Central Bank, <i>In re</i> . Canada Shipping Co's Case.....	69
Central Bank, <i>In re</i> . Lye's Claim.....	266
Central R. R. & Bankg Co. v. Hasselkus.....	523
Central Pas. Ry. Co. v. Rose.....	523
C. F. Simmons Med. Co. v. Mansfield Drug Co.....	643
Chaddick v. Haley.....	45
Chalkley v. City of Richmond.....	230
Chamberlain v. Young and Tower.....	476
Chamblie v. Davie.....	192
Chappel v. Barkley.....	282
Chase v. City of Oshkosh.....	300
Chase v. McLean.....	245
Chicago Hansom Cab Co. v. Yerkes.....	384
Chicago K. & N. Ry. Co. v. Steck.....	533
Chicago K. & N. R. Co. v. Stewart.....	279
Chicago K. & W. R. Co. v. Black.....	274
Chicago etc. Ry. Co. v. Barnes.....	30
Chicago St. L. and P. R. Co. v. Graham.....	136
Chicago and N. W. R. R. Co. v. City of Chicago.....	166
Chicago Sugar Refining Co. v. Amer. Steam-Boiler Co.—Ins.....	94
Chigot v. Thibaut.....	424
Chisholm v. McLennan.....	88
Christie v. Davey.....	589
Christie v. Morrison.....	208
Citizens' Electric Light & Power Co. v. Sands.....	444
Citizens' Street Ry Co. of Indianapolis v. Merl.....	457
City Bank of Boone v. Bennet.....	259
City Nat. Bank of Birmingham, Ala. v. Dun.....	633
City of Baltimore v. City of New-Orleans.....	443
City of Chaska v. Hedman.....	551
City of Goldboro v. Moffett.....	298
City of Greely v. Hamman.....	229
City of Hamilton v. Township of Barton.....	300
City of Montreal v. Lacroix.....	247
City of New Albany v. Ray.....	230
City of Philadelphia v. Contributors, etc.....	99
City of Pueblo v. Smith.....	587
City of Sorel v. Prevost.....	301
City of Grand Rapids v. Powers.....	166
City of Richmond v. Dudley.....	28
City of St. Louis v. Connecticut Mut. Life Ins. Co.....	99
City Passenger Ry Co. v. Dufresne.....	99
Clark v. Kellogg.....	540
Clark v. Regiman.....	327
Clark v. Pennsylvania Ry Co.....	105
Clark v. Saugerties Saving Bank.....	190
Clark v. Western Assur. Co.....	214
Cleaver <i>et al</i> v. Mutual Reserve Fund Life Assur'n.....	93
Clemans v. Supreme Assembly Royal So. of Goodfellows.....	343
Cliff's Trust, <i>In re</i> .....	417

	PAGES.
Coad v. Home Cattle Co. <i>et al</i> .....	5
Cobb v. Great Western Ry Co.....	427
Cobban Manuf'g Co. v. Can. Pac. Ry Co.....	617
Cobban Manuf'g Co. v. Can. Pac. Ry Co.....	631
Cochrane v. Stevenson.....	148
Cole v. Mercantile Trust Co.....	384
Cole v. O'Brien.....	312
Colegrove v. Smith.....	496
Collard & Collard v. Marshall & Stuart.....	293
Collingham v. Sloper.....	573
Collins v. Burlington, etc. Ry Co.....	24
Collins v. Despatch Pub. Co.....	489
Collins v. Ross.....	87
Collins v. State.....	275
Colorado Midland Ry Co. v. O'Brien.....	26
Coit v. Coit.....	253
Columbian Bank <i>In re</i> .....	259
Columbus Water Co. v. Mayor etc. of Columbus.....	290
Combination Steel & Iron Co. v. St. Paul City Ry. Co.....	36
Com. Bank of Australia v. Estate Wilson.....	422
Commercial B'k of Danville v. Burgwyn.....	259
Commercial Bank of Manitoba, <i>In re</i> .....	574
Com. Bank of Manitoba v. Bissett.....	134-167
Commercial Bank of Tasmania v. Jones.....	508
Commercial Mutual Building Society of Montreal v. The London Guarantee and Accident Co. Ltd.....	93
Commercial Union Assur. Co. v. Rector.....	150
Commonwealth v. Bell.....	12
Commonwealth v. Hess.....	361
Commonwealth v. Leach.....	336
Commonwealth v. Place.....	490
Commonwealth v. Morgan.....	530
Commonwealth v. Ryan.....	275
Commonwealth v. Smith.....	8
Commonwealth v. Tierney.....	265
Commonwealth v. U. S. Express Co.....	8
Commonwealth v. Veith.....	185
Comp. d'assur. La Prévoyance v. Hubert.....	628
Comp. d'assur. L'Union v. Martin.....	629
Comp. d'assur. L'Urbaine et la Seine v. Leroux.....	629
Comp. d'Assurance la Mutuelle de Va- lence v. Thibaud.....	566
Comp. l'Industrie National v. Barbero.....	566
Comp. "Le Monde" v. Pigoury.....	485
Comp. du ch. de fer M. & O. v. Castonguay.....	435
Comp. du ch. de fer M. & O. v. Bertrand.....	435
Comp. de chemin de fer à passagers de Montréal v. Dufresne.....	162
Conger v. Crabtree.....	474
Conklin v. N. Y. Cent. & H. R. R. Co.....	307
Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. v. Kavanagh.....	94
Connecticut Fire Insur. Co. v. Lilley.....	342
Connelly v. The Guardian Insurance Co.....	540
Consolidated Elec. Light Co. v. People's Elec. Light & Gas Co.....	233
Continental Ins. Co. v. Aetna Ins. Co.....	220
Continental Insur. Co. v. Miller.....	302
Continental Nat. Bank of Memphis v. Bowdre.....	632
Conway v. Grant.....	66
Cook v. Gray.....	157
Cook v. Lunn.....	484
Cooke v. Royal Insur. Co.....	632
Cooper v. United States Mut. Ben. Ass'n.....	300
Cooper v. City of Dallas.....	298
Corcoran v. Milwaukee Gas Light Co.....	308
Corbett v. Smith.....	434
Corporation du Canton de Compton v. Simoneau.....	95

PAGES.	PAGES.		
Corporation of Raleigh v. Williams.....	634	Denver & R. G. R. Co. v. Costes.....	314
Corporat. Township of Granby v. Corp.		Denver Hotel Co., <i>In re</i> .....	420
Township of Shefford.....	351	Deutscher v. Stone.....	315
Corpor. Dissent. School Trustees Cote		Detwiller v. City of Lansing.....	403
St. Paul v. Brunet.....	319	Dexter, <i>In re</i> .....	458
Corse v. Reginam.....	361	Destreham v. Louisiana Cypress Lumber	
Cottingham v. Grand Trunk Railway Co.	265	Co.....	531
Council of the Borough of Randwick v.		Dibbell v. Georgia Home Ins. Co.....	313
Australian Cities Investment Corpor.		Dickson v. Waldron.....	550
Limited.....	491	Dillon v. Napier, Shanks & Bell.....	495
County of Halton v. Grand Trunk Rail-		Dixon v. Plums.....	552
way Co.....	263	Doernbecher v. Columbia City Lumber	
County of Wentworth v. Smith.....	507	Co.....	201
Covenant Mut. Ben. Associat. v. Sears..	132	Dominion Salvage and Wrecking Co. v.	
Cowap v. Altherton.....	578	Brown.....	187
Cowan v. Evans.....	86	Donaldson v. Commissioners, etc.....	553
Cowen v. Evans.....	616	Donovan v. Laing Construction Co.....	443
Cox v. McKenzie.....	33	Donovan v. People.....	205
Craig v. Barclay.....	481	Dorion v. Dorion.....	414
Crawford v. City of Topeka.....	551	Dorsey v. Commonwealth.....	12
Crawford <i>et al.</i> v. Protestant Hospital		Douglass v. Main.....	442
for the Insane.....	34	Douglas v. Blackey.....	331
Crawford v. Tyrrell.....	34	Dowdy v. Commonwealth.....	18
Crawford v. State.....	481	Dowell v. Guthrie.....	552
Crear v. Williams.....	563	Downie v. Fraser.....	531
Crescent City Brewing Co. v. Flanner..	202	Doyle v. Manhattan Ry. Co.....	18
Gribbin, <i>Re</i> , and The City of Toronto	160	Dubé v. Reginam.....	31
Crook v. Morley.....	2	Dudley v. Champion.....	600
Crosby Steam Gauge and Valve Co. v.		Dueber Watch Case Co. v. E. Howard	
Consolidated Safety Valve Co.....	102	Watch Co.....	559
Cross v. Hollister.....	192	Duff & Co. v. Iron and Steel Fencing Co.	79
Cross v. National Fire Insurance Co....	342	Dumonlin v. Burfoot.....	576
Cross v. United States Trust Co. of New		Dumphy v. Kehoe.....	7
York.....	267	Duncan v. Can. Pac. Ry.....	32
Crotty v. Union Mut. Life Insur. Co. of		Duncan v. China Mut. Ins. Co.....	151
Main.....	391	Dunlop v. Balfour, Williamson & Co....	362
Crowley v. Strowse.....	552	Dunsford v. Mich. Cent. Ry. Co.....	504
Cumming v. Landed Banking & Loan		Dutcher v. Buck.....	499
Co.....	597	Dutton, Plunkett & Simon, <i>In re</i> .....	460
Cunningham v. Seattle Elect. Railway		Dutton v. State.....	85
Co.....	195	Dwelling House Ins. Co. v. Weikel.....	214
Curran v. Municipality of North Norfolk	351	Dwight v. Elmira C. & N. R. Co.....	337
Cushing v. Strangman.....	316	Dye v. State.....	206
Custy v. Donlon.....	582	Dyer v. Port Arthur.....	588
		Dygert v. Dygert.....	212
		Dyke v. Gower.....	127
<b>D</b>		<b>E</b>	
D. A. Jones Compan, <i>In re</i> .....	265	East York Dominion Election.....	88
Daisy Hopkins, <i>Ex parte</i> .....	277	Eberhart v. State.....	576
Daley v. Melendy.....	47	Eddy v. Sedgwick.....	308
Daniels v. New York & N. E. Ry. Co....	31	Eddystone Marine Insur. Co., <i>In re</i> .....	395
Davies v. National Fire & Marine Ins. Co.		Edin. Employers' Assur. Co. v. Griffiths	332
of New Zealand.....	22	Edinburgh Northern Tramway Co. v.	
Davies v. East Tennessee V. & G. Ry.		Mann <i>et al.</i> .....	75
Co.....	38	Edison Illuminating Co. of New York v.	
Dauntless, The v. The Ship Ismer.....	2	Wemple.....	44
Davies v. McMillan.....	456	Edwards, <i>Ex parte</i> .....	346
Davis v. Erickson.....	261	Edwards v. Town of Pocahontas.....	28
Davis v. Louisville N. O. and T. Ry. Co.	236	Eggleston v. Mason.....	192
Daw v. Herring.....	161	Electric Despatch Co. v. Bell Telephone	
Dawson v. Dumont.....	128	Co.....	210
Day v. Longhurst.....	424	Ellerman v. Chicago Junct. Ry. and	
Debenham & Freebody v. Cowie.....	501	Union Stock Yards Co.....	203
Decatur Bldg & Invest. Soc v. Neal.....	430	Elliott v. Osborn.....	275
Deeves v. Mayor etc. of New York.....	229	Ellis v. Drummond.....	429
DeFries v. Carr.....	480	Elmer v. Fessenden.....	17
De Hertel v. Roe.....	563	Erickson, <i>Ex parte</i> .....	316
Deim v. Kahlitz.....	316	Emard v. Marcille.....	570
Demarest v. Koep.....	161	Embry v. Lewis.....	311
De Martigny v. Mount.....	156	Emerson v. Bannerman.....	133
Demers v. Baker, and Ross. opp.....	98	Emigh v. State Ins. Co.....	93
Demers v. Blouin.....	628		
Dempsey v. Chambers.....	24		

	PAGES.
Empire State Insur. Co. v. Amer. Cent. Insur. Co.	485
English Bank of River Plate, <i>In re</i> .....	476
English v. Progress Electric Light Co.	101
Equitable Reserve Fund Life Ass'n of New York, <i>In re</i> .....	292
Evans v. Lake Shore and Mich. Southern R.	101
Erlinger v. Douglas.	209
Eric and W. Ry. C. v. City of Kokomo.	209
Eric Tel. etc. Co. v. Grimes.	170
Essex Centre Manuf'g Co.	265
Erwin v. Crook.	239
Esson v. McGregor.	262
Euler v. Sullivan.	310
Evans v. Hoare.	410
Everett v. State.	275
Ewing v. Pittsburg C. C. and St. Louis Ry. Co.	236
Exchange Bank v. Fletcher.	2

F

Faires v. Ross	311
Faison v. Alabama & V. Ry. Co.	477
Falconer v. Doherty.	488
Farber v. Missouri, Pac. Ry. Co.	494
Faris v. Hoberg.	445
Falk v. Brett Lithographing Co.	200
Farmer's Banks v. Harshman.	70
Farmer's Loan & Trust Co. v. Borough of Ansonia.	299
Farmer v. Mut. Fire Ins. Co. of Dug Hill v. Hull.	628
Faulkner v. National Sailor's Home.	252
Fawcner v. Lew. Smith Wall Paper Co.	17
Ferguson v. County of Elgin.	622
Ferguson v. Provincial Provident Institution	513
Fitzgerald v. Connecticut River Paper Co.	158
First National Bank v. Alton	70
Filer v. Smith.	533
Finnell v. Delaware L. & W. R. Co.	296
Finnigan v. Fall River Gas Works	553
First Nat. Bank v. Indiana Nat. Bank	378
First Nat. Bank v. Sarlls.	27
First Nat. Bank v. Simmons	499
First Nat. Bank of Pawnee City v. Sprague	328
First Nat. Bank of Plattsburg v. Sowles <i>et al.</i>	3
First Nat. Bank of Rapid City v. Security Nat. Bank of Sioux City.	260
Fish, <i>In re</i> .	507
Fischer v. Blank.	506
Fisher v. Fisher.	322
Fitz v. Iles.	155
Fitzgerald v. Grand Trunk Ry	104
Fitzmaurice v. Fabian.	302
Fitzmaurice v. Mut. Life Ins. Co. of New York	393
Flagg v. Chicago etc. Ry. Co.	494
Flood v. Western Union Tel. Co.	301
Florney v. Cie de Nav. de la Basse-Loire.	492
Fogarty v. Fogarty.	564
Follette v. United States Mut. Acc. Ass'n	300
Foltz v. Hardin.	103
Forbes v. Board of Health of Exambia County.	5
Fordice v. Gibson	30
Forget v. Ostigny (reported <i>In extenso</i> )	534
Forwood v. The City of Toronto.	353

	PAGES.
Fouke v. Jackson County.	520
Fourth Street Nat. Bank v. Yardley	227
Fox v. Spring Lake Iron Co.	557
Franklin Bank v. Harris	406
Fraser v. Magistrate of Rothesay	635
Fraser v. Town of New Glasgow	390
Freeman v. Mercantile Mut. Acc. Ass'n.	574
Freygang v. Daveluy	20
Friedenberg's Appeal.	550
Fyfe v. McLaughlin.	550

G

G. N. W. Tel. Co. v. Town of Niagara.	474
Gaines v. Bard.	492
Gallaher, <i>ex parte</i> .	487
Gallaher v. County of Westmoreland	233
Galloway Steam Packet Co. v. Wallace	138
Galveston H. & A. S. Ry Co. v. Davis.	637
Galvin v. Meridian Nat. Bank.	70
Garbutt v. Citizen's Life & Endowment Ass'n	221
Gardner v. Shaver.	423
Garon v. Anglo Can. Asbestor Co.	588
Garrett v. Hefflin.	564
Garrigan v. Home, etc., Missionary So.	70
Gasper v. Heimback	480
Gatchell v. Foster.	262
Gault v. Murray.	149
Gauthier v. Can. Pac. Ry Co.	572
Gauvin v. Moore <i>et al.</i>	89
Gauvreau <i>et al.</i> v. Macquet.	282
General Phosphate Co. <i>In re</i> .	525
Généreux v. Murphy.	277
German v. Rothery.	339
German Insur. Co. of Freeport v. York.	391
Germania Ins. Co. v. Deckard	94
Girault v. Pelletier	209
Gilbert <i>et al.</i> v. New England Ins. Co.	283
Gibeault v. Pelletier.	87
Gibbs v. State.	205
Gilbert, <i>In the Goods of</i> .	460
Gillespie v. City of Toronto	444
Gillespie v. Lucas.	496
Gilmour v. Fed. Street etc. Pass. Ry Co.	498
Gilmour v. North Brit. Ry Co.	592
Girault v. Coney Island & B. Ry Co.	161
Giroux v. Les Curé, etc. de Beauport.	359
Glasier v. Town of Heron	306
Glen v. Garth.	11
Glendover, The.	638
Glengarry Election.	88
Glenifer, The.	364
Glenlivet, The.	575
Globe Mut. Benefit Ass'n, <i>In re</i> .	291
Gloucester City v. Eschbach	221
Glover v. Wells.	219
Glynn v. Margetson & Co.	638
Goe's Estate <i>In re</i> .	252
Gooding v. Underwood.	191
Goodman v. Oregon Ry. and Nav. Co.	195
Gosch v. State Mut. Fire Ins. Co.	289
Gotlieb v. The Fred W. Wolfe Co. of Illinois	78
Goulding v. Hammond.	432
Graham v. Birch.	46
Graham v. City of Boston.	305
Grable v. German Ins. Co.	21
Graham v. City of Albert Lea.	230
Graham v. L'Union St. Thomas.	578
Grand Lodge A. O. U. W. v. Belcham.	438
Grand Trunk Ry. Co. v. Sibbald.	360
Grand Trunk Ry. Co. v. Tremayne.	360



PAGES.	PAGES.		
Granite City Steamship Co. v. Ireland . . . . .	107	Harvey v. Facey . . . . .	622
Grant v. Reginan . . . . .	109	Hasson v. Wood . . . . .	302
Gravel v. Gervais . . . . .	101	Hastings v. Brooklyn Life Ins. Co. . . . .	226
Graves v. Johnson . . . . .	381	Hasting v. Pearson . . . . .	135
Great North West. Tel. Co. v. Lawrence . . . . .	250	Hastings v. Thompson . . . . .	617
Green v. Minnes. . . . .	294	Hatfield v. St. John Gas Co. . . . .	191
Greenwich Insur. Co. v. Waterman . . . . .	439	Hausman v. City of Madison . . . . .	117
Gregsten v. City of Chicago. . . . .	551	Hauver v. Whalen . . . . .	301
Greig v. Moir . . . . .	633	Hawkins v. Bickford . . . . .	67
Groe v. Larson . . . . .	283	Hawkins v. Front Street Cable Ry Co. . . . .	308
Griffith v. Utica & M. R. Co. . . . .	304	Hawkins v. State . . . . .	530
Griggs v. Perrin . . . . .	269	Haygood v. State . . . . .	529
Grubbs v. Virginia Fire & Marine Ins. Co. . . . .	287	Haynes v. Hayden . . . . .	161
Guardian Assur. Co. v. Connelly . . . . .	285	Hazard v. Spencer . . . . .	261
Guerin v. Taylor . . . . .	624	Hazlehurst Compress and Manufacturing Co. v. Boomer & Boschert Co. . . . .	213
Gulf C. & S. F. Ry. Co. v. Butcher . . . . .	321	Head, <i>In re</i> . . . . .	521
Gulf C. & S. F. Ry. v. Hefner . . . . .	279	Hedley v. Pinkney & Sons Steamship Co., Ltd. . . . .	108
Gulf C. & S. F. Ry. Co. v. Ions . . . . .	523	Hegeman v. Moon . . . . .	329
Gulf C. and S. F. Ry. Co. v. Loomie . . . . .	249	Henry v. Moberly . . . . .	489
Gulf C. & S. F. Ry. v. Riordan . . . . .	495	Hemburg v. Chicago Cheese Co. . . . .	272
Gulf C. & S. F. Ry. v. Washington . . . . .	322	Helwig v. Mut. Life Ins. Co. . . . .	394
Gulf, etc. Ry. Co. v. Zimmerman . . . . .	5	Hendry's Trustees v. Magistrates of Kirkcalky . . . . .	498
Gunn v. Ohio River Co. . . . .	307	Henthorn v. Fraser . . . . .	382
Gurnsey v. Rhodes . . . . .	184	Henn <i>et al</i> v. Kennedy . . . . .	317
<b>H</b>		Henry v. Moberly . . . . .	442
H. M. Advocate v. Scott . . . . .	335	Hernan v. Gunter . . . . .	262
Haas v. Balch . . . . .	582	Heuer v. Northwestern Nat. Ins. Co. . . . .	136
Hackett v. West Union Tel. C. . . . .	33	Hevard v. O'Donohoe . . . . .	109
Haggart Bros. <i>In re</i> . . . . .	621	Hildesheim, <i>In re</i> . . . . .	522
Hale v. Bonner . . . . .	135	House v. Houston Waterworks Co. . . . .	460
Halifax Street Ry. Co. v. Joyce . . . . .	538	Hick v. Rodocanache . . . . .	457
Hall v. Concordia Fire Ins. Co. . . . .	285	Hickey v. Mich. Cent. R. Co. . . . .	589
Hall v. Cordell . . . . .	191	Hickman v. Treen . . . . .	532
Hall v. Hall . . . . .	367	Hickerson v. Parrington . . . . .	149
Hall v. Scottish Rite K. T. & M. M. Aid Ass'n . . . . .	395	Highland Chief, The . . . . .	321
Hall v. State . . . . .	23	Hill v. Harding . . . . .	45
Hallam v. Post Pub. Co. . . . .	489	Hill v. United Life Ins. Ass. . . . .	543-544
Hallstead v. Curtiss . . . . .	102	Hillion v. Société Coopérative de Vaugi- rard . . . . .	447
Halstead v. Coleman . . . . .	75	Hilsenbeck v. Guhring . . . . .	352
Halton Election . . . . .	146	Hiltz v. Skerry . . . . .	30
Ham v. Del. & Hudson Canal Co. . . . .	554	Hinkle v. Richmond and D. R. R. Co. . . . .	163
Hamburg Bremen Fire Ins. Co. v. Garlington . . . . .	214	Hirshfield v. Fort Worth Nat. Bank . . . . .	397
Hamilton v. City of Shelbyville . . . . .	444	Hodge v. Farmers' Bank of Frankfort . . . . .	475
Hamilton v. Cousineau . . . . .	295	Hodge v. State . . . . .	531
Hamilton v. The Hermand Oil Co. . . . .	497	Hodnett's Estate . . . . .	507
Hamilton Whip. Co., <i>In re</i> . . . . .	620	Hoffeld v. City of Buffalo . . . . .	248
Hamlyn v. Crown Accident Ins. Co. . . . .	436	Hogan, <i>ex-parte</i> . . . . .	487
Hampson v. Taylor . . . . .	305	Hogarth v. Miller Bros. & Co. . . . .	108
Hand Stitch Broom Sewing Machine Co. v. Blood . . . . .	9	Hoggap v. Esquimault & Nanaimo Ry. Co. . . . .	388
Handforth v. Maynard . . . . .	14	Hogue v. Williamson . . . . .	475
Hanfstaengl Art. Pub. Co. v. Holloway . . . . .	432	Holland v. Ross . . . . .	145
Hansen v. Supreme Lodge Knights of Honor . . . . .	291	Holland Trust Co. v. Taos Valley Co. . . . .	144
Hanson v. Globe Newspaper Co. . . . .	548	Hollinger v. Can. Pac. Ry. Co. . . . .	309
Hardee v. Sunset Oil Co. . . . .	524	Hollinrake v. Truswell . . . . .	432
Hardie v. Wright . . . . .	312	Holly Manuf'g Co. v. New Chester Water Co. . . . .	201
Hardwick v. Galbraith . . . . .	311	Holm v. Holm . . . . .	315
Harris v. Cameron . . . . .	303	Holmes v. Union Telegraph and Tele- phone Co. . . . .	161
Harris v. York . . . . .	316	Holmes v. Davenport . . . . .	290
Harrison v. City of Lewiston . . . . .	310	Holmes v. Gilman . . . . .	199
Harrison v. Harrison . . . . .	311	Home Ins. Co. v. Marshall . . . . .	312
Hart v. Anderson . . . . .	505	Home Nat. Bank of Chicago v. Water- man . . . . .	201
Hart v. Condon . . . . .	65	Home Provident Safety Fund Associa- tion of New-York, <i>In re</i> Voluntary Dissolution of . . . . .	170
Hart v. Tudor . . . . .	578	Hooper, <i>Ex parte</i> . . . . .	630
Hartford Life & Annuity Ins. Co. v. Unsell . . . . .	392		
Hartford Stear Boiler etc. Ins. Co. v. Cartier . . . . .	151		

PAGES.	PAGES.		
Horn Silver Mining Co. v. People of State of New York . . . . .	267	Johnson v. Armstrong . . . . .	270
Horner v. Horner . . . . .	261	Johnston v. Ballard . . . . .	310
Horstiek v. Dunkle . . . . .	250	Johnson v. Chesapeake & O. Ry. Co. . . . .	295
Horton Ice Cream Co. v. Merritt . . . . .	315	Johnson v. Edge . . . . .	312
Houston v. Newsome . . . . .	70	Johnson v. Ewart . . . . .	580
Howard, <i>ex parte</i> . . . . .	487	Johnson v. Hall . . . . .	132
Howard v. Saddler . . . . .	429	Johnson v. Lindsay . . . . .	25
Howe v. Inhabitants of Weymouth . . . . .	251	Johnson v. Netherlands Amer. Steam Nav. Co. . . . .	319
Howland v. Dominion Bank . . . . .	530	Johnson v. Northern Pac. R. Co. . . . .	89
Howland v. Inhabitants of Town of May- nard . . . . .	517	Johnson v. Northwestern Teleph. Exch. Co. . . . .	301
Hoyt v. People . . . . .	336	Johnson v. Walker . . . . .	227
Huddleston v. Kemper . . . . .	522	Johnstone v. Richardson . . . . .	427
Hudson Real Estate Co. v. Torror . . . . .	334	Johnson v. Union Switch & Signal Co. . . . .	272
Hudson River Telephone Co. v. Water- vliet Turnpike & Ry. Co. . . . .	16-60	Jones v. Lewis . . . . .	37
Hughes v. Assessor of Stirling . . . . .	387	Jones v. Merionethshire Permanent Be- nefit Building Society . . . . .	258
Hull v. Reilly . . . . .	14	Jones v. President, etc., of the Village of Portland . . . . .	280
Hunnell v. Duxbury . . . . .	10	Jones v. Ross . . . . .	560
Humber v. Crabb . . . . .	270	Joseph v. Southwark Foundry and Ma- chine Co. . . . .	238
Humes v. Decatur Land Improvement Co. . . . .	520	Joyce v. Halifax Street Ry. Co. . . . .	506
Humphrey v. Archibald . . . . .	147	Justice v. Pennsylvania Co. . . . .	349
Hunter v. Hunter . . . . .	532		
Huntingdon v. Attrill (Ont.) . . . . .	440	<b>K</b>	
Hurley v. State . . . . .	82	Kaine v. Sorensen . . . . .	302
Hurtubise v. Desmarceaux . . . . .	128	Kansas City F. S. & M. Ry. Co. v. Stower . . . . .	314
Huiskamp v. West . . . . .	10	Keane v. Village of Waterford . . . . .	160
Hus v. Commissaires d'Ecole de Ste- Victoire . . . . .	157	Kearney v. Whitehaven Colliery Co. . . . .	431
Hutton v. Smith . . . . .	481	Keenan v. Rundle . . . . .	288
<b>I</b>		Kehlor v. Magor <i>et al</i> . . . . .	40
Idaho Forwarding Co. v. Fireman's Fund Insur. Co. . . . .	301	Kelsea v. Ramsay & Gore Manuf'g Co. . . . .	560
Illinois Cent. R. Co. v. Peterson . . . . .	72	Keeney v. Whitlock . . . . .	560
Illinois Cent. R. Co. v. Slater . . . . .	105	Kehoe v. Carville . . . . .	310
In the Matter of a Special Reference from the Bahama Islands . . . . .	430	Kelly v. Flory . . . . .	311
Indianapolis Cabinet Co. v. Hermann . . . . .	526	Kelly v. Glebe Sugar Refining Co. . . . .	443
Ingersoll v. Knights of Golden Rule . . . . .	20	Kelso v. Reid . . . . .	207
Inglis v. Phillips . . . . .	41	Kennedy v. McCain . . . . .	239
Ingram v. Russell . . . . .	488	Kentucky & Ind. Bridge Co. v. Quinkert . . . . .	34
Insurance Co. of N. Amer. v. Forwood . . . . .	285	Kimber v. Press Association . . . . .	579
Inhabitants of Paris v. Norway Water Co. . . . .	640	King's County Election (Dominion) . . . . .	87
International Coal Co. v. County of Cap Breton . . . . .	640	Kirby v. Western Union Tel. Co. . . . .	597
International & G. N. Ry. Co. v. Hinzl . . . . .	296	Kneeland v. McLachlan . . . . .	636
Internat. & G. N. W. R. Co. v. Folts . . . . .	427	Knight, <i>in re</i> . . . . .	410
Isbell v. Lewis . . . . .	531	Knight v. Gardner . . . . .	410
<b>J</b>		Knoedler v. Boussod . . . . .	102
Jackson v. Pittsburg Times . . . . .	489	Knoop v. Bohmrich . . . . .	144
Jackson v. State . . . . .	12	Kohler v. Lindenmeyer . . . . .	238
Jamaica Ry. Co. v. Atty. Gen'l of Ja- maica . . . . .	425	Korrody v. Lake Shore & M. S. R. Co. . . . .	307
James v. Ins. Co. of America . . . . .	214	Kramrath v. City of Albany . . . . .	7
James v. Benson . . . . .	503	Krug v. German Fire Insurance Co. . . . .	216
Janin v. London and San Francisco Bank . . . . .	69	Kuhn v. Freund . . . . .	18
Jefferson v. Burford . . . . .	144	<b>L</b>	
Jenkins v. Shinn . . . . .	192	Labbé v. Francis <i>et al</i> . . . . .	106
Jenkins v. State . . . . .	205	Lacoste v. Wilson . . . . .	386
Jenkins v. White . . . . .	261	Lake Winnipeg Transp. Co. <i>In re</i> . . . . .	363
Jennings v. G. T. R. Co. of Canada . . . . .	6	Lamb v. Cleveland . . . . .	43
Jennings v. State . . . . .	206	Lamb v. Evans . . . . .	432
Jennings Beale & Co. v. Beale . . . . .	238	Lamb v. Evans . . . . .	443
Jensen v. McCorkill . . . . .	618	Lancôt v. Bernier . . . . .	483
Jodoin v. Bank of Hochelaga . . . . .	567	Landwehr's Estate <i>In re</i> . . . . .	252
Jodrell <i>In re</i> . . . . .	46	Langelier v. Casgrain . . . . .	441
		Langford v. State . . . . .	13
		Lansing Iron & Engine Works v. Wal- ker . . . . .	387
		Langstaff v. McRae . . . . .	353
		Laprairie Election . . . . .	209
		Larson v. Metropolitan St. Ry. Co. . . . .	376

	PAGES.		PAGES.
Laurie v. Laurie	366	Lynch v. North West Canada Land Co.	78
Law v. Local Board of Redditch	146	Lyon v. Union Mutual Life Ins. Co.	200
Lawson v. City of Seattle	551		
Lawton v. Little Rock & Fort Smith Ry. Co.	332	<b>M</b>	
Leavitt v. Chase	187	M. & O. R. R. Co. v. Nicholas	180
Leblanc v. Reginam	433	Macdonald v. Harrison	269
Lefforge v. State	83	Mackay & Son v. Police Commissioners of Leven	519
Lefeuntun v. Veronneau	630	MacKay v. Smith	282
Lefeuntun v. Veronneau	615	MacKellar v. Anchor Manuf'g Co.	270
Lehnies v. Egg Harbor Com. Bank	480	MacPherson v. Campbell	317
Leigh, In the Goods of James	171	Macrae, <i>Ex parte</i>	473
Lemay v. Martel	389	Macrae v. MacFarlane	238
Lemieux v. Cie du Ch. de Fer Quebec & Lake St. John	501	McAdam v. Ross	162
Lemme, In the Goods of	171	McArthur v. Times Printing Co.	201
Lepine v. Laurent	8	McBean v. Marshall	167
Leslie v. Bassett	191	McCahill v. Detroit City Railway	552
Le-lie v. Young	526	McClarney v. Chicago etc. Railway Co.	21
Lester v. Buel	381	McClotherty v. Gale Manufacturing Co.	297
Levy v. Bigelow	490	McConnell v. Pedigo	240
Levy v. Spencer	526	McCord's Case	47
Lewis v. Earl of Londesborough	502	McCombe v. Phillips	321
Lewis v. Jeffery	70	McCormick Harvesting Machine Co. v. Broner	504
Lexington Avenue, <i>In re</i>	279-208	McCowan v. Bain & Johnson <i>et al.</i>	22
Libby v. Maine Central Railway Co.	523	McCulloch v. Barclay	319
Lilley v. Allin, <i>in re</i>	295	McCullough v. Barr	102
Lincoln Rapid Transit Co. v. Nichols	562	McCurdy v. McLeod	42
Lindsay, <i>Ex parte</i>	130	McDonald v. Burke	204
Linton v. Stirling	515	McDonald v. Ferdais	596
Lippitt v. American Wood Paper Co.	82	McDonald v. Freed	279
Lisgar Dominion Election	87	McDonald v. McDonald	366
Lister v. Henry Lister & Son	573	McDonald v. Ill. Central Ry.	477
Little v. Little	35	McDonald v. Press Publishing Co.	488
Livingstone v. Robertson	41	McDonald v. Manning	143
Lobeck v. Lee	557	McDonald v. State	85
"	539	McDuffie v. State	21
Local Option Act, <i>In re</i>	23	McElwee v. New York Life Ins. Co.	192
Lockhart, In the Goods of	460	McFadyen v. Spencer & Co.	224
London & Canadian Life and Accident Co. and Lang, <i>In re</i>	436	McFarlane v. Helensborough Pol. Commissioners	496
London & Canadian Loan & Agency Co. v. Duggan	638	McGeachie v. North Am. Life Assur. Co.	345
London Chartered Bank of Australia v. McMillan	378	McGill v. Grand Trunk Ry. Co.	313
London Chatham & Dover Railway Co. v. South East. Ry. Co.	630	McGinnis v. George Knapp & Co.	347
London Joint Stock Bank v. Simmons	378	McGuire v. Allen	252
London Trust Co. v. MacKenzie	429	McHose v. Barnshaw	331
Lonergren v. Illinois Central Ry. Co.	31	McKay v. O'Neil	65
Long v. City of Duluth	405	McKay v. State	529
Long v. Chicago K. & W. Ry. Co.	240	McKean v. Jones	161
Loomis v. N. H. & H. Ry. Co.	434	McKeand v. McKormick	483
Lortie v. Quebec Central Ry. Co.	619	McKelvin v. City of London	306
Lothrop v. Union Bank, Colorado, & Notes	4	McKenzie v. Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.	99
Louisville & N. R. Co. v. Schmetzer	495	McKerchar v. Cameron	222
Louisville N. A. & C. Ry. Co. v. Nicholai	331	McKinnon v. Roche	150
Louisville & N. R. Co. v. Dies	194	McKnight v. Nichols	242
Louisville N. A. & C. Ry. Co. v. Creek	234	McLean v. Clark	351
Louisville N. O. & T. Ry. Co. v. Williams	551	McLellan v. The North Brit. & Mercantile Insurance Co.	512
Louisville & N. R. Co. v. Bell	264	McLeod v. 1600 Tons of Nitrate of Soda	505
Louisville St. L. & T. R. Co. v. Barrett	314	McLeod v. McNab	45
Low & Low	87	McMillan v. Barton	331
Lovejoy v. Michels	106	McMinn v. Pittsburg M. & Y. Ry. Co.	240
Lowenfeld v. Howett	81	McNally v. Phœnic Insurance Co.	151
Lucke v. Clothing Cutter's & Trimmers' Assembly	459	McNaught v. North Brit. Ry. Co.	73
Lumberville, Del. Bridge Co. v. State Board of assessors	480	McNaughton v. Exchange Nat. Bank	111
Lund v. McCutchen	9	McQuigan v. Del. L. and W. R. Co.	146
Lush v. Waldie	146	McRae v. Marshall	26
Luttrell v. Martin	590	McWilliams v. Cascade Fire & Marine Ins. Co.	628
		Mace v. State	577
		Madison v. Pennsylvania Ry. Co.	225
		Magee v. People	81

	PAGES.
Magee v. Pacific Improvement Co. . . . .	627
Mah Wong Gee, <i>Re</i> . . . . .	7
Main v. Commonwealth . . . . .	12
Major v. Kehoe . . . . .	244
Mallory v. Mallory & Wheeler Co. . . . .	272
Mallory v. Ohio Farmers' Ins. Co. . . . .	218
Manitoba Milling Co. <i>In re</i> . . . . .	111
Manitoba Milling & Brewing Co. <i>In re</i> . . . . .	47
Manlove v. Commercial Mut. Fire Ins. Co. . . . .	91
Manufacturer & Merchants Mut. Ins. Co. v. Armstrong . . . . .	510
Marchand v. Gibeau . . . . .	410
Marchand v. Molleur . . . . .	581
Marchand v. Molleur . . . . .	615
Margetson v. Glynn . . . . .	132
Mark v. Hastings . . . . .	550
Markley v. Whitman . . . . .	433
Marsh v. McNider . . . . .	487
Marshall's Patent . . . . .	35
Martin v. Farmers' Ins. Co. of Cedar Rapids . . . . .	287
Martin Kalbfleisch (The) . . . . .	505
Martin v. Manitoba <i>Free Press</i> (judgment of Q. B. (Man.) ordering new trial. Confirmed in Supreme Ct., 21 S. C. R. 518) . . . . .	222
Martin v. McMullen . . . . .	37
Martin v. W. J. Johnston Co. Ltd. . . . .	202
Martin v. Murphy . . . . .	90
Martineau v. Ladouceur . . . . .	66
Mascolo v. Montesanto . . . . .	261
Mason v. Smith . . . . .	242
Masonic Ben. Ass'n of Central Ill's v. Bunch <i>et al.</i> . . . . .	345
Masonic and General Life Assur. Co. v. Sharpe . . . . .	266
Masters v. City of Portland . . . . .	633
Masterson v. Macon City & S. Street Ry. Co. . . . .	304
Matté v. Ratté . . . . .	580
Mathewson v. City of Grand Rapids . . . . .	231
Maurer v. State . . . . .	206
Maxim Nordenfelt Guns etc. Co. v. Nordenfelt . . . . .	455
May v. Jones . . . . .	203
Mayes v. Reginam . . . . .	80
Mayor v. Alabama G. & S. Ry. . . . .	493
Mayor v. Davis . . . . .	551
Mayor etc. of New Orleans v. United States . . . . .	298
Mayer etc. of New York v. The Dry Dock R. R. Co. . . . .	365
Meads v. Lasar . . . . .	311
Mead v. State . . . . .	205
Mearn v. A. O. U. W. . . . .	344
Mearns v. Gray . . . . .	157
Meeker v. Johnson . . . . .	243
Meekle v. Wright . . . . .	442
Mercantile Invest. & Gen. Trust Co. v. Intern. Co. of Mexico . . . . .	573
Merchants' Bank of Canada v. Cunningham . . . . .	193
Merchants' Nat. of Chicago v. North West Manuf's Car Co. . . . .	202
Merchants' Bank of Halifax v. Roatt . . . . .	134
Merchants' Bank of Halifax v. Whidden . . . . .	4
Merchant Prince, The . . . . .	66
Mercier v. Morin . . . . .	297
Merionethshire Permanent Building Society v. Jones . . . . .	258

	PAGES.
Merriam v. Famous Shoe & Clothing Co. . . . .	10
Merrill Railway & Lightning Co. v. City of Merrill . . . . .	28
Metcalfe v. Bradshaw . . . . .	449
Meyer & Co. v. Detroit, Verley & Cie . . . . .	71
Meyers v. Pacific Construction Co. . . . .	8
Michigan Shingle Co. v. London & Lanc. Fire Ins. Co. . . . .	392
Michigan Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Bowes . . . . .	344
Michigan Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Nangle . . . . .	155
Mich. Mut. Life Insur. Co. v. Williams . . . . .	543
Midland Ry. Co. v. Young . . . . .	591
Mignault v. Leclerc . . . . .	348
Miller v. Caledonia Railway Co. . . . .	478
Miller v. Duggan . . . . .	390
Miller v. Hancock . . . . .	495
Miller v. Plummer . . . . .	574
Miller v. State . . . . .	529
Miller v. Union Switch & Signal Co. . . . .	358
Mills v. Limoges . . . . .	615
Milne v. Townsend . . . . .	408
Milloy v. Grand Trunk Ry. Co. . . . .	455
Milwaukee St. Ry. Co. v. Adlan . . . . .	444
Min. de Trav. Pub. v. Conduché . . . . .	554
Minnock v. Eureka Fire & M. Insur. Co. . . . .	288
Missouri Pacific Railway Co. v. Russell . . . . .	204
Mitchell v. Bradstreet . . . . .	480
Mitchell v. Trenholme . . . . .	616
Mogul Steamship Co., Ltd. v. McGregor, Gow & Co. <i>et al.</i> . . . . .	77
Mohideen, Hadjiar v. Pitchey—(India) . . . . .	421
Moir v. Village of Huntingdon . . . . .	66
Molsons Bank v. Carscaden . . . . .	329
Mondego, the . . . . .	561
Mongenais v. Allan . . . . .	380
Monitor Plough Works v. Boon . . . . .	192
Montagu v. Forwood . . . . .	558
Montreal Fish & Game Club v. Huot . . . . .	620
Montreal Herald Co. v. The Northern Insurance Co. . . . .	21
Moodie v. Jones . . . . .	229
Mooney v. Connecticut Riv. Lumber Co. . . . .	25
Moore v. Jackson . . . . .	582
Moore v. Louisiana National Bank . . . . .	188
Moore v. Western Union Telegraph Co. . . . .	44
More v. Bennett . . . . .	242
More v. New York Bowery Fire Ins. Co. . . . .	216
Morin v. The Queen . . . . .	90
Morley v. Loughnan . . . . .	434
Morris v. Tottenham & Forest Game Railway Co. . . . .	314
Morrison's Trustees v. Ward . . . . .	565
Morris v. Griffen . . . . .	35
Morrow v. Des Moines Ins. Co. . . . .	215
Morse v. Union Stock Yards Co. . . . .	245
Mott v. Cherryvale Water & M. Co. . . . .	322
Mount Hope Cemetery Ass'n v. Weidenman . . . . .	93
Mount Mansfield Hotel Co. v. Bailey . . . . .	378
Mueller v. Bethesda Mineral Spring . . . . .	103
Mullford v. People . . . . .	83
Mulligen v. New-York & R. B. Ry. Co. . . . .	227
Municipality of Cape Breton v. McKay . . . . .	29
Municipality of Morris v. The London and Canadian Loan Co. . . . .	160
Munroe, The . . . . .	514
Murchland v. Nicholson . . . . .	502
Mutual Acc. Ass'n v. Tuggle . . . . .	91
Mutual Life Ins. Co. of New-York v. Tillman . . . . .	393
Mutual Life Co. of New-York v. Suiter . . . . .	209

N		PAGES.	PAGES.	
Nason Manuf'g Co. v. Stephens .....	14	Owens v. Bedell—Convent .....	81	
National Telephone Co. v. Baker.....	457	Owen v. Tague.....	192	
Nelson v. Mayor.....	232	Owen Sound Dry Dock Shipbuilding and Nav. Co. <i>In re</i> .....	47	
Nelson v. Scott Croull and Sons.....	237	Owen Sound Bldg. & Savings Society v. Meir.....	632	
Nelson v. The Lanarkshire Road Trus- tees.....	162	P		
Nesbitt v. City of Greenville.....	230	Pacific Fire Ins. Co. v. Pacific Surety Co. 313		
New Orleans Ins. Ass'n v. Griffin.....	287	Page v. Intern. Agency & Indus. v. Trust. 573		
New-York, etc. Ry. Co. v. City of Ro- chester.....	27	Paine & Co.'s Trade Mark, <i>In re</i> .....	458	
New-York L. E. & W. Ry. Co. v. Atlan- tic Refining Co.....	234	Painter v. Industrial Life Ass'n.....	395	
New-York L. E. & W. Ry. Co. v. Nation- al S. S. Co.....	194	Palmer v. Courtney.....	1	
New-York L. E. & W. Ry. Co. v. Winter Neven v. Sears.....	195	Papenheim v. Metropolitan Elev. Ry. Co. 38		
Nichols v. Union Pac. Ry. Co. of Utah. Nicoll v. Sands.....	228	Park v. Commissioners of Adams County 274		
Niobe, The.....	22	Parker v. Langridge.....	225	
Nix v. Donovan.....	396	Parker v. Penn. Ry. Co.....	553	
Nix v. Texas & P. Ry. Co.....	297	Parker v. Truesdale.....	559	
Nixon v. Chicago R. I. & P. Ry. Co.....	236	Parks v. Smith.....	69	
Noonan v. Mechanics' & Traders' Bank..	260	Paterson Ry. Co. v. Grundy.....	505	
Nordheimer v. Alexander.....	30	Patterson & Bro. Co. (The) v. Delorme 167		
Norfolk Nat. Bank v. Woods.....	17	Pauley v. Steam Gauge & Lantern Co. 302		
Norfolk & W. Ry. Co. v. Lipscomb.....	523	Payne v. Albany City Nat. Bank.....	3	
North v. Bassett.....	135	Pearce v. State.....	577	
North Brit. Ry. Co. v. Todd.....	619	Pearson v. Zehr.....	310	
North Brit. R. Co v. Woods.....	86	Pencl v. Home Ins. Co.....	286	
North Bruce Dominion Elec. Petition. <i>In re</i> .....	37	Peninsular Land etc. Co. v. Franklin Ins. Co.....	214	
North Perth Dominion Election, <i>In re</i> 339		Penn v. Alexander.....	578	
North Perth Dominion Election.....	278	Pennsylvania Co. v. Jacksonville T. & K. W. Ry. Co.....	153	
North Western National Bank of Chi- cago v. Bank of Commerce of Kansas City.....	131	Pennsylvania Co. v. Lombardo.....	197	
Northern Pacific Ry. Co. v. Territory of Washington <i>ex rel</i> Dustin.....	226	Pennsylvania Co. v. Newmeyer.....	69	
Northfield v. Lawrence.....	133	Pennsylvania Co. v. Sears.....	143	
N. W. Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Barbour....	153	People v. Ah Jake.....	13	
Nowaczyk v. People.....	81	People v. Ah Len.....	206	
Nuttall v. Hargreaves.....	103	People v. Baine.....	89	
O		People v. Behee.....	276	
O'Brien v. Sanford.....	350	People v. Buffalo Stone and Cement Co. 270		
O'Connor v. Nova Scotia Telegraph Co. 587		Pease v. Cole.....	35	
Odell v. New York El. R. Co.....	314	People v. Cotto.....	275	
O'Donnell v. Duluth etc. Ry. Co.....	241	People v. Crowley.....	318	
O'Donohoe v. Beatty.....	109	People v. Freeman.....	205	
Ohio and M. Ry. Co. v. Press Pub. Co. 222		People v. Hughes.....	319	
Oliver and City of Ottawa, <i>In re</i> .....	185	People v. Johnson.....	12	
O'Neil v. Everest.....	407	People v. Kane.....	205	
O'Neil v. Massachusetts Benefit Ass'n..	289	People v. McGuire.....	206	
Ontario & Quebec Ry. Co. et les Curés et Marguilliers de l'Œuvre et Fabrique de Ste-Anne du Bout de l'Île.....	39	People v. Minnaugh.....	205	
Ontario Bank v. Chaplin.....	215	People v. Mitchell.....	205	
Ontario Express and Transportation Co. v. The Grand Trunk R. Co. of Canada. 101		People v. Potter.....	205	
Ontario National Gas Co. v. Township of Gosfield South.....	99	People v. Sinell.....	274	
Oregeum Gold Mining Co. of India v. Roper & Walthorth.....	380	People v. Stapleton.....	189	
O'Reegan v. Williams.....	499	People v. Thompson.....	206	
Orme v. Mackabiah.....	480	People v. Wemple.....	562	
Orr v. Mitchell.....	483	People v. Williams.....	411	
Oskaloosa Water Co. v. Board of Equal- ization of City of Oskaloosa.....	247	People v. Wood.....	175	
Overbeck v. Overbeck.....	513	People v. Wood.....	150	
Overton v. State.....	526	People <i>ex rel</i> . Harlan & Hollingsworth Co. v. Frank Campbell.....	397	
		People <i>ex rel</i> . Southern Cotton Oil Co. v. Wemple.....	270	
		People's Bank v. State of Maryland.....	307	
		People's Mutual Assur. Fund v. Baesse 91		
		People's Mut. Ben. Soc. v. Werner.....	186	
		Pepe v. City and Sub. Bldg. Society.....	125	
		Perkins v. Bell.....	494	
		Peters v. Quebec Harbour Commis- sioners.....	143	
		Peters v. Seaman.....	375	
		Petri v. First Nat. Bank of Fond du Lac 263		
		Petry v. Caisse d'Economie.....	130	
		Pharmaceutical Soc. v. Piper.....	452	

*Index to Digest.*

667

	PAGES.		PAGES.
Phoenix Ins. Co. v. Boren.....	287	Regina v. Bird.....	276
Phoenix Ins. Co. of Brooklyn v. Lorenz.....	216	Reg. v. Bittle.....	198
Phoenix Ins. Co. of Brooklyn & Perry.....	312	Regina v. Bourdeau.....	85
Phipps v. London & North West Ry. Co.....	359	Regina v. Brice.....	81
Phoenix Ins. Co. v. Grimes.....	93	Regina v. Brulé.....	385
Phoenix Ins. Co. v. Parsons.....	155	Regina v. Burke.....	570
do do v. Pickel.....	152	Regina v. Chisholm.....	84
Picard v. Ridge Avenue Pass. Ry.....	234	Regina v. County of Wellington.....	141
Picher v. Rousseau.....	298	Reg. v. Dubois.....	145
Pioneer Manuf'g Co. v. Phoenix Assur. Co of London.....	342	Regina v. Ellis.....	623
Pini v. Roncoroni.....	311	Regina v. English.....	386
Pittsburg and L. E. Ry. Co. v. Henly.....	228	Regina v. Fisher.....	30
Pittsburg C. C. & St. L. Ry. Co. v. Light- cap.....	477	Regina v. Friel.....	276
Plaute v. The Corporation de St. Jean de Matha.....	404	Regina v. Gurr.....	159
Poirier v. Brulé.....	268	Regina v. Harper, etc.....	102
Poll v. Hewitt.....	490	Regina v. Hazen.....	631
Polk v. State.....	275	Regina v. Hogarth.....	579
Pontus dit Clément v. Rousseau.....	403	Reg. v. Instan.....	433
Port Glasgow Sailcloth Co. v. Caledonia Ry. Co.....	337, 353, 360	Regina v. Jackson.....	104
Porter v. Dunn.....	295	Regina v. King <i>et al.</i> .....	275
Porter v. Indiana & L. M. Ry. Co.....	560	Reg. v. Kirk.....	494
Potts v. Western Union Tel. Co.....	320	Reg. v. Labelle.....	433
Poulin v. Can. Pac. R. Co.....	73	Regina v. Labrie.....	145
Pounder v. North Eastern Ry. Co.....	265	Regina v. McGreevy.....	140
Powell's Trade Mark.....	507	Regina v. Malcolu.....	15
Powers v. Clarke.....	19	Regina v. Martin.....	352
Pratt v. Dwelling House Mut. Fire Ins. Co.....	153	Regina v. Murphy.....	335
Prescott Election Case.....	208	Regina v. Nichols.....	487
Prescott v. Grady.....	4	Reg. v. Parker.....	483
Proulx v. Fraser.....	208	Reg. v. Ricker.....	355
Prudential Ins. Co. v. Berger.....	91	Reg. v. Rowe.....	198
Purcell v. Bergin.....	508	Regina v. St. John Water Commissioners.....	128
Purcell v. St. Paul City Ry. Co.....	235	Regina v. Stapleton.....	284
Purves v. Germania Ins. Co.....	286	Reg. v. Thompson.....	433
<b>Q</b>			
Quebec Bank v. Bryant.....	281	Regina v. Vereones.....	12
Quebec Bank v. Bryant.....	428	Regina v. Williams.....	306
Quebec Bank v. Ward.....	508	Reg. v. Williams.....	433
Quebec Gas Co. v. City of Quebec.....	327	Reichenbach v. Ellibre.....	486
Quebec, etc. Ry. Co. v. Mathieu.....	148	Reid v. Coyle.....	348
Quebec, The.....	361	Reid v. New York N. H. & H. R. Co.....	397
Queen v. Appleby.....	599	Reilly v. Dodge.....	193
Queen v. Morse.....	127	Renner v. North. Pac. Ry. Co.....	31
Queensland Mercantile Agency Co., Con- flict of Laws.....	77	Reynold v. McShane.....	483
Quart v. The Queen.....	141	Reynolds v. Kneeland.....	307
<b>R</b>			
Rafferty v. Central Traction Co.....	412	Ricard v. Banque Nationale.....	619
R. R. Co. v. Kassen's Administrator.....	309	Rice v. Grange.....	262
Ramsay v. Cheek.....	97	Richard v. Bowes.....	191
Ramsay v. State.....	481	Richards v. City of Oshkosh.....	3-5
Ramsay v. Holmes Elect. Protection Co.....	481	Richebois v. Dusan.....	424
Ramsay v. Thompson Manufacturing Co.....	480	Richmond v. Chicago & W. M. Ry. Co.....	32
Rancour v. Hunt.....	309	Richmond & D. Ry. Co. v. Chandler.....	550
Randall v. Frankfort.....	31	Rider v. Snow.....	88
Randall v. New Orleans & N. E. Ry. Co.....	477	Ritchie v. Barclay.....	168
Rapier v. London Tramways Co.....	447	Ritchie & Co. v. Sexton.....	98
Rascher v. East Detroit & G. R. Co.....	305	Rixo v. Edinburg North. Tramways Co.....	571
Raymond v. Fraser.....	310	Roach v. Woodall.....	262
Reck v. Phoenix Insurance Co.....	156	Roanoke Investment Co. v. Kansas City and S. E. Ry. Co.....	240
Rector, etc. of Holy Trinity Church v. United States.....	317	Robb v. Carnegie Bros.....	15
Redigan v. Boston and M. R. Co.....	100	Roberts v. City of Louisville.....	19
Regina v. Barry <i>et al.</i> .....	15	Roberts v. Kendall.....	210
		Robertson v. British Linen Co.....	139
		Robertson v. Grand Trunk Ry. Co.....	592
		Robertson v. Lonsdale.....	193
		Robertson v. National S. S. Co.....	194
		Robertson v. New-Hampshire Ins. Co.....	214
		Robertson v. Que. Central Ry.....	431
		Robins v. The Empire Printing and Pub. Co.....	280
		Robinson, <i>Ex parte</i> .....	405
		Robinson v. Abbott.....	597
		Robinson v. Great Northern R. Co.....	282
		Robinson v. Harris.....	186

	PAGES.		PAGES.
Roddy v. Leah, <i>In re</i> .....	151	Simon Israel & Co. v. Sedgwick.....	439
Rogers v. Carmichael.....	367	Simon v. Johnson.....	591
Rogers v. Wiley.....	333	Simonds v. Chesley.....	320
Ronald v. Mut. Reserve Fund Life Ass'n	394	Simpson v. Caledonia Insur. Co. of Que.	436
Rood v. Lawrence Manuf'g Co.....	296	Simpson v. Grand Trunk Railway Co....	571
Rosenkranz v. Lindell Ry. Co.....	302	Singleton v. Phenix Insurance Co.....	391
Ross v. Bucke.....	224	Sipière v. Cie d'Assurance la France et la	
Ross v. Hannan.....	40	Nationale.....	438
Ross v. Ross.....	599	Sise v. Pullman Car Co.....	121
Ross v. Van Etten.....	22	Slade v. Mutrie.....	261
Royal Aquarium and Summer and Win-		Smith <i>Ex parte</i> .....	577
ter Garden Society (Limited) v. Park-		Smith v. Baker & Sons.....	27
inson.....	398	Smith v. City of Des Moines.....	232
Royal Ins. Co. v. Wight.....	510	Smith v. Cooke.....	45
Rozetsky v. Beulac.....	460	Smith v. Phoenix Ins. Co.....	21
Rublec v. Davis.....	192	Smith v. Reginam.....	105
Rugland v. Thompson.....	261	Smith v. Rentz.....	210
Rumsey v. New York & N. E. R. Co.....	279	Smith & Service v. Rosario Nitrate Co.	639
Rural Municipality of Cornwallis v.		Smith v. Sun Printing and Pub. Co.....	490
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.....	169	Smith v. West Union Tel. Co.....	415
Rutherford v. Morning Journal Ass'n.....	96	Smith v. Wise.....	258
Russell v. Jones.....	475	Smeth v. Valley Gold Co, Ltd.....	573
Russell v. Richmond & D. Ry. Co.....	24	Society of Accountants v. Corp. of Ac-	
		countants.....	455
<b>S</b>		Société Canadienne Française v. Daveluy	377
Sabin v. Senate of the Nat. Union.....	219	Society of Solicitors v. Officer.....	562
Sahlgaard v. St. Paul City Ry. Co.....	234	Somerville v. City Ry. Co. of Pough-	
Saint v. Wheeler & Wilson Manufaktur-		keepsie.....	301
ing Co.....	313	Southwest National Gas Co. v. Fayette	
Salk v. Donaldson.....	526	Fuel Gas Co.....	200
Sana Wah <i>Ex parte</i> .....	43	Southy's Patent.....	35
Sappenfield v. Main Street, etc. Ry. Co.	24	Spain, <i>In re</i> .....	36
Sarnia Cil Co., <i>In re</i> .....	107	Sparham v. Carley.....	230
Savoie v. Scanlan.....	23	Speir v. City of Brooklyn.....	631
Sax, <i>In re</i> .....	599	Spier v. Craig.....	101
Sayre v. Weil.....	261	Spilman v. City of Parkersburg.....	229
Scagel v. Chicago, etc. Railway Co.....	17	Split Rock Cable Co. <i>In re</i> .....	17
Schaffner v. Kober.....	70	Sprague, <i>Ex parte</i> .....	346
Schaller v. Borger.....	60	Sproat v. Director etc. of Greene County	186
Scarbrough v. Alabama Midland Ry. Co.	228	Squires v. State.....	85
Schmidt v. German Mutual Insurance		St. Jean v. Peters.....	269
Co. of Indiana.....	395	St. Louis etc. Ry. Co. v. Murray.....	210
Schmidt v. Steinway.....	352	St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Kidd.	439
School Dist. v. Lund.....	526	St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Parsons	93
Scott v. Pennsylvania R. R. Co.....	161	Stamford Spalding & Boston Banking Co.	
Scottish Provident Institution v. Robin-		v. Smith.....	330
son & Newett <i>et al.</i> .....	377	Standard Life & Acc. Ins. Co. v. Jones..	281
Schubert v. J. R. Clark Co.....	407	Standard Oil Co. v. Tierney.....	136
Schuchman v. Winterbottom.....	316	Stanstead Election.....	88
Schwartz v. Barry.....	249	Star Newspaper Co. v. O'Connor.....	575
Schwersenski v. Vineberg.....	2	Stastney v. Second Ave. Ry. Co.....	406
Scott v. McCaffrey.....	277	State v. Allen.....	263
Sears v. Hicklin.....	523	State v. Beasley.....	201
Second National Bank of Columbia v.		State v. Brown.....	145
Cummings.....	183-189	State v. Cansey.....	14
Security Co. v. Town of Hartford.....	319	State v. City of Passaic.....	328
Seers v. Hicklin.....	475	State v. Day.....	238
Seitz v. Brewers' Refrigerating Mac. Co.	106	State <i>ex rel.</i> Postal Tel. Cable Co. v.	
Sentenne v. Cité de Montréal.....	434	Delaware & Atlant. Telegraph & Tele-	
Seymour v. Chicago Guar. Fund Life Co.	543	phone Co.....	365
Schaffner v. Erhman.....	3	State v. Duncan.....	481
Schakleford v. Hamilton.....	348	State v. Fernald.....	530
Sharp v. Knox.....	186	State v. Freeman.....	11
Shaw v. Jacobs.....	475	State v. Hackett.....	82
Sharpe, <i>In re</i> .....	266	State v. Herron.....	385
Shedd, Estate of.....	18	State v. Jenkins.....	13
Shepard v. Pulaski County.....	204	State v. Johnson.....	544
Sherar v. State.....	85	State v. Lindoen.....	440
Sickman v. Wilhelm.....	281	State v. Lucas.....	529
Silkman v. Board of Water Commission.	563	State v. McClung.....	14
Silver v. Gatti.....	622	Sthte v. McGahey.....	531
Simeoe v. Grand Lodge A. O. U. W.....	220	State <i>ex rel.</i> Columbia Club v. McMaster	197
		State v. McGraw.....	275

PAGES.	PAGES.		
State v. Mounts .....	12	Thompson v. Clydesdale Bank.....	474
State v. Passaic County Agr. Society ...	271	Thompson v. Dick.....	403
State <i>ex rel.</i> Attorney General v. Standard Oil Co.....	271	Thompson v. Greeley.....	130
State v. Scanlon.....	42	Thompson v. Seguin.....	211
State v. Thompson.....	529	Thompson v. State.....	274
State <i>ex rel.</i> Waggoner v. Russell.....	259	Thompson v. Thompson.....	461
State v. Tilma.....	38	Thompson v. Wright.....	350
State v. Washington.....	14	Tinken v. Tallmadge.....	79
State v. Williamson.....	18	Tiorohiata v. Toriwaieri, <i>alias</i> Barnes... ..	90
State v. Woodruff.....	83	Tilbury Portland Cement Co., <i>In re</i> .....	525
Steel v. Phœnix Ins. Co. of Broocklyn..	93	Tilden v. Green.....	46
Steers v. Rogers.....	451	Tobin v. West Union Tel. Co.....	249
Stephens v. Gordon.....	458	Tode v. Gross.....	9
Stephens v. McArthur.....	247	Tootle v. First Nat. Bk. of Port Angeles	520
Stephens, Mawson & Goss v. MacLeod & Co.....	7	Toronto Street Ry. Co. v. Corporation of City of Toronto.....	639
Sterber v. Vansicklen.....	406	Tournaise v. Cie, le Secours.....	435
Sterling Fire Ins. Co. v. Beffrey.....	216	Tousignant v. Shafer Iron Co.....	550
Stevens v. Hannon.....	4	Town of Prescott v. Connell.....	635
Stevens v. Nicholls.....	302	Town of Thorold v. Neelon.....	75
Stewart v. Armstrong.....	520	Township of Sombra v. Township of Moore.....	306
Stewart v. Atkinson.....	637	Traders' Ins. Co. v. Race.....	217
Stewart v. Cincinnati W. & M. Ry. Co.....	240	Traders' Nat. Bank v. Smith.....	522
Stewart v. Casey.....	165	Tremblay v. Graham.....	72
Stewart v. Union Mutual Life Ins. Co.....	290	Trenholme <i>et al</i> v. Mitchell <i>et al</i> .....	23
Stoddard v. Village of Saratoga Springs.	28	Trent-Stoughton v. Barbados Water Supply Co.....	643
Storey v. Cooke.....	45	Trent Tile Co. v. Fort Dearborn Nat. Bk.	188
Story v. State.....	84	Tribune v. Commonwealth.....	18
Strackan v. State.....	45	Tripler v. Mayor, etc., of New York.....	269
Street v. Johnson.....	96	Trippe v. Prov. Fund Soc. ....	485
Strickland v. Pennsylvania Railway Co.	445	Troop v. Union Insur. Co.....	486
Srutzel v. St. Paul City Railway.....	234	Trudeau v. Vincent.....	409
Succession of Andrieu.....	199	Tucker v. Kellogg.....	280
Sullivan v. McWilliams.....	635	Tucker v. United Life & Acc. Ins. Ass'n.	393
Supreme Lodge Knights of Honor v. Dalberg.....	91	Turcotte v. Whelan.....	142
Swain v. Fourteenth Street Ry. Co.....	235	Turgeon v. Wurtele.....	293
Swampscott Mach. Co. v. Rice.....	522	Turnbull v. Oliver.....	96
Swartz v. Large.....	98	Tyson v. West. Nat. Bk. of Balto.....	521
Sweeney v. Warren.....	45		
Swentzel v. Penn. Bank.....	189	<b>U</b>	
Swift Specific Co. v. Jacobs.....	19	Union Bank of Australia, <i>Ex parte</i> .....	77
<b>T</b>		Union Freight Ry. Co. v. Winkley.....	425
Takoma Hotel Co. v. Tacoma Light and Water Co.....	251	Union Pac. Ry. Co. v. Botsford.....	45
Taillefer v. Taillefer.....	148	Union Pac. Ry. Co. v. Goodridge.....	477
Taylor v. Commanville.....	484	United States Bank v. Nat. Bank of New York.....	187
Taylor v. Gardiner.....	244	United State v. Guess.....	245
Taylor v. Smith.....	316	United States National Bank v. National Park Bank.....	260
Taylor v. Town of Philippi.....	231	United States Acc. Ass'n v. Millard.....	577
Taylor v. Maclellans <i>et contra</i> .....	10	Universal Life Ins. Co. v. Devore.....	291
Temperton v. Russell.....	459		
Tenhopen v. Walker.....	519	<b>V</b>	
Tenant v. Union Bank.....	251	Vallée v. Talbot.....	378
(Just affirmed by Privy Council)		Vallo v. United States Express Co.....	302
Tennessee River Trans. Co. v. Kavanagh	558	Van Kleeck v. McCabe.....	35
Tester v. Canadian Pacific Railway.....	194	Van Sickle v. Belknap.....	36
Texas Land & Loan Co. v. Watron.....	557	Vance v. City of Franklin.....	306
Texas & P. Ry. Co. v. James.....	264	Vangindertaelen v. Phœnix Ins. Co. of Brooklyn.....	391
Texas & Pacific Railway Co. v. Morin.....	235	Varnier v. Piton.....	494
Texas & P. Railway Co. v. Snyder.....	314	Viau v. Languedoc.....	493
Texas Standard Cotton Oil Co. v. Adoue.	381	Victory <i>Ex parte</i> .....	441
Thériault v. Globe Woollen Mills Co.....	598	Village of New Hamburg v. County of Waterloo.....	635
Thibaudeau v. Pauzé.....	424	Vipond <i>et al</i> v. Findlay <i>et al</i> .....	41
Thiele v. McManus.....	32	Virginia Fire & Marine Ins. Co. v. Buck	152
Thompson v. Clarkson.....	149	Viry v. Cie d'assurance l'urbain.....	566
Thomas v. Henges.....	302	Vogel v. Lehlritter.....	599
Thomas v. Kinkead.....	334		
Thomas v. Thomas.....	291		
Thompson v. Bank of New Brunswick..	503		



	PAGES.		PAGES.
Voght <i>et al</i> v. Richter.....	211	Whelan v. Ryan.....	240
Voison v. Commercial Mutual Ins. Co. . . .	95	White v. O'Brien.....	315
Vonderbank v. Schmidt.....	310	White v. Pollock.....	531
Voorhies v. People's Mut. Ben. Society of Elkhart.....	380	White v. Sage.....	281
		White v. State.....	275
<b>W</b>		White Sewing Machine Co. v. Ritcher. . .	33
Wabash & Western Ry. v. Friedman . . .	196	Whyte v. Mackay.....	474
Waddington v. The Esquinnault & Nanaimo Railway Co.....	388	Wickersham v. Crittenden.....	190
Wadleigh v. Buckingham.....	39	Wild v. Waygood.....	350
Wadsworth v. Jewellers and Tradesmen's Co.....	292	Willet v. Viens.....	579
Walden National Bank v. Birch.....	132	Willems v. Heritiers Willems.....	502
Wagner v. City of Rock Island.....	551	Willets v. Hatch.....	358
Wagner v. H. W. Jayne Chemical Co.....	296	Williams v. Citizens' Ry. Co.....	232
Wait v. Nashua Armory Association.....	82	Williams v. Parrand.....	351
Walbank v. Protestant Hospital for the Insane.....	67	Williams v. Grundysen.....	474
Walker v. Baxter.....	532	Williams v. Irvine.....	421
Wallace v. Allan.....	475	Williams v. Preferred Mut. Acc. Ass.....	628
Wallace v. Roger.....	579	Williams v. The City of Portland.....	232
Wallace Bay Aboiteau, <i>In re</i> .....	20	Williamsburg City Fire Ins. Co. v. Gwinn.....	93
Walter v. Everard.....	55	Wills' Trade Mark.....	458
Walter Wallet, The.....	457	Wilson v. City of Charlotte.....	417
Warburton v. Huddersfield Industrial Society - Society.....	388	Wilson v. Louisville & N. Ry. Co.....	302
Ward v. Township of Caledon.....	250	Winchell v. National Express Co.....	281
Wark v. Perron.....	424	Wineberg <i>et vir</i> v. Hampson.....	95
Washington Diamond Mine Co., <i>In re</i> .....	574	Wishner v. Coulthard.....	500
Washington Saving Bank v. Butchers' & Grocers' Bank.....	225	Withington Board of Health v. Corp. of Manchester.....	448
Watrous Engine Co. v. Town of Palmerston .....	233	Witter v. Damitz.....	282
Waterloo Woolen Manufacturing Co. v. Shanahan.....	42	Wolfe v. Wilsey.....	70
Waterman v. Alden.....	253	Wood v. Engineers' Society.....	44
Waterman v. Chicago & I. Ry. Co.....	202	Wood River Bank v. First Nat. Bank.....	423
Watson v. Johnson.....	103	Woodall v. Foster.....	241
Watt v. City of London.....	639	Woodcock v. McKenzie.....	88
Wateau v. Fenwick.....	455	Wooden v. Western New York & P. Ry. Co.....	403
Way v. Toyle.....	134	Wooden v. Western N. Y. & P. Ry. Co.....	228
Weed v. Fire Assurance of Philadelphia.....	216	Woodruff v. New York L. E. & W. R. Co.....	171
Weegar v. G. T. R. Co.....	491	Woods, <i>Ex parte</i> .....	55
Weidenfeld v. Sugar Run Ry. Co.....	241	Woolsey v. State.....	85
Weiss v. Amer. Fire Insur. Co.....	313	Woolweaver v. State.....	529
Welland Election Appeal.....	339	Work v. Beach.....	200
Weller v. Becktell.....	30	Worthington v. Central Vermont Ry. Co.....	236
West v. Grand Lodge A. O. U. W.....	395	Wright, In the Goods of.....	460
West Northumberland Dom. Elec.....	278	Wright v. Bell.....	367
Western Assurance Co. v. Ontario Coal Co.....	158	Wright v. Guild & Wyllie.....	424
Western & Atl. Pipe-Lines Co. v. Home Ins. Co.....	21	Wright v. Howard, Baker & Co.....	633
Western Home Ins. Co. v. Thorp.....	257	Wright v. Weimeister.....	35
Western Insur. Co., <i>Ex parte</i> .....	395	Wyatt v. Berry.....	460
Western Union Tel. Co. v. Bruner.....	414	Wynn v. City & Sub. Ry. Co.....	523
Western Union Tel. Co. v. Houghton.....	249	Wynn v. City & Sub. Ry. Co. of Savan- nah.....	478
Western Union Tel. Co. v. Lowrey.....	44		
Western Union Tel. Co. v. Lydon.....	320	<b>Y</b>	
West Union Tel. Co. v. Lyman.....	506	Yardley v. Clothier.....	259
Western Union Tel. Co. v. Nations.....	319	Yale v. Watson.....	522
Westmoreland Green & Blue Slate Co., <i>In re</i> .....	525	Yates v. Eva.....	379
Wetherall v. O'Brien.....	190	York v. Canada Atlantic Steamship Co.....	635
Wheat v. City Council of Alexandria.....	322	Young v. City of Oskaloosa.....	631
Wheatland v. Fryor.....	351	Young v. Weed.....	507
Wheeler & Wilson Manuf'g Co. v. Aughy.....	37	Zabel v. Louisville Baptist Orphan's Home.....	13
		<b>Z</b>	
		Zabriskie v. Central Vermont Ry. Co.....	243
		Zieverink v. Kemper.....	473
		Zimmer v. Grand Trunk Ry. Co.....	313

## CASES AFFIRMED OR REVERSED IN APPEAL.

PAGES.	PAGES.		
Anglo Continental Guano Works v. Emerald Phosphate Co. (Q. B.) Quebec.....	91	Confirmed by Q. B., Magor v. Kehlor, 1 Off. Rep. Q. B. 23.....	244
On Appeal to Supreme Ct., Held, not Appealable, 21 Can. S. C. R. 422.....		Lilley v. Allin.....	157
Banque du Peuple v. Bryant, Powis & Bryant. Superior Ct.....	37	Confirmed by Ct. of Appeal, Ontario.....	295
Reversed by Q. B., but Superior Ct. Affirmed by Privy Council (1893 App. Case 170).....	452	McGeachie v. North American Life Assur. Co. Reversed by Ct. of Appeal, 20 Ont. App. 187..	345
Barrett v. City of Winnipeg, Supreme Ct.....	78	McKinnon v. Roche.....	150
Reversed by Privy Council, 1892, (App. Cas.).....	445	Appeal to Supreme Ct. dismissed 21 S. C. R. 615 <i>sub. nom.</i> Mader v. McKinnon.....	
Baumvoll Manufactur. Von Scheibler v. Gilchrist & Co. (Q. B.).....	137	McLean v. Clark.....	354
Reversed by C. A. — C.A. Affirmed by House of Lords.....	457	Reversed in Part. by Ct. of Appeal, 20 Ont., App. 650.....	
Aurora The Bergman, Re.....	363	Manitoba Free Press v. Martin.....	222
Maritime Lien—Wages of Master.....		Judgment of Q. B. (Man.) ordering new trial, confirmed by Supreme Ct., 21 S. C. R. 518....	
In this case it was decided in the Exchequer Court that the master of a vessel registered at the port of Winnipeg had, in the years 1888, 1889 and 1890, no lien upon vessels for wages earned by him as such master, and that even if such a lien were held to exist, there was in the years mentioned no Court in the Province of Manitoba in which it could have been enforced, and it could not now be enforced under the Colonial Courts of Admiralty Act 1890 (53-54 Vic. U. K., c. 27) or (The Admiralty Act 1891 54-55 Vic., Can., c. 29) because to give those Statutes a retroactive effect in such a case as this would be an interference with the rights of the parties. 4 Western Law Times Reports 14.....		Margetson v. Glynn.....	132
Brantford, Waterloo & Lake Erie Ry Co. v. Huffman — Bond.....	5	Affirmed by House of Lords.....	638
Ontario Ct. of Appeal affirmed by Supreme Court of Canada.....	72	Paino & Co's. Trade Mark.....	416
Campbell v. Roche (Ont. App.).....	159	Reversed by Ct. of Appeal (Eng.).....	458
Appeal to Supreme Ct. dismissed 21 S. C. R. 645 <i>sub. nom.</i> Campbell v. Patterson.....		Port Glasgow & Newark Sailcloth Co. v. The Caledonian Ry. Co.....	337, 353 360
Clark v. Reginam, Ex. Ct.....	327	Affirmed by House of Lords, 30 Scot Law Rep. 591.....	
Appeal to Supreme Ct. dismissed, 21 S. C. R. 656.....		Quebec Bank v. Bryant, Powis & Bryant, Superior Court.....	37
Cleaver and others v. Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association (Q. B.).....	20	Affirmed by Q. B. and Privy Council [1893, App. Cas. 170].....	452
Reversed by Ct. of Appeal.....	92	Sise v. Pullman Palace Car Co. (Superior Ct.)... Just confirmed by Ct. of Queen's Bench (Que.)	121
Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. v. Kavanagh (Q. B., Que.) Confirmed in Appeal to Privy Council, 1892, App. Cas. 473.....	91	State v. Delaware & A. Telegraph & Telephone Co. Confirmed by U. S. C. Ct. App.....	110 365
County of Halton v. Grand Trunk Ry. Co.....	263	Tennant v. Union Bank.....	251
Appeal to Supreme Ct. of Canada dismissed 21 S. C. R. 716.....		Just confirmed by Privy Council.....	
Hollinger v. Can. Pac. Ry.....	309	Toronto Street Ry. Co. v. Corporation of Toronto, Ont. Chancery (Appeal)..	331
Affirmed by Ct. of Appeal, 20 Ont. App. 214..		Confirmed by Privy Council.....	639
Kehlor v. Magor.....	40	Town of Thorold v. Neelon.....	75
		Appeal to Supreme Ct. allowed Nov. 20, 1893	
		Warburton v. Huddersfield Industrial Society, Div Ct. Q. B. (Eng.).....	283
		Affirmed by Ct. of Appeal, 61 L. J., Rep. Q. B. 422.....	388
		Waterous Engine Works v. Corp. Town of Palmerston.....	233
		Appeal dismissed by Supreme Ct., 21 S. C. R. 556.....	
		Western Assurance Co. v. Ontario Coal Co.....	15g
		Appeal to Supreme Ct. of Canada, dismissed 21 S. C. R. 383.....	
		Zimmer v. Grand Trunk Ry. Co.....	313
		Affirmed by Ct. of Appeal (Ontario) on other grounds, 19 Ont. App. 767.....	



# INDEX TO DIGEST.

	PAGES.		PAGES.
ACCIDENT INSURANCE—See Insurance, Accident.		15. Right of — Acquiescence in Judgment.....	376
ACCOUNT.		16.        New Trial.....	616
Action for Account of Money Paid—Receipt		17. Title to Land.....	128
—Error—Parol Evidence—Art. 1231—Art.		<i>(See also Jury Trial 2—Servitudes.)</i>	
H. C. C.—Findings of Fact.....	1	APPRENTICESHIP—See Infancy.	
ADMIRALTY LAW—See Ships and Shipping.		ARBITRATION AND AWARD.	
ACTION.		1. Contract—Clause of Reference .....	519
1. Parties to—Demurrer—" Res Judicata "—		2. Discretion of Arbitrators -- Expropriation	
New Brunswick .....	163	under Railway Act R.S.C., c. 109—Award	
2. Commenced—See Limitations of Actions 2.		—Non-Interference on Appeal—Quebec...	129
3. Confessoire—See Servitude.		<i>(See also Expropriation 1. 23.)</i>	
ADULTERATION.		<i>(See also Criminal Law — Tampering with</i>	
1. Milk—Sale by Servant—Conviction of Master—No Evidence of Master's Knowledge or Connivance—Sale of Food and Drugs Act 1875 (Eng.).....	257	<i>Arbitration Samples—42.)</i>	
2. Milk—Sale by Servant.....	185	ARCHITECT.	
3. Milk — Guilty Intent — Sale of Food and Drugs Act 1875 (Eng.).....	127	1. Commission—See Contracts 8.	
ADULTERY—See Evidence 22.		2. Submission of Plans—Contract—Damages. 67	
AGENCY—See Principal and Agent.		AS PER FORM ATTACHED—See Insurance 179.	
AGENT—See Principal and Agent.		ASSAULT AND BATTERY—See Evidence 21—	
AGREEMENT—CONSTRUCTION OF—See Timber.		Crim. Law—Damages 10. 14.	
ALIEN CONTRACT LABOUR LAW (U. S.).....	317	ASSESSMENT AND TAXES—See Taxation.	
ANIMALS—(See also Negligence 1-4).		ASSESSMENT AND TAXES—See Mun. Corp. 2-6.	
1. Killing Trespassing Dog.....	519	ASSETS—See Companies 10.	
2. Live Stock Commissioners—Killing Diseased Animals—Damages.....	310	ATTACHING ORDER — PRIORITIES BETWEEN, AND ASSIGNMENT—See Banks 4.	
APPEAL.		ATTACHMENT OF DEBTS—BANKING CORPORATIONS—HEAD OFFICE—BRANCHES—See Banks 5.	
To Privy Council.		ATTACHMENT OF GOODS BY PROCESS IN FOREIGN COUNTRY BEFORE BILL OF LADING DELIVERED—See Banks 31.	
1. From Court of Review—Right of .....	615	ATTORNEY AND CLIENT.	
2. Indian Appeal — Appealable Amount — Mesne Profits .....	421	1. Authority of Attorney.....	4
3. In Criminal Case Refused — Indian Penal Code, s. 511.....	473	2. Contract.....	52
<i>(See also Principal and Surety 2.)</i>		3.        .....	18
To Supreme Court.		4.        Effect on Infant Clients.....	24
4. Action to Vacate Sheriff's Sale .....	615	5. Privileged Communications.....	258
5. Amount in Dispute .....	128, 615, 616	AUCTIONEERS—See Negligence 57.	
6. Appeal Bond — Parties to — Appellant a Party — Non Execution by Appellant — Costs awarded by Judgment.....	186	AUTHORS, RIGHTS OF—See Literature.	
7. As to Cost only .....	66	BAILEMENT.	
8. Extension of Time—Application after Expiration of Time — Exchequer Court Act, 1887 (In Supreme Ct. Held not Appealable, 21 S. C. R. 636).....	327	1. Storage of Wheat—Loss by Fire—Owner's Risk .....	421
9. From Court of Review— Supreme and Exchequer Courts Amending Act 1891... 128	121	2. Storekeeper's Right of General Lien.....	171
10. Future Rights — Action for Call of \$1,000— R. S. C. sec. 29, sub sec. (b) of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.....	186	BANKS AND BANKING.	
11.        Title to Lands— Servitude		1. Agency—Power of Cashier.....	520
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Acts, s. 29 (b).....	95	2.        Bank agent—Excess of authority 3	
12. Municipal matters—Setting Aside By-Law .....	66, 327	<i>(See also Principal and Agent 7.)</i>	
13. Non-Retroactivity .....	616	3. Assignment to Bank—Collateral security —Rights of assignor.....	259
14. Questions of Fact—Interference with Decision of Trial Judge.....	67	Equitable — Priorities between Assignment and Attaching orders — Bank act—Power of banks as to business to be done—(Canada).....	328
		5. Attachment of Debts — Rule 195 — Garnishee " within Ontario " — Head office — Branches .....	567
		6. Certificate of Deposit — Bona Fido Purchasers—Transfer " without Recourse " — Set-off.....	260
		7. Clearing House Rules — Return of Unaccepted Cheque—Usage .....	67

BANKS AND BANKING.		PAGES.
8.	Collections—Acceptance of Draft.....	188
9.	Deposits for — Time drafts— Bills of Lading.....	188
10.	Drafts.....	188
11.	Proof of Handwriting.....	187
12.	Default of Correspondent.....	328
13.	Insolvency.....	520
14.	Contract by officers— <i>Ultra Vires</i> .....	520
15.	Deposit—in Name of Wife—Checks by Husband—Assignment by Bank —Rights of Assignee.....	263
16.	Savings Bank—Special or General deposit.....	190
17.	Check.....	67
	<i>(See also Insolvency 8.)</i>	
18.	Depositors—Bankers—Death of Partner— Liability of deceased Partner's Estate— Fresh Receipt Note — Novation.....	521
19.	Directors—Liability of for Representations	3
20.	Liability of for Loan.....	130
21.	Liability of—Gross Negligence.....	189
22.	Powers of—Misappropriation— Directors' Meetings—Suit by Stockholder	189
23.	Discounts—Note—Notice—Burden of Proof	259
24.	Draft.....	3
25.	Draft—Assignment of Fund.....	520
26.	do Acceptance—Revocation.....	187
27.	do Title — Transference of — Indorse- ment for Collection.....	520
28.	Insolvency—Purchase of Stock—Rights of Owners.....	259
29.	Rights of Depositors—Set-off	259
30.	Lien—Cash—Credit—Bond—Negotiable Securities Deposited in Security—(Scotch Case).....	422
31.	Loan—Conversion—Election of Remedies —Action on Note.....	131
32.	Fraud of Officer.....	520
33.	To Broker—Deposit of Customer's Security — Right of Redemption— "Contango".....	422
34.	Bill of Lading—Promise to Transfer Acquisition of Goods Attached by Process in Foreign Country Before Bill of Lading Delivered—Conflict of Law—Proof of Foreign Law.....	68
35.	Action on Note—"Bona Fide" Pur- chaser—Evidence.....	259
36.	Mistake in not Paying Check — Measure of Damages.....	2
37.	Overdraft—Unauthorized—Fraudulent De- tention of Money by Customer's Cashier— Liability of Bank.....	378
38.	Payment—What Constitutes—Suretyship —New South Wales.....	422
39.	of Forged Check—Liability to De- positor.....	69
40.	of Forged Order—Recovery of Amount Paid.....	378
41.	of Forged Draft by Drawee.....	131
42.	to Wrong Person—Pass-Book— Evidence—Savings Bank.....	190
43.	Shares—given to another Bank as Collateral Security — Banking Act— Art. C. C. 1970, 1973, 1975.....	2
44.	of Bank Stock Held by Deceased Person — Injunction to Compel Transfer of Shares to Executor— Shares Specifically Devised—Bank Act R.S.C. c. 120, ss. 29, 30, 32, 31, 35.	130

	PAGES-
45. Shares—Pledge—Power of Husband Acting as Agent for his Wife—Arts. 1301, 181, 1483, 1971 C. C.....	567
46. Substituted Property — Registra- tion—Arts. 931, 938, 939 C.C. Shares in Trust.....	129
<i>(See also "Shares.")</i>	
47. Stockbroker Paying into Credit of his Own Account—Money of Client.....	474
48. Negotiable Securities — De- posit of Securities by Broker—Authority of Broker to Pledge—Pledge of Securities without Authority—Holder for Value and in Good Faith.....	378
<i>(See also "Warehouse Receipt.")</i>	
BARGE OWNERS—See Negligence 58.	
BASE BALL—See Gambling Transactions.	
BILL OF SALE.	
Affidavit of "Bona Fides" — Adherence to Statutory Form — Proof of Execution — Attesting Witness.....	132
BILLS OF LADING—See Banks 9, 31—Pledge 5— Ships 2, 3.	
BILLS AND NOTES.	
1. Acceptance, whether Qualified — Words Prohibiting Transfer — Ac- ceptance "in favour of Draw- er only" — Bills of Exch. Act 1882 (Eng.).....	71
2. Per Procuration — Agent's Authority.....	424
3. Action—by Assignor.....	261
4. Defenses.....	475
5. Prematurely Brought.....	424
6. Alteration—Disch. of Surety—Ratification	192
7. Surety.....	474
8. Material.....	474
9. Burden of Proof.....	261
10. ....	522
11. —Fraud.....	423
12. Certificate of Deposit — Bona Fide Pur- chaser.....	262
13. Check—No Funds — Subsequent Debt — French Law.....	476
14. Days of Grace.....	134
15. Fraud—Custom and Usage.....	475
16. Presentment for Payment — Reason- able Time — Damages—Custom of Bankers.....	570
17. Person who Cashed Cheque Held to be not Agent of Payee but Holder —Bills of Exchange Act 1882 (Eng.)	424
18. Bill of Exchange—Overdue Inland Bill In- dorsed Abroad — Claims by Different Holders in Absence of Payer — Indorsee with Valid Title under Foreign Law — Rights against Prior Holder with Equit- able Title in England — Conflict of Laws — Bills of Exchange Act, 1882 (45 & 46 Vic. ch. 61), ss 29 (sub-sec. 2), 36 (sub-sec. 2), 72 (sub-sec. 2).....	139
19. Conflict of Laws—Promissory Note.....	4
20. Bill of Exchange.....	191
21. Consideration.....	78
22. Quantum Meruit.....	70
23. Failure of.....	192
24. Failure of—Laches.....	262
25. Fraud.....	192
26. "Bona Fide" Purchasers.....	262
27. Illegal — Accommodation Indorser—French Law.....	424

BILLS AND NOTES.		PAGES.
<i>See also Intoxicating Liquors 41.</i>		
29.	Equities of Acceptor.....	190
30.	Estoppel—Silence as.....	4
31.	Partnership.....	192
32.	Bill of Exchange.....	191
33.	Assignment of Note.....	192
34.	Evidence.....	70
35.	Delivery of Note to Plaintiff.....	329
36.	Forgery—Forging Payee's Name—Innocent Purchaser.....	262
37.	Evidence.....	192
38.	Fraud.....	69
39.	Garnishment—Negotiable Note.....	262
40.	Indorsement—Indorsers for accommodation—Notice of Protest—Warrantors—Art. 2311 C. C. R. S. Can., c. 123, s. 5.....	193
41.	Indorser for accommodation—Bad Faith of Holder—Conspiracy—Ontario.....	570
42.	Indorser for accommodation—Joint Sureties.....	378
43.	without Recourse.....	191
44.	Liability of Indorser.....	69
45.	Proof.....	423
46.	Indorser after Maturity.....	133
47.	"To take Care of".....	475
48.	Guaranty—Trust for payment of debts—Evidence.....	522
49.	Negotiation—Contempt of Court.....	192
50.	Indorser—Interest.....	424
51.	Indorser—Interest.....	379
<i>(See Bills and Notes—Acceptance 2.)</i>		
52.	Interest—Bill of Exchange—Action on.....	263
53.	Limitations & Prescription—Interruption.....	423
54.	Payment to take out of Statute of Limitations.....	423
55.	Part Payment—Payment not made to holder or his agent.....	522
56.	Partial Payment.....	329
57.	Married women (Quebec)—Innocent holder for Value.....	475
58.	(Quebec)—Nullity—Third Parties holders in good Faith.....	227
59.	New Note—Illegality.....	619
60.	Note—Collateral Agreement.....	423
61.	Payable to "order"—Bills of Exch. Act 1882 (Eng).....	522
62.	Payable with Exchange.....	476
63.	Payment—Burden of Proof.....	617
64.	Agreement as to.....	70
65.	Set-off.....	192
66.	Extension.....	261
67.	Discharge.....	70
68.	Demand Note.....	261
69.	and Discharge—Cancellation without authority—Liability of Agent employed to collect Bill.....	4
70.	Negotiability—Note payable to particular person—Holder in due Course—Bills of Exch. Act (Canada).....	71
71.	Time—Clause giving time to makers—Principal and Surety Agreement—Bills of Exch. Act (Eng).....	508
72.	Pleading—Acceptance as Executor—Evidence.....	379
		618

		PAGES.
73.	Pleading—Exchange of Notes—Counter Claim.....	262
74.	Declaration—Necessary Averments—Bill held by Bank as Agents.....	191
75.	Presentment—for Payment—where Payable for acceptance—Declaration.....	134
76.	what it should allege—Demurrer—Leave to Amend.....	133
77.	Promissary Notes—What Constitutes.....	475
78.	Nature and Requisites—Indorsement—Presumption.....	70
79.	Will.....	69
80.	Protest and dishonour—Notice of Dishonour—Waiver.....	263
81.	Waiver.....	261
82.	Liability of Bank for Default of Notary.....	423
83.	Warrantor donneur d'aval.....	570
84.	Notice of.....	522
85.	Notice of.....	618
86.	Bill of Exchange Drawn Abroad accepted Payable in London—Liquidation of Acceptors—Protest for non Payment—Protests for Better Security—Commission—Notarial—Expenses—Bills of Exch Act 1882 (Eng).....	476
<i>(See also Libel and Slander 51-52—Custom and Usage 2.)</i>		
87.	Reissue of Note.....	4
88.	Signature—Question Whether one of the Signers, a Joint Maker or Witness Only—Evidence—Presentment.....	423
89.	Mining Agents—Signature Followed by Letters "Mg. Agts."—Effect of—Bills of Exch. Act 1890, sec. 26.....	509
90.	Statute of Frauds—Order on Executors.....	329
91.	Transfer—of Note After Maturity.....	522
92.	Without Indorsement—Warranty—Laches.....	70
<i>See Companies 41—Partnership 26, 27—Principal and Agent 5, 9, 10, 11—Principal and Surety 1, 2.</i>		
BOARDS OF HEALTH.		
	Nature and Liability of.....	5
	Abatement of Nuisance—Notice to owner of Premises.....	135
BONDS.		
1.	Condition—Breach—Bonus—Liquidated Damages—Confirmed 21 S. C. R., 716.....	263
2.	Liability—Contract—Tender for—Acceptance—Consideration.....	71
3.	Construction—Yearly or half-yearly Bonds—Accounts.....	424
4.	Surety—Withdrawal of—Official Bond.....	193
5.	Affidavit of Justification—Cross Examination—Partnership.....	31
6.	Release of—Erasing name.....	3
"BOODLER"—See Libel and Slander 5		
BOOKS OF COMPANY—RIGHT TO INSPECT—See Companies 61.		
BOOMAGE.		
	Charges for—Agreements—Renunciation Rights—Estoppel by Conduct—Renoncia tion Tacite.....	

	PAGES.
"BOOMED AND DELIVERED TO TUG"	
See Contracts 48.	
BOYCOTT—See Trade Unions 2.	
BREACH OF PROMISE OF MARRIAGE—	
See Marriage.	
BROKERS—See Gambling Transactions 3-6.	
DEPOSIT OF CUSTOMER'S SECURITY—	
See Banks 33.	
DISOBEYING INSTRUCTIONS—DAM-	
AGES—See Contracts 17.	
PLEDGE OF SECURITIES—See Banks 48.	
MONEY OF CLIENT—PAYING INTO	
CREDIT OF HIS OWN ACCOUNT—	
See Banks 47.	
BUILDING SOCIETIES.	
1. Member—Notice of Withdrawal—Alter-	
ation in Rules after Notice and Before	
Payment.....	125
2. C.S.L.C., ch. 69—By-laws—Transfer of	
Shares—Pledge—Art. 1970, C. C.—Insol-	
vent Creditor's Right of Action—Art. 1981	
C. C.....	376
BURDEN OF PROOF—See Banks 23.	
See Bills & Notes 9, 10, 11, 63	
See Carriers 32, 7.	
See Negligence 31.	
See Partnership 9	
"BURNT"—See Insurance 178.	
CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT—See Intoxi-	
cating Liquors.	
CAPIAS.	
Ship Captain Leaving for Great Britain.....	72
"CAR LOAD"—See Contracts 30	
CARRIERS.	
OF GOODS.	
1. Delay in Delivery—Damages.....	264
2.    Caused by Strikes.....	264
3.    Reasonable Time.....	523
4.    Corpse—Damages.....	135
5.    Error in Way Bill.....	194
6. Connecting Lines—Liability for Injuries to	
Goods—Imperfect Pack-	
ing—Evidence—Ins-	
truction.....	194
7.    Burden of Proof—Pre-	
sumption—Sealed Cars	
Liability—Limitation	
of—Bill of Lading.....	571
8.    Advances—Steamship..	193
9.    Costs of Action for	
Damages.....	331
11. Freight—Dangerous—Negligence of Ship-	
per—Personal Injuries—Evidence	
—Excessive verdict.....	135
12.    Charges—Who Liable for.....	425
13. Insurance—Benefit of.....	5
14. Liability for Goods destroyed by Fire at	
Station.....	571
15.    as Insurer—Breach of Contract—	
Damages.....	194
16.    for Injury to Thorough-Bred Dog	
Agency—Damages—Measure	
of—Evidence.....	280
17. Limiting Liability—Live Stock—Special	
Contract.....	72
18.    Owner's Risk Note....	619
19.    Live Stock—Palace	
Horse Cars.....	194
20.    Live Stock—Hogs.....	427

	PAGES.
21. Validity of Special	
Contract—51 Vict. c.	
29, s. 346, sub-sec. 3(D) 591	
22. Express Company—	
Liability for Loss....	72
23. Contract.....	5
24. Special Conditions—	
Fragile Goods—Art.	
1676 C. C.—Special	
Rates for Perishable	
Goods.....	380
25. Live Stock—Horse—"Inherent Vice.....	619
26. Rates—Unlawful Discrimination ...	477
27. Refusal of Goods by Consignee—Sale by	
Carrier.....	265
OF PASSENGERS AND THEIR BAGGAGE.	
28. Accidents to Passengers—Alighting at Eat-	
ing Station.....	179
29. Contributory	
Negligence—Art. 1675	
C. C.....	619
30. Contributory	
Negligence.....	523
31. Negligence—	
Alighting.....	477
(See also Negligence).	
32. Baggage—Connecting Lines—Burden of	
Proof.....	127
33. Connecting Lines.....	523
34. Loss of—Limiting Liability.....	331
35. Sleeping Car Company—Liabi-	
lity of (Confirmed by Ct. of Appeal	
Jan. 1894).....	121
36. Sleeping Car Company—Liabili-	
ty of. (This case is now before	
the Ct. of Cassation).....	323
37. Contract of Carriage—Reasonable Accom-	
modation—Overfilling Carriage	
—Negligence—Attack from Fel-	
low—Passengers—Remoteness of	
Damages.....	264
38. Robbery in Train—Overcrowd-	
ing.....	427
39. Imbecile Emigrant—United States	
Law—Obligation to Carry	
Back to Port from Whence he	
Came.....	477
40. Ticket—Extension of Time.....	477
41. Limited Trains.....	477
42. Conditions on Ticket.....	264
43. Rights of Season Ticket Holders	
Strike.....	73
44. Negligence of Employee—Pas-	
senger Directed into Car Cut off	
from Train—Damages.....	523
45. Defective Road Bed.....	523
46. Delay—Liability for Steamboats in Con-	
nection with Trains.....	478
47. Ejectment—Non Payment of Fare.....	5
48. Defective Ticket—Form of Ac-	
tion.....	73
49. Payment of Fare—Sunday....	136
50. From Street Car—Arrest by	
Policeman—Liability of Comp.	
195	
51. Knowledge of Rules of Comp. 195	
52. Passenger Falling Asleep and	
Carried Beyond Destination—	
Rights of Conductor. ....	264

CARRIERS.	PAGES.		PAGES.
53. Pleading—Injuries—Relation of Passenger and Common Carrier — Avera-ments of Declaration—Allegation of Termini.....	195	19.	—Payment of Dividend out of Capital—Stale Demand. 75
54. Rights of Persons who are not Passengers — Negligence—Street Car.....	332	20.	Powers of..... 202
55. Street Car — Who is Authorized to Permit one to Ride.....	523	21.	—To Vote Salary — Ratification..... 272
58. — Street Car — Injury to Child....	478	22.	Present from Promotor to Director — Nominal Vendor with no Interest..... 525
57. Who are Passengers? .....	478	23.	Qualification— Beneficial ownership..... 429
58. ....	523	24.	Dissolution—Violation of Charter..... 270
CEMETERY ASSOCIATION—See Expropriation 4.		25.	Dividend—Profits—Increase in Value of Assets—Land Company..... 332
CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSIT—See Bills & Notes 12.		26.	False Representations — Capital Stock — Statement of Corporation..... 10
CERTIORARI.		27.	Fraudulent Conveyance..... 384
Commissioners Court—Jurisdiction — Quasi-Contract.....	651	28.	Sales — Rights of Minority Stockholders..... 384
(See also Intoxicating Liquors 2.)		29.	Indictment for Keeping Disorderly House — Appearance by Attorney — Jurisdiction. 271
CHAMPERTY.....	196 197	30.	Insolvency—Preferring Creditors..... 272
CHARITABLE BEQUESTS — WHAT ARE — See Wills 1. 2. 3.		31.	—Preferring Creditors..... 272
CHARTER-PARTY—See Ships & Shipping 4.—7.		32.	—What Constitutes..... 47
CHEQUES—See Banks.		33.	Issue of Shares at a Discount..... 380
CHINESE EXCLUSION ACT.		34.	Memorandum & Articles of Association— Construction — Power to Borrow — “ Issue ” — Oral Charge on Uncalled Capital 524
Deportation.....	7	35.	— Construction—Director— Qualification—The Companies Act 1862 (Eng.)... 138
CHURCHES—See Religious Societies.		36.	— Alteration of Objects — Extension to New Business — Alteration of Name of Company—Companies (Memorandum of Association) Act, 1890 (Eng.)..... 137
CLUBS.—See Intox. Liquors 10.		37.	— Limited by Guarantee — Right in Security — Pledge — Power to Hypothecate Guarantee Letters in Security of Advances — “ Ultra Vires ” — Companies Act, 1862 (Eng.)..... 138
COLLATERAL SECURITY—See Pledge, 1, 2, 3.		38.	Officers—Compensation for Services..... 202
COLLISION—See Ships 8.		39.	Promoting—Construction..... 524
COMBINATIONS IN RESTRAINT OF TRADE — See Restraint of Trade.		40.	Promotion Expenses—Liability of Directors for..... 428
“ COMMENCED ” — ACTION — See Limitations of Actions 2.		41.	Liability of Promoters for — Partnership — Ontario Company..... 428
COMMERCIAL TRAVELLERS.		42.	Preliminary Expenses — Liability to Account — Personal Bar..... 75
Travelling Expenses — French Currency — Foreign Currency.....	620	43.	President—Authority of..... 82
COMMISSIONER'S COURT. — Quasi-Contract— See Certiorari.			(See also Sale of Goods 6).
COMPANY LAW.		44.	Promissory Notes—Corporate Liabilities... 270
1. Agency—Powers of Agent—Apparent authority.....	69	45.	Purchase of Their Own Shares—Creditors — Seniority—Trust Deed for Benefit of Creditors — Avoidance — Fraud..... 270
2. Contracts— Before organisation— Ratification—Statute of Frauds.....	201	46.	—Sale of Assets..... 429
3. Between Creditor and Stockholder .....	201	47.	Residence of Company—Where Head Office Exists—Cannot Change Residence—53, V. c. 60 (N. B.)..... 273
4. Estoppel to deny authority....	269	48.	Stock—Issue to Officer..... 10
5. Estoppel—Corporate Indebtedness.....	143	49.	—Powers Relating to Dealing in..... 144
6. Ultra Vires—Restraint of Trade 202		50.	—Transfers of... 82-272
7. Creditors of Corporation—Priority. ....	270	51.	Stockholders—Action against — Res Judicata .....
8. De Facto Corporation—Liability—Exercise of Corporate Franchise—Account Stated. 270			10
9. Debentures—Minority, Powers of—Trust. ....	573		
10. Uncalled Capital—“Assets”... ..	573		
11. Majority—Power to Bind dissentient Minority — ‘Compromise’ — Notice of Meeting — Time.....	573		
12. Bonds issued to Stockholders. 524			
13. Mortgage Bonds — Construction — Action by Individual Bondholders.....	200		
14. Solicitor — Retaining Lien— Debenture-Holder's Action... ..	266		
15. Priority—First and Second Issue.....	573		
16. Directors—Fees—Unpaid Calls—Set-off....	573		
17. Interest in Contract.....	574		
18. Liability—Ultra Vires Acts ....	420		



## COMPANY LAW.

	PAGES.
52. —Action—Right of.....	141
53. —Action for Stock—Transfers —Forgery.....	141
54. —Action against by Creditor of Corporation.....	202
55. —Individual Liability—Joint Stock Companies.....	74
56. —Liability for Unpaid Assess- ments.....	201
57. —Liability — Assignment for Benefit of Creditors — Val- idity — Powers of Direct- ors .....	203
58. —Liability—Record not Con- clusive—Unauthorized Trans- fer of Customer's Stock to Broker's Name—Disaffirma- nce—Estoppel .....	11
59. —Shares—Collateral Security — Liability to Contribution — Transfer of Shares only Partly Paid-up as Fully Paid-up—Di- rectors—Agreement — Absen- ce of Corporate Act—" Ultra Vires "—Ratification by Meet- ing of Creditors (Reversed by Supreme Ct Nov. 20 1893).....	75
60. —Withdrawal .....	430
61. —Right of to Inspect Books— Mandamus .....	202
62. —Sale of Property on Execu- tion — Contest by Stock- holders .....	200
93. —Rights of—Acts of Directors —Charters.....	202
64. Subscriptions before Organization — With- drawal .....	331
65. —Procured by Fraud.....	480
66. —Misrepresentations—Wind- ing-up —Contributory.....	332
67. —Contributories.....	47
68. — do .....	47
<i>(See also International Law 1).</i>	
69. Voting—Proxy.....	429
70. Winding-up—Claim Filed without Mention of Security — Application for Leave to Withdraw—R. S. C., c. 129, s. 62—Rule 71.....	111
71. —Power to Carry on Business —R. S. O., c. 183, s. 6, sub-s. 1....	620
72. —Just and Equitable — Sub- stratum Gone—Wishes of Con- tributories—Companies (Wind- ing-up Act—(Eng.) 1890, sec. 8. ....	525
73. —Costs — Two Petitions Pre- sented by Creditors—Costs of Second Petitioner .....	111
74. — Director's Liability — Mis- feasance — Payment of Divi- dends out of Capital — Ultra Vires — Lapse of Time—Stale- ness of Demand — Statute of Limitations.....	266
75. — Director — Illegal Transac- tion — Summary Application to Set Aside — R. S. O. c. 183, s. 23 sub-s. 17 .....	265
76. —Sale of Assets by Liquidator — Order of County Court Ap- proving — R. S. O. c. 183 — Practice—Appeal—Final Order	265

	PAGES.
77. — Liquidator—Appointment of —Costs of Contest for.....	574
78. — Liquidator — Commission — Allowance of Commission on Sett-offs.....	266
79. Liquidator—Joint Stock Com- panies' Act, 1862-83 (Imperial) — Winding-up Act — Liquid- ator, Status of, before Cana- dian Courts — Intervention — Deposit — Saisie-Arrêt.....	428
80. —Liquidator—Rev. Stats. Can. sec. 31.....	574
81. — Voluntary Assignment for Benefit of Creditors—Approval of Majority of Creditors — Dis- cretion—R. S. C. c. 129, sec. 9. ...	620

*(See also Estoppel (Share—Certificate) 1.*

*(See also Trusts (Receiver) 2.)*

COMPENSATION — See Contracts 4.

CONDITION PRECEDENT—See Sale of Goods 40.

CONDITION PRECEDENT OR WARRANTY —  
See Ships.....

CONFISCATION.

Capital Punishment—Powers of Legislature

—Constitut. Law.....

CONFLICT OF LAWS.

Wills—Perpetuities .....

*(See Bills and Notes 18, 19, 20 — Banks 34 —  
Foreign Law.)*

CONSPIRACY — See Bills and Notes 41 — Trade  
Union 1

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

## CANADIAN.

1. Dominion Parliament — Validity of Domi-  
nion Acts — 31 V. c. 17  
— 33 V. c. 40—Banking  
and Incorporation of  
Banks — Bankruptcy  
and Insolvency—Taxa-  
tion — Exemption —  
Crown Lands — Be-  
neficial Interests of  
Crown.....
- 141
2. —Validity of Domi-  
nion Acts—31 V. c. 17  
(D)—33 V. c. 50 (D)—  
Banking and Incor-  
poration of Banks —  
Bankruptcy and In-  
solveney—Taxation—  
Exemption — Crown  
Lands—Beneficial In-  
terest of Crown—Ont-  
ario .....
- 141
3. —Customs Act—Pow-  
ers of Dominion Par-  
liament to Impose  
Taxation—33 V., c. 20  
—"Ex Post Facto Le-  
gislation"—"Property  
and Civil Rights"  
—Right of Parliament  
to Impose an Addi-  
tional Tax after Goods  
are Taken out of  
Warehouse.....
- 138
4. Provincial Legislature—Interest—B. N. A.  
Act, S. 91 — Legisla-

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

PAGES.

tive Authority over  
— Municipal Act —  
Taxation — Addi-  
tional Rate for Non-  
Payment..... 77

5. — Education—Consti-  
tution of Manitoba  
— 33 Vict., c. 3 (D.)—  
Act Respecting Edu-  
cation — Denomina-  
tional Rights—Sepa-  
rate Schools (Re-  
versed by Priv. Coun-  
cil [1892] App. Case.  
445)..... 78

— Executive Power—  
Commis. of Inquiry  
— R. S. Q. 590, 598. —  
Prohibition, Writ of 141

7. — Giving Evidence  
Criminal Matters—  
R. S. O. 61, s. 9 —  
Offence against Onta-  
rio Liquor License  
Act — Evidence of  
Defendant..... 198

8. — Giving Evidence  
in Criminal Matters  
— R. S. O. c. 61, s. 9 —  
Intra Vires—Crimin-  
al Procedure—Offen-  
ces against Provin-  
cial Enactments —  
Evidence of Defen-  
dant..... 198

9. Pardonng Power —  
Validity of 51 V., c.  
5 (O) — Royal Prero-  
gative — Commut-  
ing and Remitting  
Sentences — Powers  
of Lieutenant-Gov-  
nors..... 199

10. — Intoxicating Li-  
quors—Sale of..... 8

(See also Expropriation — Confiscation—  
Taxation — Lotteries 1.)

AMERICAN.

11. Taxation—Peddlers' License..... 526

12. Of Corporate Stock..... 480

13. Express Companies..... 8

14. Foreign Corporations..... 267

15. Power of State to Regulate Elevator  
Charges..... 267

"CONTANGO"—See Banks 33.  
CONTEMPT OF COURT.

1. Attempt to Intimidate Witness ..... 79

2. Disobeying Injunction—Motion to Quash  
Appeal ..... 622

3. Newspaper Publication ..... 480

4. — Costs — Sentence  
— Stay of Execution after Sentence —  
Appeal..... 623

5. Nature of the Offence — Obstruction to  
Public Justice—Power of Crown to Remit  
Sentence — Appeal from the Bahamas..... 430

6. Refusal of Witness Summoned under s. 27  
of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 (46 & 47 Vict.  
c. 52), to Submit to Examination — Motion

PAGES\*

for Committal—Civil Process — Privilege  
of Parliament — Bankruptcy Rules — 1886,  
R.R. 70, 83... 130  
(See Bills and Notes 50 — Mun. Corp. 58.)

CONTRACTS.

1. Agreement to Pay when able—Parol Evid-  
ence ..... 199

2. Condition—Breach — Damages (Confirmed  
by Supreme Ct. see page 72)..... 5

3. Breach of—Loss of Profits—Damages..... 70

4. Compensation—Defence..... 268

5. Benefits..... 526

6. Damages—Prospective Profits. 481

7. No Specific Time for Delivery  
— Unavoidable Delay—Reason-  
able Time ..... 9  
(See also Damages 2, 7 — Club).

8. By Architect — Commission — Cost of  
Building More than amount Contract-  
ed for—Basis of Remuneration—Li-  
ability of Members of Building Com-  
mittee of Church. .... 26

9. Advertiser—Fulfillment of Conditions  
— Usages..... 431

10. Correspondence — Offer and Accept-  
ance — Post Office,  
Effect of Using —  
Withdrawal Re-  
ceived After Post-  
ing but Before Re-  
ceipt of Acceptance 391

11. Proposal by Tele-  
gram—Acceptance. 432

12. Negotiation by Tele-  
gram — Incomplete-  
ness — Acceptance  
of Offer not Proved 623

13. Under the Civil and  
Common Law —  
Article..... 112

14. Lunatic — Not Knowing him to be  
Lunatic..... 575

15. Mayor—Reward Offered by City..... 79

16. Municipal Corporation — Capacity to  
Contract Except Under Seal ..... 142  
(See also Mun. Corp. 15, 29).

17. Stock Broker — Consideration — Diso-  
beying Instructions— Measure of Dam-  
ages..... 333

18. Telephone Company—Transmission of  
Messages — Construction of Term —  
Breach ..... 200

19. Building Contract — Effect of Custom or  
Usage of Trade. . . 480

20. Charges of Quantity  
Surveyor — Liability  
of Builder — Usage. 135

21. Bulk Sum Contract—Engineer's Certificate  
Finality of—Deduction—Engineers, Pow-  
ers of -Interest . . . 143

22. Consideration — Member of Parliament —  
Government Situation. . . 310

23. Public Policy—Bondsman  
Liquor License . . . 267

24. Bankruptcy — Note..... 199

25. Illegal — Stifling Prosecu-  
tion — Pres-ure ..... 257

26. Suretyship — Indorsement  
of Note—Right to Commis-  
sion for Indorsing..... 143  
(See Bonds 2.)

CONTRACTS.		PAGES.	CONTRACTOR.		PAGES.
27.	Construction — Implied Promise — Breach thereof .....	9	1.	Liability for Damage to Property of Third Party—Landslip—Vis Major .....	269
28.	Sale of Stock .....	9	2.	for Construction of Wall upon Foundations made by Another .....	85
29.	Reasonable Efforts .....	480	3.	Independent—See Negligence 60, 61, 62, 63.	
30.	Uncertainty — Car Load .....	526	4.	Who is?—See Municipal Corporations 31.	
31.	Railway Co.—Debentures .....	430	CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE—See Carriers 29, 30—Negligence.		
32.	Toronto Street Ry. Co.... Purchase of Ry. by City of Toronto — Franchise — Road-Bed (Confirmed by Privy Council, see p. 639) .....	331	COPYRIGHT.		
33.	Parol Evidence—Wholesale Price .....	431	1.	Book — “ Map, Chart or Plan ” — Pattern Sleeve—Subject-Matter—Literary Merit—Copyright Act—(5 & 6 Vic., c. 45) ss. 1, 2 (Eng.) .....	432
(See also Insurance 42)			2.	Stenography .....	269
34.	Fraud — Engineer's Certificate .....	8	3.	Cast of Fruit and Leaves—51 Geo. 3, c. 56 ..	81
35.	For Construction of Public Works— Delay in Exercising Crown's Right to Inspect Material — Independent Promise by Crown's Servant, Effect of—Government Ry. Act 1881 — Estoppel .....	80	4.	Directory .....	432
36.	Construction of Railway — Standard of Quality — Evidence .....	79	5.	International Copyright Act 1844 to 1885 — English Copyright in Foreign Painting or Book—Right of Owner to sue for Infringement without Registration under Copyright Acts—The Berne Convention of Sept. 5, 1887—Order in Council of Nov. 28th, 1887, Adopting the Berne Convention — Fine Arts Copyright Act, 1862 (25 & 26 V., c. 68), s. 4—Copyright Act, 1842 (5 & 6 V., c. 45), s. 13—International Copyright Act, 1886 (49 & 50 V., c. 33) .....	432
37.	Personal Services — Injunction .....	621	6.	Photograph—Infringement by Lithograph .....	526
38.	.....	621	7.	When Subject to .....	200
39.	Injunction .....	574	8.	Time Tables—Interdict .....	526
40.	Specific Performance .....	621	9.	Webster's Dictionary—Advertisement .....	10
41.	Sale of Land — Building Restriction — Description — Street Boundaries — Construction of Covenant .....	575	CLUBS.		
42.	Sale of Land — Deed — Evidence — Agency — Statute of Frauds — Parol Evidence .....	333	1.	Contract—Breach of—Damages—Unincorporated Association .....	615
43.	Illegal—Public Policy—Bidding for Public Printing—Enforcement .....	575	2.	Furnishing Liquors to Members .....	197
44.	Sale of Intoxicating Liquors to be Illegally Sold in Another State. —	381	3.	Liability of Steward .....	269
45.	Stipulation — Validity of Other Stipulation .....	431	COSTS.		
46.	Public Policy—Real Estate Agents — Assessment to Divide Commissions .....	526	1.	Taxation—Experts .....	294
46a.	Implied—See Counties 2.		2.	Trade Mark — Infringement — Innocent Purchaser .....	274
46b.	In Restraint of Trade—See Restraint of Trade—Injunction 1.		(See also Expropriation 3, 11—Crown 5—Insurance 96—Companies 73.)		
47.	Liquidated Damages—Penalty—Sum Payable on one event Only — Non-Completion of Work by Day Specified .....	145	COUNTIES.		
47a.	Not to carry on business — See Damages 2.		1.	Mandamus—Res Judicata .....	274
48.	Of Sale—Construction—“ Boomed and Delivered to Tug ” .....	480	2.	Implied Contract—Employment of Attorney .....	201
(See also Sale).			3.	Liability for Injuries caused by Negligence .....	201
49.	Performance — “ And as Much More as Might be Delivered ” .....	8	CONSPIRACY.		
49a.	Printed Clauses and Written Clauses—See Insurance 121.		Indictment—Motion to Quash .....		
49b.	Privity of — See Water Companies 2.		CORPORATIONS—See Company Law—Taxation 7—Limitations of Actions 3—Master and Servant 1—Negligence 3.		
50.	Rescission—Mistake—Performance of Conditions—Revocation of Trust .....	267	CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE.		
51.	Evidence—Damages .....	142	1.	Abortion—Evidence—Declaration .....	330
52.	Mind Enfeebled by Epileptic Attacks .....	480	2.	Alibi—Burden of Proof .....	83
53.	Subscription to Aid Manufactory .....	8	3.	Arrest for misdemeanor—Escape—Killing by Officer .....	331
54.	Use of Advertising Idea .....	333	4.	Without Warrant—Homicide .....	481
55.	Termination—Breach .....	271	5.	Arson—Indictment—Variance .....	85
56.	Notice of—Default .....	9	6.	Assault—With Intent to Kill — Testimony as to Threats .....	81
57.	To Procure Insurance .....	480	7.	Deadly Weapon .....	205
(See also Master and Servant 7.)			8.	Attempt to—Verdict of .....	433
			9.	Administration of Poison .....	529
			10.	Felonious—Evidence .....	12
			11.	Deadly Weapon — Failure to Prove that Rifle was Loaded .....	585

CRIMINAL LAW AND PROCEDURE.	PAGES.		PAGES.
12. and Carnal Knowledge—Verdict of Guilty of Indecent Assault—Age—Consent.....	83	60. Murder—Evidence—Joint Defendants.....	275
13. and Carnally Knowing—General Verdict of Guilty.....	81	61. Instructions.....	81
14. Autrefois Acquit—Illegally Selling Liquor.....	274	62. Joint Defendants.....	205
15. Coroner's Jury.....	433	63. Incest—Evidence.....	83
16. Convict—Manslaughter—Summary Conviction.....	276	65. Insanity—Murder—Medical Testimony.....	145
17. Bail—Admission to.....	13	67. Larceny—What Constitutes.....	83
18. Writ of Error—R. S. C. ch. 174, s. 265.....	85	68. Attempt to Steal—Empty Pocket.....	275
19. Burglary—Charging Larceny.....	14	69. What Constitutes—Charge of Judge.....	274
20. Larceny.....	82	70. By Baillee—Attorney's Lien.....	520
21. Presumption of Guilt.....	81	71. Embezzlement.....	11
22. Carnal Knowledge of Girl Under Thirteen—Male Under Fourteen.....	433	72. Malicious Mischief—Evidence.....	205
23. City Ordinance—Violation of—Driving on Sidewalk.....	145	73. Nolle Prosequi.....	14
24. Cohabitation—Conjugal Union—§3 Vic. (D) c. 37, s. 11.....	145	74. Perjury.....	276
25. Conviction—Daisy Hopkins Case.....	276	75. Principal and Accessory.....	275
26. Cruelty to Animals—Non-feasance—No Evidence of Guilty Knowledge of Animal's Condition—Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1849 (12 & 13 V., c. 92), (Eng.) s. 2.....	275	76. Profanity—Verdict.....	11
27. Detection of Crime by Photography—Article.....	465	77. Prostitution—What Constitutes the Offense.....	529
28. Disorderly House.....	85	78. Rape—Resistance—Evidence.....	576
29. Disturbing Public Worship.....	12	79. Robbery—Stealing.....	82
30. Election—Prosecuting Attorney.....	85	80. Reserved Case—Amendment—Notice to Prisoner to Produce Document—Verbal Evidence.....	85
31. Embezzlement—Deposit with Master.....	83	81. Presence of Defendants.....	335
32. What Constitutes.....	274	82. Second Appeal—Res Judicata.....	85
33. Evidence—Communications with Attorney.....	275	83. Self-Defence—Provocation.....	275
34. Dying Declarations.....	275	84. Speedy Trials Act—Bail Surrendering—Right to Elect to be Tried Summarily—Subsequent Indictments Quashed—Several Offences—Valuable Security.....	576
35. Confession.....	433	85. Theft—Baccarat—French Case.....	433
36. Receiving Stolen Goods.....	206	86. of Dog.....	82
37. Of Other Crimes.....	205	87. what Constitutes—Presence of Borrowing Saddle.....	529
38. Conspiracy to Defraud.....	335	88. Trial—Appeal—Objections Waived—Judicial Notice.....	276
39. Larceny—Photograph.....	530	89. Arguments of Counsel.....	206
40. Res Gestæ.....	481	90. Instructions—Reasonable Time.....	13
41. Homicide.....	206 531	92. Written Instructions by Judge "The Word "Guilty" Written on Margin by Inadvertence Inst'd of "Given".....	530
42. Manufacture of False Evidence, Attempt to Pervert Due Course of Justice—Judicial Tribunal—Arbitrators—Tampering with Arbitration Samples.....	12	93. Accomplices.....	335
(See also Constitutional Law 7. S.)		94. Presumption of Innocence.....	205
43. False Pretences—Indictment.....	275	95. — Jury — Grand Jury — Removal of Disqualified Member.....	14
44. Forcible Detainment—Evidence.....	530	97. Mixed—Challenge.....	385
45. Forgery—What Constitutes.....	528	98. Practice—Venires.....	275
46. Comparison of Handwriting—Evidence.....	205	99. Refusal of Permission to Counsel to Examine Jurors on their <i>voir dire</i> , etc.....	205
47. Knowledge of—Note.....	204	100. Crown Case Reserved—Judge's Order for Grand Jury—Additional Petit Jurors.....	385
48. Indictment.....	204	101. New Trial—Newly Discovered Evidence.....	206
49. Signing name of Dead or Incapacitated Person.....	433	102. Uttering Forged Note—Incipient Fraud.....	205
50. Gaming—Selling Property by Lot or Chance—R. S. C. c. 159, s. 2.....	482	103. Verdict—Sufficiency of.....	13
51. Homicide—Aider and Abettor.....	529	105. Weapons—Carrying—Self-Defence.....	529
52. Conspiracy.....	12	106. Witnesses—Duty of Prosecutor to Call all.....	530
53. Burden of Proof.....	13	(See also Justice of the Peace 2(Crim. Code ss. §15, §17, §57) 3—Weapons—Trade Union 1—Extradition—Conspiracy.)	
54. Culpable—Child-Birth—Neglect to Call for Assistance—Indictment—Relevancy.....	335		
55. Justifiable.....	529		
56. Robbery.....	481		
57. Manslaughter.....	12		
58. —Neglect of Person of Full Age.....	433		

	PAGES.		PAGES.
<b>CROWN.</b>		9.	Trespass—Fruit Trees..... 337
1. Obligations of—Government Railway—Boundary Ditches.....	90	10.	Assault..... 483
2. Navigation—Interference with Public Right of—Injunction—Jurisdiction.....	30	11.	Deceit..... 531 (See also Carriers (Thoroughbred Dog) 16—Banks—Negligence (Injuries to Children) 47).
3. Lands—Location Tickets—Transfer of Purchaser's Rights—Registration of—Waiver by Crown—Cancellation of License—23 Vic., ch. 2, ss. 18 & 20—32 Vic., ch. 11, s. 18 (Q.)—36 Vic., ch. 8 (Q.).....	145	12.	Personal Injuries—Child knocked down by Vehicle..... 183
4. Pre-emption—Statutory Right to—Lands Reserved.....	357	13.	Falling Ice..... 483
(See also Constitutional Law 1. 2—Taxation 5. 6.)		14.	Assault and Battery—College "Rush"..... 433
5. Minor Prerogatives—Action for Penalty—Appeal—Petroleum Inspection Act—Costs—Security for.....	613	15.	Slipping on Sidewalk. 483
6. Appeal from Report of Official Referee—Damages to Property from Works Executed on Government Railway—Parol Undertaking to Indemnify Owners for Costs of Repairs by Officer of the Crown—Effect of.....	128	16.	Railway Accident—Discharge..... 86
(See also Contracts 25—Customs 2—Negligence 61.)		17.	Probable Cause—Arrest as a Dangerous Lunatic..... 277
<b>CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.</b>		18.	Proceedings to Obtain Payment of Debt—Marilee..... 277
(See also Criminal Law—Cruelty to Animals).		18a.	Punitive—See Libel and Slander 7—Mun. Corp. 63.
1. Conviction of Master for Act of Servant—Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1850 (13 and 14 Vict. cap. 92), sec. 1.—Scotland.	531	18b.	Undertaking as to—See Injunction 10.
2. Rabbit Coursing—"Domestic Animals".....	576	19.	Debt Collecting Agencies, Liability of..... 254
(See also Criminal Law 26.)		20.	Remoteness—See Carriers 37.
<b>CURATOR TO SUBSTITUTION—</b>			(See also Libel and Slander 53, 55, 56, 57—Landlord and Tenant 2—Animals—Evidence 15—False Arrest 1—Fraud 4—Crown 6—Interest—Procedure 10—Sale 49).
See Substitution.		<b>DEBT COLLECTING AGENCIES, LIABILITY OF</b>	—See Damages 19.
<b>CUSTOM AND USAGE.</b>		<b>DEBENTURES—RAILWAY COMP.—</b>	See Contracts 31.
1. Evidence.....	531	<b>DECEIT—</b>	See Damage 1. 11. Fraud 4.
2. Promissory Note—Notice of Dishonor—(Amer.).....	531	<b>DEEDS.</b>	(See also Delivery.)
(See also Contracts 19, 20—Bills and Notes 15, 16—Insurance (Marine) 170).		1. Action to Set Aside—Undue Influence—Evidence—Nova Scotia.....	433
<b>CUSTOMS.</b>		2. Construction of—Trust—Parol Evidence of—Enforcement—Findings of Fact—Non-interference with.....	227
1. Duties—Market Value—Value for Duty—Costs.....	105	3. Scotch Law—Conveyance—Sale of Superiority—General Words of Description in Dispositive Clause—Construction—Subsidiary Clauses—Right to Coals.....	183
2. Goods Stolen While in Bond in Customs Warehouse—Claim for Value Thereof Against the Crown—Crown not a Bailee—Personal Remedy against Officer Through whose Act or Negligence the Loss Happens	361	4. Fraudulent—See Insolvency 4, 5.	
<b>DAMAGES.</b>		<b>DEFECT IN SUBSTANCE OR IN FORM—</b>	See Justice of the Peace 2.
1. Deceit—Evidence.....	15	<b>DELIVERY.</b>	
2. Breach of Contract—Contract not to Carry on Business—Evidence.....	206	1. Deeds—What Constitutes.....	181
(See also Contracts 6.)		2.....	531
3. Fire—Title to Sue—Insurance.....	337	3. Gift of Money—What Constitutes.....	483
4. Grounds for—Land—Injurious Affection of—Construction of a Railway Siding on a Side-Walk Contiguous thereto—Measure of Damages.....	15	(See Sale of Goods.)	
5. Property—Injurious Affection of by Construction of Public Work—Obstruction of Access.....	15	<b>DEMURRAGE—</b>	See Ships 10, 18.
6. Coke Ovens—Injury to Adjoining Land.....	14	<b>DETECTION OF CRIME BY PHOTOGRAPHY..</b>	465
7. Measure of—Breach of Building Contract.	14	<b>DEVIATION—</b>	See Ships 2, 3.
8. Ice—Destruction.....	14	<b>DIRECTORY—</b>	See Master & Servant 46.
		<b>DISAVOWAL.</b>	
		Action in—Prescription.....	128
		<b>DISHONORABLE CONDUCT—</b>	See Libel & Sland.
		<b>DISORDERLY HOUSE—</b>	See Companies 29.
		<b>DIVORCE—</b>	See Domicile 1, 2.
		<b>DOMESTIC ANIMALS—</b>	See Cruelty to Animals 2.
		<b>DOMICILE.</b>	
		1. Husband and Wife—Divorce—Jurisdiction—Scotland.....	86
		2. Husband and Wife—Divorce—Jurisdiction—Domicile of Succession—Scotch Law.....	52
		(See also Foreign Law 1 2).	

	PAGES.
<b>DONATION.</b>	
1. Subsequent Deed—Giving in Payment—Registration—Arts. 806, 1592 C. C.....	386
2. Undue Influence—Religion—Confidential Relationship.....	434
<b>DRAFTS</b> —See Banks 25, 26, 27.	
<b>EASEMENTS</b> —See Evidence 15—Railways 31—Waters etc.	
<b>EFFECTS</b> —See Wills 13.	
<b>ELECTION OF REMEDIES</b> —See Banks 31.	
<b>ELECTIONS.</b>	
1. Ballot—Marking.....	259
2. Corrupt Practices—Promise to Procure Employment by Candidate—Finding of the Trial Judges—49 V. c. 8, s. 81, (b).....	338
3. Loan for Travelling Expenses—Proof of Corrupt Intent—Executive Contract—Free Railway Ticket.....	339
4. Expenses—Agency—Dominion Act.....	623
4a. Municipal—See Mun. Corp. 33, 31.	
5. Petition—Appeal—Deposit of Security..	208
6. ....	278
7. Return of Deposit—Dissolution of Parliament.....	146
8. Non Suit.....	87
9. Preliminary Objection—English General Rules—Manitoba—Description and Occupation of Petitioner—(Dominion Act)....	87
10. Preliminary Objection—Service at Domicile—Domin. Act.....	87
11. Preliminary Objection—Reservice of—Order Granting Extension of Time—Description of Petitioner—Dominion Act..	88
12. Preliminary Examination of Respondent—Order to Postpone Until After Session of Parliament—Effect of—Six Month's Limit—Dominion Act.....	208
13. Status of Petitioner—Onus Probandi.....	207
14. Status of Petitioner—Onus Probandi.....	87
15. Status of Petitioner—When to be determined—Dominion Act.....	208
16. Substituting Petitioners.....	83
(See also Procedure 2.)	
17. Recount—Quebec Act—Notice of Order	338
18. Voters' List—Revising Officer—Electoral Franchise Act, R. S. C., ch. 5, ss. 19, 33—Notice of Objection to Names on Voters' List—Grounds of Objection—"Not Qualified"—Validity of Notice—Ruling of Revising Officer upon—Appeal to County Judge (Confirmed by Ct. of Appeal, see page 295).....	157
<b>ELECTRIC COMPANIES.</b>	
1. Rights in Subways.....	16
2. Plant—See Nuisance 2,	
3. Poles—See Lien.	
4. Wires—See Injunction 3.	
(See also Mun. Corp. 35.)	
<b>ELECTRICITY AS A NUISANCE</b> —See Street Railways 2.	

	PAGES.
<b>EMINENT DOMAIN</b> —See Expropriation. See Mun. Corp. (Market Stall)	59
<b>EMIGRANT, IMBECILE</b> —See Carriers 39.	
<b>ESTOPPEL.</b>	
1. Company—Share—Certificate—Certificate under Company's Seal—Damages.....	626
2. What Constitutes.....	532
(See also Bills & Notes 31, 32, 30, 33—Boonage—Companies 1, 5, 58—Partnership 16—Principal & Agent 18—Mun. Corp. 23.)	
<b>EVIDENCE.</b>	
1. Books of Account.....	210
(See also Partnership (Books) 7, S.)	
2. Declaration of Agent.....	17
3. ....	210
1. of Architect—Building Contracts.....	481
5. of Attorneys.....	431
6. of Directors.....	279
7. of one of several Defendants.....	210
8. of Principal.....	279
9. Res Gestæ.....	209
9a. Expert—See Expropriation 10.	
10. Foreign Commission—Application to Suppress—Irregularity—Waiver.....	210
11. Application for—Material—Good Faith—Necessity for Evidence—Expense—Delay—Admissions... ..	280
12. Handwriting.....	209 217
13. —Comparison.....	280
(See also Banks 11.)	
14. In Action for Slander.....	17
15. Damages—Injunction—Easement.....	17
16. Malicious Prosecution—Police Officer's Privilege—Disclosure of Information—Discretion of Judge.....	147
17. Injuries.....	89
18. ....	209
19. Physician.....	279
20. ....	17
21. In Criminal Cases—Assault & Battery... ..	18
22. Adultery.....	250
23. False Swearing.....	18
24. Homicide.....	18
25. Insanity.....	18
(See also Crim. Law.)	
26. Opinions—Damages.....	279
27. Injury to Horse.....	89
(See also Witnesses 2.)	
28. Parol—Contract—Wholesale Price.....	17
(See also Contract 1. 33—Deeds 2—Sale 19)	
29. Privileged Communications.....	532
<b>EXECUTOR</b> —See Title to Land.	
<b>EXPRESS COMPANIES</b> —See Railways 27—Carriers 22.	
<b>EXPROPRIATION.</b>	
1. Award—Interference with.....	434
2. ....	435
3. R. S. Q. 5161, ss. 15, 16, 17, 18, 21—Award—Arbitrators—Jurisdiction of—Lands Injuriouly Affected—43 & 44 V., c. 48 P. P.) Appeal—Amount in Controversy—Costs—Quebec.....	147
4. Cemetery Association—Powers of—Constitutional Law.....	88

EXPROPRIATION.	PAGES.	FRUIT TREE — See Damages 9.	PAGES.
4a. Market Stall — See Mun. Corp. 59.		<b>GAMBLING TRANSACTIONS.</b>	
5. Public Use — Elevated Tramways .....	17	1. Baseball — Game of Skill .....	577
6. Taking for Streets — Measure of Damages		2. Loan to Player at Cards — Club Waiter —	
Award .....	279	Nullity .....	435
7. Opening Street Across Railway — Tender		3. Stock Speculations — Broker — Advances 534 168	
of Damages Assessed — Appeal — Costs —		1. Broker — Commission — Art. 1927 C.	
American Case. ....	209	C. — Usage — Pledge — Art.	
8. Under Ry. Act — Country Residence.....	434	1792 C. C.....	534
(See also Arbitration — Railways 25. 25½.)		5. Refusal to Deliver Stocks 168	
9. Value of Land taken — Proof of — Res		6. Option Dealings — Recovery of	
Judicata.....	279	Amount Lost.....	381
10. Value of Land taken — Expert Evidence..	279	(See also <i>Crim. Law</i> 50.)	
11. Witnesses — Cost of and Advocates — Art.		<b>GARNISHMENT — See Bills &amp; Notes 39 — Banks 5.</b>	
407 C. C .....	434	<b>GIFTS — See Donations.</b>	
<b>EXTRADITION.</b>		<b>GOOD WILL (See also Restraint of Trade.)</b>	
Habeas Corpus — Indictment — Validity....	577	1. "Carrying on same Business" ....	282, 647 650
<b>FACTOR.</b>		2. Rights of Surviving Partners... ..	539
Mercantile Agent — Person Employed to		3. Taxation — Hotel.....	387
Sell on Commission.....	435	1. What Constitutes — Assignment — Trade	
<b>"FALSA DEMONSTRATIO NON DOCET" —</b>		Name.....	340
See Insurance 32.		(See also <i>Trade Marks</i> 2 — <i>Partnership</i> 15. 21.)	
<b>FALSE ARREST.</b>		<b>GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE.</b>	
1. Justice of the Peace — Illegal Commit-		Official Report — Privileged Communication	
ment of Witness — Malice — R. S. C., ch.		Malice.....	282
178, s. 32 — Damages.....	89	<b>GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS — See Crown 1. 6.</b>	
2. What Constitutes — Arrest on Suspicion		<b>GUARANTEE INSURANCE — See Insurance,</b>	
— Justification — Probable Cause .....	532	(Guarantee).....	128
(See also <i>Damages</i> 17 — <i>Libel &amp; Slander</i> 50)		<b>HABEAS CORPUS — See Extradition.</b>	
<b>FAMILY — MEANING OF.....</b>	18	<b>HANDWRITING — See Evidence 12. 13 — Banks 11.</b>	
<b>FEEES.</b>		<b>HIGHWAYS.</b>	
New Tariff — Quebec — Pending Cases .....	281	1. Dedication.....	282
<b>FELLOW SERVANT — See Master and Servant</b>		2. Railroad Crossing .....	282
S. 9. 10. 11. 12.		(See also <i>Negligence</i> 33. 44.)	
<b>FINAL JUDGMENT — See Jury Trials 2.</b>		<b>HOTELKEEPER — See Intoxicating Liquors 6 —</b>	
<b>FIRE INSURANCE — See Insurance, Fire.</b>		Innkeeper.	
<b>FIXTURES.</b>		<b>HUSBAND &amp; WIFE — See Married Women — Ne-</b>	
1. Pictures — Heritable and Moveable.....	148	gligence 45. 53 — Domicile 1. 2.	
2. Portable Saw Mill.....	387	<b>ICE — DESTRUCTION — See Damages 8.</b>	
<b>FORGERY — See Bills &amp; Notes 36 — Companies</b>		<b>INDIANS.</b>	
53 — <i>Crim. Law</i> 45. 49.		Rights of, How Determined — Minors — Ap-	
<b>FORGED CHEQUE — MISREPRESENTATION —</b>		pointment of Tutor.....	90
See Fraud 3.		<b>INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY.</b>	
<b>DEEDS — See Principal &amp; Agent 3.</b>		Application of Profits — Subscription to	
<b>FOREIGN CORPORATION — SERVICE — DO-</b>		Strike Fund — Industrial and Provident So-	
MOCILE — See Pro-		cieties Act 1876 (Eng.).....	388
cedure 9.		<b>INFANCY.</b>	
See Inhabitant.		Covenant to Pay Premiums in Apprentic-	
<b>COMMISSION — See Evidence 10. 11.</b>		ship — Necessaries — Education — Bond ....	90
<b>JUDGMENT — See International</b>		(See also <i>Attorney &amp; Clients</i> 4.)	
Law 2.		<b>INHABITANT.</b>	
<b>LAW.</b>		Foreign Corporation.....	283
1. Conflict of Laws — Ante-Nuptial — Present		<b>INJUNCTION.</b>	
and Future Property — Matrimonial Do-		1. Contracts — Restraint of Trade.....	90
micile — "Lex Rei Site" — Statute of		(See <i>Contracts (for Personal Services)</i> 36. 39)	
Frauds — Signature by Notary in Quebec.	148	2. Corporation — Misleading Use of Profes-	
2. Proof — Domicile — Marriage — Procedure		sional Designation — Chartered Account-	
Obligation .....	211	ants Entitled to Prevent Use by other	
(See also <i>Banks</i> 3.)		Accountants of Initials "C. A.".....	481
<b>FRAUD.</b>		3. Electric Light Wires — Interference with	257
1. Fraudulent Conveyance — Intent.....	281	4. Evidence.....	19
2. Action to Set		5. Maintaining Dam .....	253
Aside — Lands in		6. Mandatary — Laches of Plaintiff .....	19
Foreign Coun-		7. Municipal Acts .....	19
try — Jurisdic-		(See also <i>Mun. Corp.</i> 46. 39.)	
tion .....	211	8. Pleading.....	19
(See also <i>Insolvency</i> 3. 4. 5.)			
3. Payment — Insolvency.....	211		
Misrepresentation — Forged Cheque —			
Deceit — Damage.....	281		

INS

	PAGES.
INJUNCTION.	
9. Title to Land — Bornage (on appeal to Supreme Ct, held not appealable 21 S. C. R. 422).....	90
10. Undertakings to Damages — Dismissal of Action at Trial — Award of Damages — Reference.....	149
<i>(See also Crown 2 — Banks (Transfer of Shares) 44.)</i>	

INNKEEPERS.	
1. Liability for Goods Destroyed by Fire — Guests and Boarders.....	627
2. do Loss of Guest's Property....	20

INSANITY — See Evidence 25.

INSOLVENCY.

1. Act of — Notice of Intention to Suspend Payment.....	2
2. Discharge — New Promise.....	67
3. Fraud — Liability of Assignee.....	253
4. Dead Fraudulent on its Face — Resulting Trust.....	388
5. Fraudulent Preference — Action to set Aside Deed — Knowledge by Grantee of Insolvency.....	149
<i>(See also Fraud 3.)</i>	
6. Joint and Several Liability — Partners — Note Signed by Both Partners — Holder of Note can Rank on the Private Estate of the Insolvent Partner — Bills of Exch. Act 1890.....	627
7. Notes held as Collateral Security — Collocation.....	212
8. Distribution of Assets — Privilege — Deposit with Bank after Suspension.....	212
9. Loan to Trader — Interest Varying with Profits — Bovill's Act — Partnership Act (Eng.).....	521
10. to Effect Payment — Secret Agreement — Failure to Pay — Arts. 1039, 1040 C. C.....	139
11. Action to set aside Security (Appeal to Supreme Ct dismissed 21 S. C. R. 645).....	149
12. Preferences — Inspector of Insolvent Estate Purchaser of Estate from Assignee — R. S. O., c. 124.....	149
13. Gas Supply — Arrears of Gas Rent.....	577
14. Rights of Insolvent.....	389
<i>(See also Contracts (Consideration) 24 — Company Law 30, 31, 32 — Banks (Collections) 13 — Banks (Purchase of Stock) 23 — Banks (Rights of Depositors) 29 — Partnership 6 — Sale of Goods 27.)</i>	

INSURANCE.

ACCIDENT.

1. Accidentally Inhaling Gas.....	655
2. Application — Knowledge of agent — Deafness.....	390
3. Article on Accident Insurance.....	461
4. Cas Fortuit — Horse — Wound caused by nail laying on the Highway.....	435
5. Conditions of Policy — Date of accident.....	213
6. Disability.....	628
7. Total.....	577
8. Engaging in Fight.....	577
9. External violent and accidental Means.....	628
10. Peritonitis.....	389
11. and Visible Means.....	435

	PAGES.
12. Injuries.....	341
13. Limitations of Time to Bring Suit.....	390
14. Notice of Death or Injury.....	213
15. Waiver.....	341, 652
16. Delay.....	485, 628
17. Pleading — Duo Care — Intoxication.....	284
18. Risk Incidental to Employment.....	150
19. Voluntary Exposure to Danger.....	577
20. Waiver of Proof of Death.....	213

FIRE.

21. Action on Policy — Evidence.....	285, 289, 213, 287
22. Additional Insurance — Waiver.....	214
23. Consent of Insurer — Protect. of Property.....	287
24. ....	566, 94, 286
25. Agent — Authority of.....	287
26. ....	485
27. ....	150, 215
Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. v. Kavanagh confirmed in Privy Council).....	
28. Arbitration as a condition to Suit.....	391
29. Refer. to Arbiters not Known.....	436
30. Assignment of Policy — Partial.....	485
31. Application — Description of Property — Age of Building.....	151
32. Description — Reference to Plan — Mistake — "Falsa Demonstratio Non Nocet".....	284
33. Binding Force of Applicant's Answers.....	393
35. ....	94
36. False Representation — Forfeiture.....	566
37. Watchman — Warranty.....	152
38. Cancellation of Policy — Notice of.....	540
39. ....	217
40. Change Material to the Risk Under the Ontario Rev. Stat. c. 167, s. 114.....	628
41. Contract of — Witness — Admission of Agent.....	391
42. Contract to Cut and Deliver Ice at a Certain Price — Quantity and Quality to be Determined When Shipped — Vesting of Property — Advances by Vendee — Insurance by Vendor — Ownership of Property — Material Statements in Application — Right to Recover Market Value of Ice Irrespective of Contract Price with Vendee — Insurance by Vendee to Cover Advances — Subrogation of Vendee's Rights.....	541
43. Conditions of Policy — Continuing Warranty — Change of Use or Occupancy.....	93
44. Unoccup. House.....	342, 217
45. Double Insurance.....	214
46. Void if Used for any Other Purpose than Storage.....	216
47. Incumbering Property.....	343, 216
48. Other Insurance.....	285
49. Fixtures — Safe.....	285
50. Lights — Open.....	152



INSURANCE.		PAGES.			PAGES.
51.	Scire Facias—Foreclosure—Mortgage..	343	94.		287
52.	Lumber Piling.....	214 392	95.	Complaint.....	93
53.	Concealment by Agt.	151	96.	Proof of Loss—Property Covered—Costs on Appeal.....	285
54.	Condition Precedent—Arbitration.....	438	97.	Premature Action.....	150
55.	Condition Precedent—Warranty.....	438	98.	Waiver—Instructions—Evid.....	215
56.	Completing Improvements.....	540	99.		342
57.	Unconditional and Sale Ownership.....	628	100.		391
58.	Transfer of Property—Change of Title.....	216 20	101.	Evid.....	217-287 286
59.	Transfer of Property—Lease with Option to Purchase.....	21	102.		21 343
60.	Transfer of Insured's Interest.....	150	103.		285
61.	Waiver—Cancellation of Policy.....	217	104.		214
62.	Waiv.—Compromise	343	105.	Re-Insurance—Transferred Risks.....	94
63.	Waiver—Title of the Property.....	342	106.	Removal of Insured Property.....	21
64.	Waiver—By Agt.....	93 342	107.	Risk—What is within—Explosion.....	94
65.	Waiv.—Conveyance of Homestead.....	391	108.		436
66.	Waiv 628, 218, 286, 215	392	109.	Severable Contract.....	93
67.	Conditions—Waiver—Second Mortgage.	21	110.	Subrogation in Rights of Insured—Arts. 1155, 1156, 2584, 1053 C. C.....	577
68.	Contribution.....	93	111.	Termination of Policy.....	21
69.	Evidence—Jury Trial.....	152	112.	Total Loss.....	214
70.	False Warranties—Piling Lumber—Return of Premium.....	214	(See also Damages #).		
71.	Fraud—Settlement Procured by.....	151 343	GENERAL.		
72.	Insurable Interest—Rights of Mortgagee	216	113.	Action on Policy—Jurisdiction—Proof of Death.....	289
73.		343	114.	Agents—Powers of.....	150
74.	Limitation—Waiver.....	93	115.	Fraud—(Connecticut Fire Ins. Co. v. Kavanagh Confirmed in Privy Council 1892, App. Cas. 473).....	94
75.		342	116.	Rights of.....	150
76.	Mutual Insurance—Powers of Officers—Policy to Secretary..	94	117.	Application for Insurance—Binding Force of Applicant's Answers.....	393
77.	Powers to Create Guarantee Fund.....	288	118.	Assignment of Policy,—Consideration—Powers of Officers of Corporation.....	219
78.	Voidable Policy—Ratification—Powers of Officers—Conditions—Nonsuit.....	152	119.	Conditions—Allegation of Performance.....	290
79.	Waiver of Forfeiture—Assessments.....	628	120.	on Back of Policy.....	436
81.	Mortgage—Beneficial Interest.....	217	121.	Contract—Jurisdiction.....	389
83.	Arbitration of Loss.....	216	(See also Contracts 57)		
84.	Forfeiture—Waiver—Evid.....	218	122.	Forfeiture of Charter.....	91
85.	Loss payable to Mortgagee—Conditions of Policy—Proof of Loss.....	287	123.	Premium—Payment to Agent.....	289
86.	Forfeiture—Waiver.....	286	124.	Printed Clauses and Manuscript Clauses..	566
87.	Payment Pro Tanto by Insurance—Evidence.....	341	125.		287
88.	New Insurance.....	566 94	126.	Successive Accidents—Rate of Indemnity.	629
89.	Payment of Premiums—Cancellation of Policy—Waiver of Conditions..	215	127.	Transfer of Policies.....	219
90.	Powers of Agt.....	215	GUARANTEE.		
91.	Waiver.....	392	128.	Bond—Failure to Give Notice.....	93
92.	Payable at Domicile or Office—Conditions of Policy—Payment after Loss	629	LIFE.		
93.	Pleading—Action on Policy—Practice—Waiver.....	342	129.	Action on Policy—Limitation.....	389
			130.	Evidence.....	394
			131.	Application—False Statements—Rejected by Another Company.....	344
			132.	False Statement—Former Insurance.....	485
			133.	False Statements—Consumption.....	393
			134.	False Statement—Piles.....	513
			135.	False Statement—Change Material to the Risk—Ontario Statute, 55 V., c. 39, s. 33—Asthma—Jury.....	543
			136.	False Statement—Intoxicating Liquor.....	488
			137.	Beneficiaries—Amount Payable to Wife—Divorce, Effect of.....	578
			138.	Insurance in Favour of Wife—Death of Insured by Criminal Act of Wife—Action by Executors of Insured—Pub-	

INSURANCE.

PAGES.

PAGES.

lic Policy — Married Women's Property Act 1882 (Eng.) — Maybrick Case (Reversing Q. B. p. 20)..... 92

139. Death of Insured Before Children are Born — Executors..... 91

140. Insurance in Favour of Wife—Claim by Fiancee of Deceased — Summary Disposition of Claim—Rule 1149 — Issue—Ontario..... 151

141. Insurance Payable to "Legal Heirs"—Effect of, Between their Children and Subsequent Wife..... 314

142. Creditor as Beneficiary — Proof of Death..... 393

143. Construction of Policy—Judgment..... 290

144. Death—Doctor— Professional Secret— Refusal of Certificate..... 485

145. Doctor—Professional Secret— Refusal of Certificate..... 289

146. Proof of..... 393

147. of Insured by Criminal Act of Wife 92

148. By Suicide..... 219

149. .... 438

150. .... 151

151. .... 392

152. Exchange for Paid-up-Policy..... 291

153. Insurable Interest — Husband & Wife .... 543

155. Pleading — Declaration — Demurrer .... 91

156. Premiums — Forfeiture — Election ..... 344

157. Conditions..... 485

158. .... 153

159. Payment—Waiv. of Condi'n. 394

160. .... 392

161. .... 219

162. Conditions (Reversed by Ct of Appeal 20 Ont. App. 187)..... 344

163. By Beneficiaries — Designation of Beneficiary..... 290

164. with Stolen Money — Right to Proceeds..... 290

165. Rebate — Parol Agreement for..... 513

(See also Partnership 25.)

166. Substitution of Policy by another Comp'ny 542

167. Surrender of Policy — Rights of Creditors. 153

168. Tontine Assignment — Payment to Fiducial Agent ..... 513

MARINE.

169. Action on Policy — Evidence..... 394

170. Agent — Authority of — Local Usage..... 439

171. Agreement to Insure — Verbal — Defence 65

172. Application — Promissory Representation 220

173. Barratry ..... 95

174. Change of Interest of Insured ..... 151

175. Collision Clause — Construction of Policy. 22

176. "Sunken Wreck"..... 544

177. Construction of Policy — Indorsement .... 220

178. "Burnt"..... 578

179. "As per Form Attached"..... 439

180. Declaration of Goods by Insured — Onus Probandi — Misrepresentations..... 21

181. Evidence of Value of Cargo..... 95

182. Foreign Statement Clause—General Average — Chartered Homeward Freight..... 438

183. Insurable Interest— Partner..... 95

184. Insuring Advances..... 155

184. Risk—Attachment of..... 439

185. Re-Insurance—"To Pay as May be Paid" on Original Policy—Indemnity—Condition Precedent ..... 394

186. Warranty as to Load Carried..... 155

187. Custom—Prohibited Waters.... 486

MUTUAL BENEFIT ASSOCIATIONS.

188. Assessments—Duty to Levy..... 132

189. By Laws—Change of—Rights of Beneficiary—Bequest to Creditor—Insurable Interest..... 221

190. Amendment — Retroactive Effect—Beneficiaries ..... 395

191. Change of Beneficiary—Relatives..... 220

192. By Laws..... 291

193. .... 315

194. Vested Interest — Evidence..... 395

195. Benefit Certificate 132

196. Construction of Certificate..... 291

197. .... 292

198. Expulsion of Member—Fair Trial—Report of Committee — Evidence not before Committee—Absence of Member..... 578

199. Fraternal Societies—Insurance Act R.S.C. c. 124, ss. 43, 49—Summary Conviction..... 284

200. Insurable Interest..... 345

201. Insolvent Corporation — Distribution of Assets—Costs—Receiver..... 291

202. Judgment..... 486

203. Notice of Assessment—Waiver—Forfeiture 221

204. Presumption from Mailing—Forfeiture 291

205. Suspen. of Member. 91

206. By Law..... 395

207. Payment of Assessments—Suspension for Non-Payment.. 291

208. Non - Payment of — Burden of Proof..... 395

209. Days of Grace.. 395

210. Waiver..... 486

211. Rejection of Claim..... 20

INTEREST.

1. Compound—Agreement..... 65

2. On Bond—Damages..... 221

3. Money Payable at Time Depending on a Future Contingent Event—Time Depending on a Verification of Accounts — Damages for Detention of Debt—3 & 4 Wm. 4. c. 12, s. 28..... 630

(See also Contracts 21.)

INTENT—See Weapens—Libel and Slander.

INTERNATIONAL LAW.

1. Transfer of Chose in Action—Scotch Arrestment—Company—Calls..... 76

2. Foreign Judgment—Penal Actions—Distinction Between Public and Private Penalties..... 440

"INTIMACY"—See Libel and Slander 18.

	PAGES.
<b>INTOXICATING LIQUORS.</b>	
1. Action Against Hotelkeeper for Selling Liquor to a Person when Warned not to do so—Art. 929, Rev. Stat., P. Q. ....	57
2. Can. Temp. Act Application of Fines Municipal Corporation — Discretion Mandamus. ....	630
3. Certiorari — Motion to Quash Return. ....	487
4. 51 Vic. c. 31, s. 8—Information. ....	346
5. Instructions to Counsel to Defend not Warrant him in Pleading Guilty. ....	346
6. Summary Conviction — Service of Summons — Minutes of Evidence Magistrate's Discretion. ....	487
7. Summary Conviction — Judge's Order Staying Proceedings—Effect of—Adjournment. ....	346
8. Summary Conviction — Excessive Costs — Jurisdiction of Magistrate — Certiorari. ....	488
9. Summary Conviction — Minute of Adjudication — Variance—R. S. C. c. 178, s. 53. ....	346
10. Club—Selling Liquor to Members Without a License. ....	578
<i>(See also Clubs 2.)</i>	
11. Constitutional Law—Local Option—Sale by Wholesale — Sale by Retail. ....	23
12. Temperance Act 1861. ....	95
<i>(See also Constitutional Law 16.)</i>	
13. Defense to Prosecution. ....	440
14. Breach of Certificate—Hospitality—Scotch Case. ....	347
15. Master and Servant — Scotch Case. ....	544
16. Illegal Sales—Conviction. ....	23
17. "Spiritous Liquors". ....	23
18. License—Mandamus. ....	544
19. Liq. License Act 1883, s. 6. (Dominion)—Salaries of License Inspectors—Approval by Governor—General in Council. ....	396
20. 1839 (Manitoba) Summary Conviction—No Evidence that Defendant Held Licenses—Power to Amend Defects. ....	396
21. Promissory Notes—Action on—Plea that Notes Given to Licensed Hotel Keeper for Demurrer—Liquor License Act R. S. Manitoba, c. 90, s. 131— <i>Intra Viros</i> —Trade of Commerce. ....	439
22. Mining Act, Quebec—Mining Inspector—Powers of, to Grant Licenses. ....	95
23. Travellers—Who are <i>Bona Fide</i> . ....	578
24. ....	578
25. Cyclists. ....	544

*(See also Contracts (Consideration) 23—Sale 28.)*

	PAGES
ISSUE—See Companies 31.	
JOINT STOCK COMPANIES—See Companies 55.	
JUDGE.	
Police Magistrate—Interest—Bias—Relationship to Informant. ....	451
<b>JUDGMENT DEBLOI.</b>	
Refusal to Answer Questions—Application to Commit. ....	2
<b>JUDICIAL SALES.</b>	
Venditioni Exponas—Order of Court or Judge—Vacating of Sheriff's Sale—Arts. 553, 662, 714 C. P. C.—Jurisdiction—Quebec. ....	61
<b>JURISDICTION.</b>	
Lessor and Lessee — Amount Claimed—Arts. 887, 888 C. P. C. — Jurisdiction of Circuit Ct. : <i>(See also Fraud 2—Insurance 121.)</i>	
<b>JURY TRIAL.</b>	
1. Verdict — Rider by the Jury — Reparation	
2. Disagreement of Jury — Question Reserved by Judge — Motion for Judgment — Amendment of Pleadings — New Trial — Rule 799 — Appeal — Jurisdiction — Final Judgment — Ontario. ....	10
<i>(See also Criminal Law — 96. 100—Tresspass to Land — Verdict.)</i>	
<b>JUSTICE OF THE PEACE.</b>	
1. Conviction on a Subsequent Day Bad. ....	
2. Summary Conviction — Information — Two Offences — "Defect in Substance or in Form" — Adjournment — Crim. Code 1892, ss. 845 (3) 847, 857. ....	10
2. Summary Trials Act — Trial of Defendant for Felony without Consent — Summary Conviction — Quashing. ....	10
<i>(See also False Arrest 1.)</i>	
LACHES — See Bills & Notes 21. 92 — Injunction 6 — Sale 20. 33 — Sheriffs 1.	
<b>LANDLORD AND TENANT.</b>	
1. Liability of Tenant for Introducing Bed Bugs into the House. ....	632
2. Stoppage of Elevator — Damages. ....	632
<i>(See also Negligence (Snow Slide from Roof) 71 — Negligence 66. 68.)</i>	
LAW AGENT — See Suspension.	
LEASE — See Railways 32.	
LEGISLATURE — See Constitutional Law.	
LESSOR AND LESSEE — See Jurisdiction.	
<b>LIBEL AND SLANDER.</b>	
1. Action Against a Town for. ....	547
2. Advertising Account for Sale — Justification. ....	203
3. By Mercantile Agency. ....	547
4. ....	458
5. Newspaper—Intent—"Boodler". ....	539
5j. Malice—Damages. ....	579
6. Intent—Mistake in Name. ....	547
7. Source of Information — Punitive Damages. ....	459
8. Candidate for Nomination to Office—Privilege. ....	459
9. Criticism Concerning Public Official — Militia Officer. ....	459
10. Justification—Facts Grossly Misstated—Costs. ....	232
11. Provisions of Act Relating to Newspapers—Compliance with — Special Damages—Loss of Custom — 50 V., cc. 22 & 23 (Man.). ....	221

LIBEL AND SLANDER.		PAGES.
12.	Injunction .....	96
13.	Malice .....	96
13½.	Defence of Fair Comment. (Judgment ordering New Trial confirmed by Su- preme Ct. 21 S. C. R. 518) ..	222
14.	Complaint—Sufficiency of .....	347
15.	.....	96
15½.	Allegations of Malice .....	412
16.	Evidence .....	224 488
	(See also Evidence 14).	
16½.	Husband and Wife—Slander .....	294
17.	Injunction—Trade Union—“Sweating”— Trade Label .....	293
18.	Innuendo—Words Libellous per se—Use of Word “Intimacy”—Publication Concerning Postal Official .....	488
19.	From Failure of Trustee to Publish Accounts—Charge of Partiality .....	488
20.	Relevancy—Newspaper Letter and Leaderette .....	441
21.	School Teacher .....	222
22.	“Shebeen” .....	156
23.	“Dishonourable Conduct”— Landlord and Tenant .....	96
24.	Ironical Meaning Attached to Words .....	97
25.	Justification—Scandalous Rumors Con- cerning Private Individ- uals .....	490
26.	Fair Comment—Pleading —Evidence .....	488
27.	Libel in Plea—Evidence of Fact Posterior to Date of Action .....	23
28.	Justification .....	580
29.	Allegations of Fraud—Good Faith—Probable Cause .....	442
30.	Malice—Implied .....	23
31.	Damages .....	579
32.	.....	488
33.	.....	442, 291
34.	Pleading—Truth .....	579
35.	Denial of Words Attributed— Justification of others .....	441
36.	Allegations of Malice .....	442
37.	See Complaint.	
38.	Privilege—Slander—Statement by Phy- sician called in to see Patient ..	348
39.	Averment of Malice .....	488
40.	Witness (Head-note Incom- plete) .....	580
41.	Report of Judicial Proceedings ..	579
42.	Public Officials .....	489
43.	Private Letter—Accusation of Theft .....	348
44.	Charges against Public Officer ..	97
45.	Testimony of Lawyer and his Wife—Statement by Physician ..	156
46.	Charge of Dishonesty against a Body of Workmen .....	224
47.	Qualified Privilege—Absence of Actual Malice—Evidence —Admissibility—Falsity of Slander—Justification not Pleaded .....	224
48.	Candidate for Election to Town Council—Statement by one Elector to another .....	294

	PAGES.	
49.	Slander—County Council Words Spoken by Member— Granting Dancing Licences .....	398
50.	False Arrest—Charge of Theft —Repetition of Charge on which Apprehension had fol- lowed, to Members of Public ..	442
51.	Protest of Note—Malicious, by Notary— Liability of Bank .....	293
52.	Premature .....	396
53.	Plaintiff—Flight and Bad Reputation of— Mitigation of Damages .....	580
54.	Slander—Real Intention of Slanderous Words—New Trial .....	580
55.	Special Damages—When Need not be pro- ved—Railroad Company .....	222
56.	Slander—Imputation of Unfitness for Office not of Profit—Absence of Special Damage .....	398
57.	When must be Proven .....	579
58.	What Constitutes—Misdemeanours of Neighbour—Publicat'n .....	291
59.	Statement by Rail- road Co. to Consignors Concerning Consignees .....	517
60.	Residence of a Citizen of the United States in Canada .....	488
61.	Words Actionable Per Se—“B in hands of Notary” .....	632
62.	Rival Milk Sel- lers .....	441
	LICENSEE—See Negligence 20. 21. 22. 23. 67. 54.	
	LIEN.	
	Appurtenances, what are—Elect. Light Poles ..	401
	(See also Bailment 2—Banks 30.)	
	LIFE INSURANCE—See Insurance, Life.	
	LIME KILN—See Nuisance 5.	
	LIMITATIONS OF ACTIONS.	
	1. Acknowledgment .....	582
	2. When Action “Commenced” .....	473
	3. Corporat'n—Stockholders—Cause of Action ..	224
	4. Possession—Tenancies in Common—Care- taker of one Tenant—Partition—Adverse Possession as to Co-Tenants—Acts of Own- ership .....	109
	(See also Bills and Notes 53. 54. 55. 56—Wills 20 )	
	LIQUIDATED DAMAGES—See Bonds 1.	
	See Contracts 47.	
	LIQUIDATOR—See Companies 77. 78. 79. 80.	
	LIQUOR LICENSE ACT—See Intoxicating Liquors.	
	LITERATURE.	
	Rights of Authors—Novel Adaptation to Theatrical Play—Agreement .....	510
	LOAN—TO PLAYER AT CARDS—See Gambling Transactions 2. See Insolvency 9. 10.	
	LOCATION TICKETS—See Crown Lands 3.	
	LOTTERIES.	
	1. Constitutional Law—Powers of Federal Parliament .....	402
	2. “Missing Word” Competition—Return of Contribution—Wager .....	442
	MAGISTRATE—See Malicious Prosecution 1.— Intox. Liquors.	
	MALICE—See Damages 18.—Libel and Slander 13. 15½. 30. 31. 32. 33. 39.—Government Em- ployee—Mun. Corp. 63.	

MALICIOUS PROSECUTION.		PAGES.		PAGES.	
1.	Advice of Magistrate.....	55 <sup>o</sup>	12.	Common Servants of Common Employer.....	491
2.	Reasonable & Probable Cause—Jury.....	29 <sup>o</sup>	13.	Who are.....	296
3.	Malice Rebutted.....	22 <sup>o</sup>		(See also Ships 21, 25).	
4.	Accusation of Theft.....	22 <sup>o</sup>	14.	Liability of Master for Acts of Servant — Third Person — Ratifi- cation — Delivery of Coal.....	24
5.	Officer.....	21	15.	Torts of Servt. — Scope of Authority — Ticket Agt. — False Arrest by 227	550
	(See also False Arrest—Evidence 16).		16.	Assault by Servant.....	582
<b>MANDAMUS.</b>			17.		
1.	County Commissioners.....	98	18.	Servant lent to another Firm.....	443
2.	Railroad Company — Erection and main- tenance of Station.....	22 <sup>o</sup>	19.	Negligence — Contributory — Attending to Switch Lamps.....	24
3.	Revising Officer — Electoral Franchise Act R. S. C., c. 5.—Objection to Name on List— Notice—Grounds of Objection (Confirming Q. B. 157).....	295	20.	Common Fault — Contribu- tory Negligence.....	103
4.	School Commissioners — Establishment of New School District — Superintendent of Education — Jurisdiction of upon Appeal— R. S. P. Q., Art. 2055.....	157	21.	Contributory — Removing Press Cylinder.....	490
	(See also Counties 1. — Companies (Right to Inspect Books) 61—Intox. Liquors 2. — Mun. Corp. 57, 58, 61.)		22.	Defective Appliances—Iron Hook.....	403
<b>"MANUAL LABOUR"</b> —See Master and Servt. 31.			23.	Defective Appliances—Sta- tionary Drilling Engine.....	296
<b>MARGARINE ACT.</b>			24.	Defective Appliances—Rail- road Company.....	295
	Scotland — Act of 1887, s. 6 — Marking on Wrapper Required by the Act.....	550	25.	Defective Appliances—Un- guarded Shaft.....	297
<b>MARINE INSURANCE</b> —See Insurance, Marine.			26.	Defective Appliances.....	227
<b>MARITIME LAW</b> —See Ships.			27.	Defect. Appliances—Street Car — Draw Head.....	24
	LIEN—See Ships 20-23.		28.	Defective Appliances—Con- tribut. Negligence.....	308
<b>MARKET PRICE</b> —See Sale of Goods 24.			29.	Defect. Appliances—Coup- ling Cars.....	21
<b>"MARKET VALUE"</b> —See Customs 1.			30.	Employers' Liability Act, England, 1880 — Order.....	350
<b>MARRIAGE.</b>			31.	Employers' Liability Act, England, 1875 — Persons en- gaged in "Manual Labour" — Real and Substantial oc- cupation.....	158
	Breach of Promise — Syphilis.....	348	32.	— Evid. of — Stone Mason — Dressing Stone — Explosion... ..	228
<b>MARRIED WOMEN.</b>			33.	Saw-mill Car- riage.....	25
1.	Injury to Wife — Loss of Wages.....	226	34.	Coupl. Cars.....	490
2.	Action for Wife's Services — Witness — Contract — Will — Damages.....	295	35.	Low Overhead Railr'd Bridge.....	413
3.	Gifts to Husband — Checks Indorsed in Blank.....	25 <sup>o</sup>	36.	Defect. Scaff'd.....	462
4.	Married Woman's Property — Separate Estate — Contract by Married Woman — Separate Property Exigible — C. S. U. C. ch. 73 — 35 Vic., ch. 16 (O.) — R. S. O. [1877] cc. 125 & 127 — 17 Vic., ch. 19 (O.) Ontario... ..	58 <sup>o</sup>	37.	Railroad Fire- man.....	403
	(See also Bills and Notes 57, 58.)		38.	Elevator Acci- dent— Employ- ment of Infant under Twelve.....	349
<b>MASTER &amp; SERVANT.</b>			39.	Elevator Acci- dent.....	296
1.	Action against Corporation for personal Injuries to an Employee— Agent of Cor- poration.....	227	40.	Building Dam- — Breaking — W o r k m e n	297
2.	Action for Wages.....	550	41.	Drowned.....	297
3.	Contract by Workman not to Recover Compensation at Common Law or under Employers Liability Act 1880 (Eng.).....	632	42.	Derailment of Train.....	24
4.	Discharge — Damages.....	98	43.	Factories Act, Ontario— Knowledge of Employer of Danger of Employee — Want of Guard.....	350
5.	Sickness — Absence.....	227			
6.	Arbitrary Right of — Forfeiture of Property.....	25			
	(See also Mun. Corp. 63 — Patents 8.)				
7.	Engagement to Serve at Particular House — Destruction of House.....	490			
8.	Fellow Servants—Conductor & Brakeman.....	228			
9.	Common Employment Contractor & Sub-Contractor (Johnson v. Lind- say).....	25			
10.	Stevadore and Servant.....	496			
11.	Operating Steam Winch.....	349			

MASTER AND SERVANT.		PAGES.			PAGES.
44.	Factories Act, Scotland — Duty of Fencing Machinery	443	9.	Prohibiting Sunday Preaching in Parks — R. S. O., ch. 181, sec. 501, sub-sec. 10	160
45.	Lease of Steamboat and Crew — Accident — Who Responsible	491	10.	Stallions—Nuisance	405
46.	Right to Work done by Servants — Canvassers for Trade Directory	413	11.	Stopping Trains on Street	493
47.	Risks of Employment — Increased Risk caused by Master's Negligence	582	12.	Bill Boards	551
48.	Defective Machinery — "Volenti non Fit Injuria"	490	13.	Variance from Notice — Notice to Ratepayers	144
49.	Assumption of — Chemical Fumes	296	14.	Street Railway — Construction Beyond Limits of Municipality Validating Act — Construction of — Ontario	587
50.	Assumption of — Minor — Exemption of Employer — Powers of Parent	296		(See also Street Railway )	
51.	Regulations for Protection of Employee	295	15.	Contracts—Ultra Vires	443
52.	Icy Steps — Question for Jury	158	16.	Delegation of Power to Sell City Property	551
53.	Defect in System — "Volenti non Fit Injuria" — (Smith v. Baker)	26	17.	Payment on Void Contract	551
54.	Railroad Construction — Unskilled hand	26	18.	Electric Lighting	28
55.	Vice Principals — Who are?	319	19.	Increase of Indebtedness	229
56.	— Conductor & Brakeman	403	20.	Time of Performance	229
57.	Foreman	582	21.	With Water Company	299 229
58.	When the Relation Exists	492	22.	Executory for Purchase of Fire Engine — Necessity for By-law — Contract under Seal — R. S. O., ch. 181, ss. 282, 480	233
59.	Workmen's Compensation for Injuries Act, Ontario — Elevator Accident — Employment of Infant under Twelve — Factories Act	319	23.	Fraud — Evidence — Mutual Corporation — Estoppel	232
60.	Machinery — Defect in the Arrangement	297	24.	By-laws—Bonds—Damages	298
	(See also Ships (Wags) 25.)		25.	Retaining Services of Solicitor — Want of By-Law — No Benefit taken by Corporation	351
MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, PRIVILEGE OF — See Contempt of Court 6.			26.	License to Construct Vault under Alley	551
MERCANTILE AGENCIES. Liability to Subscribers for False Representations	633		27.	Grading—Interpretat'n—Evid. of Perform.—Directing Verdict	404
(See Libel and Slander 3, 4.)			28.	Authorising Mayor to enter into — Not Acted upon	443
MERCANTILE AGENT — See Factor.			29.		444
MINING ACT QUEBEC — See Intox. Ljg. 22.				(See also Contracts 16.)	
MINING COMPANY — See Negligence 70.			30.	Council — City Charter — Limitation of Power to make Purchases — Quantum Meruit — Delegation of Power	7
MINERAL GAS — See Mun. Corp. 68.			31.	Special Meeting — Legality	229
MINORS — See Indians.			32.	Minutes of Meeting—Correct'n	551
MINOR — See Infancy.			33.	Elections—Misconduct of Presiding Officer in opening Ballots	29
MISREPRESENTATION — See Fraud 4.			34.	Disqualification of Councillor — Construction of Word "Contractor" — Proceedings Attacking Election and Return — 51 Vic., ch. 1, s. 50, s.s. c. — R. S., 5th Series, c. 57, s. 48	494
MISTAKE — See Insurance 32.			35.	Electric Light Company — Use of Poles — Compensation	444
MONEYS ENTRUSTED FOR INVESTMENT. Condition Precedent — Prescription — Art. 2262 — Transfer — Prete-nom	228		36.	Injunction—Discharge of Sewage	27
MORTGAGE — See Insurance 81-87.			37.	Nuisances — Wooden Buildings	27
MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.			38.	Moving House through Street	232
1. Aldermen — Qualification	300		39.	Action to Restrain Works or Cause Removal of Obstructions—Rights of Ratepayers	351
2. Assessments—Improvements — Void Assessment	633		40.	Liability of—Fireworks Display — Nuisance	631
3. Motion to Quash — Disqualification — Estoppel Dykerate	28		41.	Defective Drains and Sewers	27
4. Voluntary Payment—Void Assessment — Burden of Proof	299		42.		230
5. Liabilities of Street Rlws.	299		43.		230
6. Confirmation — Notice — Death of Property owner — Parties to Action	298		44.	Defective Streets—Change of Grade — Contributory Negligence	9 9
7. By-Laws—Storage of Oils	28				
8. Livery Stables and Cabs — License	159				

MUNICIPAL CORPORATION.		PAGES.			PAGES
45.	Danger. Structures in Streets	230	75.	Road Declared a County Work — Cost of Maintenance—Arts. 757 & 938 — Mun. Code .....	351
46.	Defective Streets — Pile of Stones—Frightened Horse....	230	76.	Change of Level — Default of Proprietor — Damages .....	101
47.	Defective Streets.....	231, 587, 631	77.	Paving — Street Railr'd	444
48.	Defective Sidewalk — Evidence—Question for Jury.....	159	78.	Taxation — Exemption — Street Improvements—Liability of Charitable Corporation.	99
49.	Defective Sidewalks—Notice to City—Evidence—Damages.	232	79.	Townsites—Public Squares—Dedication...	631
50.	Defective Sidewalks—Repair.	230	80.	Water Rates—By Law.....	551
51.	Defective Sidewalks—Liability of Abutting Owners.....	99	81.	Water Works—Exclusive Franchise.....	404
52.	Defective Bridges.....	493	<i>(See also Intox. Liquors 2.—Trees 1. 3.)</i>		
53.	Negligence of Officers — Unhealthy Prison.....	28	MUTUAL BENEFIT SOCIETIES — See Insurance. Mutual Benefit Societies.		
54.	Fireman—Negligence.....	551	NATURAL GAS.		
55.	Obstructions on Street — Excavations—Contrib. Neg.....	631	Transportation — Regulation by States — Interstate Commerce .....		
56.	Obstructions on Streets—Fast Driving—Post .....	587	301		
57.	Mandamus — to Municipal Board to Pay Judgment — Expenditure of Money in Excess of Revenue.	298	NAVIGABLE WATERS—See Riparian Rights.		
58.	to Police Judge—Adjudging Comptroller in Contempt — Investigation by City Council .....	298	NAVIGATION—See Crown 2.		
59.	Markets — Interest of Lessee of Stall — Ejectment by Eminent Domain.....	444	" NECESSARIES " — See Infancy.		
60.	Municipalities Act New South Wales 1867 s. 163 — Construction .....		" NECESSARY " — See Timber.		
61.	Nuisance — Slaughter House — By-law...	310	NEGLIGENCE.		
62.	Officers — Appointment of Board of Health — Physician .....	29	1.	Animals—Vicious Dogs—Scienter.....	66
63.	Wrongful Dismissal — Legal Malice — Actual Malice — Want of Reasonable & Probable Cause Misdirection — Damages — Punitive Damages — Costs—Excessive Damages .....	233	2.	Public Officer....	186
64.	Public — Mandamus to compel Acceptance of Office.....	444	3.	Dog Bite—Contributory Neg....	614
65.	Ontario Municipal Act 1887—Construction of Bridges — Liability for—Width of Stream .....	635	4.	Accident caused by Animal to his Keeper — Presumption of Fault upon the Proprietor — Proof Necessary to Destroy that Presumption .....	447
66.	Highways — Remedy over .....	306	5.	Contributory—Article on—Civil and Common Law Doctrines Compared .....	172
67.	Construction — Damages for Non-Feasance — Mandamus — Notice in Writing — Remedy by Arbitration.....	634	6.	Evidence—Excursion Train	236
68.	Mineral Gas.....	98	7.	Question for Jury — Alighting from Moving Train.....	236
69.	Right to Enter Lands of another Municipality for Sewage purposes.	300	8.	Crossing Track.....	236
70.	Quo Warranto — Municipal Council — Resolution — Nomination of Councillor — Municipal Code Art. 316 .....	300	9.	.....	307
71.	Roads & Streets — Dedication of Streets — Acceptance — Adverse Possession — Evidence.	231	10.	Blasting in Quarry—Loaded Cars in the Way of Escape.	302
72.	Delay in Grading — Action against City for ...	231	11.	Evid.—Questions of Fact—Instructions .....	394
73.	Statutory Powers—Control over Streets—Alteration of Grade — Negligence — Contributory..	231	12.	Riding on Platform.....	308
74.	Opening — Default of Land-owner — Recommendation of Report—Costs	298	13.	Slipping on Sidewalk.....	447
			14.	Passing under Scaffold—Injured by Chisel Dropped....	552
			15.	Crossing Street.....	552
			16.	Dog Bite — Remoteness of Damages—Evidence of Actionable Neg.—Scienter....	614
			17.	.....	351
			<i>(See also Master and Servant 19. 20. 21. 28.—Mun. Corp. 44. 55.)</i>		
			18.	Dangerous Premises.....	552
			19.	Pleading.....	32
			20.	Licensee—Falling into Cellar....	109
			21.	Licensee — Permitting Teacher to Examine Premises with Class of Thirty Pupils .....	551
			22.	Licensee — Elevator Shaft .....	115
			23.	Licensee — Private Way — Failure to Indicate as such.....	302
			24.	Right to Enter.....	302

NEGLIGENCE.	PAGES.	PAGES.
25. Vault under Sidewalk — Consent of Municipal Officer .....	161	
26. Owner of Building — Fire Escape .....	302	
27. Liability of Hotelkeeper to Guest — Trap Door .....	302	
28. Dangerous Machinery — Fencing — Child Killed by Straying past — Insufficient Fence .....	496	
30. Defence of Bar on Account of Compensation Received from the same Injuries in a Separate Action — Railway .....	195	
31. Discharge of Fireworks — Burden of Proof .....	552	
32. Evidence .....	301 307	
33. Highway — Runner of Sleigh coming in Contact with Boulder — Plaintiff Injured by Trying to raise the Horse — Remoteness .....	306	
34. Road — Obstruction — Mud — Heap — Fault — Scotch Law .....	162	
35. do do do .....	237	
36. Defective — Evid. — Fencing .....	406 306	
37. Falling over Trunks on Sidewalk .....	301	
38. Excavations in Streets .....	301	
39. Defective Bridges — Contributory Negligence .....	305	
40. Icy Sidewalk .....	305	
41. .....	305	
42. Passing Obstructions .....	406	
43. Steam Road — Roller — Horse taking Fright .....	496	
44. Driver of Horse — Attaching Head Weight .....	635	
45. Husband & Wife — Compensation for Injuries to Wife .....	308	
46. Injury from Fright .....	236	
47. Injuries to Children — Damages — Measure of .....	302	
48. Careless Driving — Allegations of Loss of Services Rendered by Children .....	32	
49. Street Ry. — Child on Track — Damages .....	231	
50. Ry. — Child killed on Track — Measure of Damages — Verdict ..	235	
51. Electric Wires — Playing in Street .....	305	
52. Trespasser on Street Car .....	552	
(See also Damages 12.)		
53. Imputed Neg. — Husband and Wife — Contributory Neg. of Husband .....	231	
54. Licensor and Licensee .....	161	
55. Improper Performance of Contract .....	302	
56. Latent Defect in Machine — Duty of Inspector — Onus .....	408	
57. Of Auctioneer — Responsibility of Auctioneer for plant in his Employer's Premises — Fault — Relevancy .....	236	
58. Barge Owner — Unloading Barge — Falling in hold .....	406	
59. Corporation — Saint John Public Hospital — Act 23 V., c. 61 — Charitable Corporation — Liability for Injury Arising from Negligence of Servants — Application of Trust Funds to Satisfy Judgment for Damages .....	553	
60. Contractors — Independent Contractor — Municipal Corporation .....	496	
61. Negligence of Independent Contractor — Liability of Principal .....	33	
62. Sub-contractor — Liability of .....	491	
63. Government Railway — Blasting — Liability of Government and Contractor — French Case ..	551	
(See also Contractor.)		
64. Crown through its Servants — 50-51 Vic., c. 16 — Prescription .....	352	
65. Crown .....	31	
66. Landlord — Dangerous Premises — Building Let in Flats — Staircase out of Repair — Landlord, Liability of, to Persons other than Tenants — Implied Undertaking to Repair Staircase .....	495	
67. Dangerous Premises — Nuisance — License .....	406	
68. Dangerous Premises — Contributory Negligence .....	351	
69. Manufacturer of Defective Article — Liability to Third Person .....	407	
70. Mining Company — Liable in Damages to its Employé for Injuries Caused by Explosion of Powder Magazine not Provided with Lightening-Conductors — R. S. P. Q., 876.—1011 .....	588	
71. Owners of Buildings — Snowslide from Roof — Owner Responsible — Co-Proprietors .....	309	
72. Elevator — Liability for Running of .....	303	
73. Fire — Fall of Wall after Fire — Damages .....	30	
74. Purchaser of Toy Air-gun for Child .....	303	
75. Railway Coys — Animals Straying on Tracks — Horses killed — Property on Adjoining Premises .....	31 591	
76. Animals Straying on Track — Defect. Fence (Quebec Case) .....	30	
77. Animals Straying on Track — Railway Act — 51 V., c. 29, s. 191—53 V., c. 28, s. 2 .....	99 504	
78. Animals Straying on Track — Value of Breed .....	559	
79. Alighting from Train — Plea .....	33	
80. Duties of Railroads toward Passengers known to have Fallen from Train on to the Track .....	309	



NEGLIGENCE.		PAGES.
81.	Collision with Street Car.....	32
82.	Fire caused by Sparks from Engine—Contrib. Negligence (as to the Negligence of the Rly., see this case in House of Lords (30 Scot. Law Rep. 591) affirming Ct. of Sessions, page 360)...	352
83.	Frightening Horses 31,	491
84.	Injuries to Persons on Track—160, 307, 308, 491, 495, 553, 551	
85.	Injuries to Persons on Track—Exit from Station — Custom — Flagman.....	306
86.	Injuries to Persons on Track after being Wrongfully Ejected from Train.....	553
87.	Injuries to Persons at Crossings .. 31, 32, 100, 162	
88.	Injuries to Persons at Crossings—51 Vic., c. 29, s. 256, Ringing Bell or Sounding Whistle—other Precautions—Unusual Danger—51 Vic., c. 29, s. 256— " Train of Cars " — " Stop, Look and Listen ".....	308
89.	Turntables—Injuries to Children at.....	31
90.	Statut'y Powers—Construction of Railway—Want of Precautions in Conducting Dangerous Operations - Interdict—Railway Clauses Consolidation Act 1845 (Scotland).....	495
91.	Unload'g Cars—Duties of Carriers.....	231
92.	Steamboat Owners—Liability of Steamboat Owners for — Action by a Father for Damages for Accident Causing his Daughter's Death — Appeal from Judgment for Plaintiff dismissed with Costs. 162	
93.	Of Stevedores—Independently Engaged — Employee of one Injured by Employee of other ..	415
94.	Street Rlys.—Riding on Dummy of Cable Car — Contrib. Neg.....	308
95.	Collisions— Rights of Street Rlys. on the Highway.....	497
96.	Collisions — Runaway Horse.....	588
97.	Collisions — Absence of Head Light.....	301
98.	Collisions — Driver of Wagon.....	234
99.	Collisions — Patrol Wagon	
	Question for Jury ...	235
100.	Collisions — With Sewer Pipe — Injuring Man in Excavation.....	352
101.	Crowded Car—Boy falling off Platform.....	31

	PAGES.	
102.	Boarding Moving Car....	234
103.	.....	233
101.	Height of Rails — Statut. Obligations — Accident to Horse.....	588
105.	Accidents on Track—Stopping Car — Proximate Cause.....	353
100.	Accidents on Track — Running over Child.....	162
	(See also Injuries to Children.)	
107.	Accidents on Track — Running over Child.....	161
108.	Premature Starting.....	303
109.	Snow Plough Ridges.....	304
110.	Trespasser on Car—Child. 552	
	(See also Carriers 55, 55, 56.)	
111.	Of Wharf Owner — Passenger Vessel — Use of Wharf — Invitation to Public — Accident in Using Wharf — Proximate Cause — Excessive Damages — Nova Scotia.....	636
112.	Telegraph Company — Defective Arm on Telegraph Pole ..	301
113.	Telephone Company — Injuries from Charged Wire.....	553
114.	Overflowing of Land — Bursting of Timber Boom — Right to Erect Booms in Rivers ..	353
115.	Per se Resting Arm on Window-sill of Car.....	160
116.	Jumping from mov'g Street Car	304
117.	Riding on Freight Elevator with Portion of Body Project'g beyond the Edge of the Platform.....	491
118.	Proximate Cause.....	33
119.	Injury to Cattle — Fire..	30
120.	Carriers Measure of Damages.....	235
121.	Danger Voluntarily Incurred.....	625
	See also Carriers 11. (Dangerous Freight.)	
	14. (Goods Destroyed by Fire.)	
	Mast. & Servt.	
	(Steamboat owner) 15.	
	Physicians and Surgeons 1.	
	Counties 3.	
	Mfm. Corp. 10, 56.	
	Ships 26, 29.	
	(Arrest of — Crassa Negligentia) 1.	
	Tutorship.	
	Telegraph Companies.	
	Damages (Slipping on Sidewalk) 15.	
	(Rly. Co. — Discharge) 16.	
	(Injuries to Child) 12.	
	(Falling Ice) 13.	
	NEW TRIAL — See Jury Trial 2.	
	NOTARY, SIGNATURE — QUEBEC — See Foreign Law.	
	" NOT QUALIFIED " — See Elections 18.	
	NOTICE, CONSTRUCTIV See Shares.	
	" NOXIOUS BUSINESS " — See Nuisance 9.	
	NUISANCE.	
	1. Asylum for the Insane—Action to Compel Discontinuance of Erection.....	31
	2. Electric Light Plant—Dwelling House.....	101
	3. Escape of Rubbish from Refuse Heap to the Injury of Cattle—Limits of Maxim " Sic utere tuo ut alienum non laedas ".....	498

	PAGES.
<b>NUISANCE.</b>	
4. House of Ill Fame—Damages.....	34
5. Lime Kiln—Odours—Adjoining Property— Damages—Pre-occupation—Purchase Price	101
6. Music.....	589
7. Overhanging Trees—Notice.....	589
8. Smoke from Chimney.....	309
9. Small Pox Hospital — " Noxious Business " ..Statute.....	448
10. Statutory Powers — Tramway Company's Stables.....	447

(See also Board of Health—Damages 6.—*Mun. Corp.* 10. 40. 61.)

**"OF SAME QUALITY AND KIND AS FURNISHED YOU DURING THE PAST YEAR"**  
—See Sale of Goods 48.

**OWNER'S RISK** —See Bailment 1.

**PARDONING POWER**—See Constitutional Law 9.

**PAROL EVIDENCE**—See Evidence Parol.

**PARTNERSHIP.**

1. Accounting — Devoting Time to the Business.....	35
2. Surrender of Right to Account—Consideration.....	102
3. Law Partnership — Acting as Executor.....	449
4. Partnership Moneys — Sequestration of — Contre-Lettre — Compensation — (Quebec).....	557
5. Articles — Expiration or Determination of Partnership by Effluxion of Time — Continuance of Business without Fresh Arrangement—Application of Provisions in Articles to Partnership at Will.....	161
6. Assignment for Benefit of Creditors—Right of Assignee to Assets as against Attaching Officer.....	34
7. Books as Evidence — Settlements — Impeachment.....	636
8. Limited Partners'p	237
9. Burden of — Proof — Stockholders Bank — Incorporated or Limited Partnership.....	102
10. Contract—Prescription.....	238
11. Dissolution — Division of Property.....	310 35
12. Letters received after—Mandate — Order—Resolution — Right of Action.....	164
13. Notice of.....	310 238
14. Right to have Receiver Appointed.....	311
15. Rights of Retiring Partners —Continu g Business—Firm Name—Good-will.....	351
16. Surviving Partner — Estop.	557
17. Execution — Against Individual Partner Sale of Share.....	311
18. Partnership Property — Exemption — Levy after Dissolution on Allotted Share.....	238
19. Firm and Private Debts.....	311
20. Fraudulent Conveyances.....	311
21. Good-will — Dissolution of Partnership — Retiring Partners.....	351
22. Sale of — Right of Purchaser to use Seller's Name.....	102
23. Limited—Officers.....	238
24. Misappropriation of Partnership Funds — Banking.....	351
25. Payment of Premium of Life Insurance with Partnership Money.....	499

	PAGES.
26. Power of Partner to Bind the Firm—Note— Presumption—Evidence	35
27. Note.....	311
28. Loan — Proof of.....	291
29. Sale by Partner not within Scope of Partnership Business — Damages — Replevin.....	499
30. In General Trading — Partnership—Article on —Civil & Common Law	368
31. Purchase of Interest.....	198
32. Registration—Names of Members—Initials	310
33. Secret Partner—Action against—Art. 1836 C. C.....	589
34. What Constitutes—Holding out Person as Partner (Reversed in Part by Ct. of Appeal 20 Ont. App. 660).....	354
35. Banking Business.....	35
36. Executory Contract of Sale.....	164
37. Contract to Cut Logs and Bolts.....	499

(See also Railways 32.)

(See also Banks (Depositors) 18 — Bonds 5  
— Companies 41 — Insolvency 6 — Good-will 2)

**PATENTS.**

1. Assignment — Contract — Consideration— Past Services.....	165
2. Co-owner's Rights.....	451
3. Equitable Assignment of a Share—Registration— Documents of Title, Custody of.....	164
4. Infringement — Threats of Legal Proceedings—Circular in General Terms—" Person Aggrieved " — Invalid Patent — Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act. 1883 (46 & 47 V., c. 57), s. 32.....	311
5. Damages for.....	102
6. Action by Licensee in his own Name.....	501
7. License—to Manufacture.....	311
8. Master and Servant — Wrongful Dismissal—Pleading.....	358
9. For Sale in Foreign Countries.....	501
10. Licensee — Action by in his own Name — Ambiguous Contract—Injunction—Substantia! Grant.....	501
11. Patentable Inventions—Combination—Old Elements — New and Useful Result Previous use.....	590
12. Milking Machine — Whether Competing Invention a Mechanical Equivalent — Anticipation.....	391
13. Prolongation of — Non-user of Invention — Presumption of Non-utility Rebutted.....	35
14. Practice—Time for Filing Petition.....	35

PAGES.	PAGES.
<b>PATENTS.</b>	
15. Validity—Provisional Specification—Variation from Complete Specification—Nature of Invention—Patents—Designs and Trade Marks Act, 1883 (Eng.).....	102
<b>PAYMENT.</b>	
Acceptance of Note.....	35
<b>PEDDLERS.</b>	
Who are—City By-Law.....	502
Sale by Samples.....	36
<b>PENALTIES, PUBLIC AND PRIVATE—DISTINCTION BETWEEN—</b> See International Law 2.	
<b>"PERMANENT"—</b> See Railways 31.	
<b>PETITION OF RIGHT.</b>	
R. S. Q. Art. 5976—Sale of Timber Limits—Licenses—Plan—Description—Damages—Art. 992 C. C.....	409
<b>PETROLEUM INSPECTION ACT—</b> See Crown 5.	
<b>PHARMACY.</b>	
Sale of Poisons—Proprietary Medicine—"Chlorodyne".....	452
<b>PHOTOGRAPH OF DOCUMENTS—</b> See Procedure 3. 4.	
<b>PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS.</b>	
1. Negligence.....	238
2. Proof of Services—R. S. Q. 5551.....	103
<b>PHYSICAL EXAMINATION.</b>	
1. Of Party—Rights of U. S. Courts to Compel	44
2. Pennsylvania.....	99
3. New York Court of Appeal.....	146
4. Child—Action by Father as Tutor.....	321
<b>PLEADING.</b>	
1. Demurrer to Plea in Part—Discontinuance—Amendment—Manitoba.....	239
2. Reply—Departure from Complaint.....	312
3. Compensation—Unliquidated Damages—Special Replication to Special Answer....	358
(See also Jury Trial 2—Bills & Notes 76—Carriers 53.)	
<b>PLEDGE.</b>	
1. Collateral Security—Joint Obligors.....	103
2. Sale.....	312
3. Stock.....	557
4. Of Goods—Care of Goods—Duty of Pledgee	358
5. For Pre-existing Debt—Transfer of Bill of Lading—R. S. Q. 5616.....	103
6. Immoveable—Arts. 1965, 1967, 1970, 1975, C. C.....	165
(See also Banks 45.—Building Societies 2.)	
<b>POISONS—</b> CHLORODYNE— See Pharmacy.	
<b>POLICE MAGISTRATE—</b> See Prohibition. See Judge.	
<b>POSSESSION—</b> See Wills 20—Sale 29, 30.	
<b>ADVERSE—TENANCIES IN COMMON—</b> See Limitat. of Actions 4.	
<b>POWER OF ATTORNEY—</b> See Principal & Agt.	
<b>PRACTICE—</b> See Privy Council—Procedure.	
<b>PREROGATIVES OF THE CROWN—</b> Minor— See Crown 5.	
<b>PRESCRIPTION.</b>	
Art. 1055 C. C.—Action under Art. 2262 C. C.—433 C. C. P.....	185
Interruption of by Compensation.....	168
(See also Disavowal—Bills and Notes 53 (Interruption)—Partnership 10.)	
<b>PRINCIPAL AND AGENT.</b>	
1. Authority of Agt.—Authority to use Name—Telegram—Letter of Credit.....	312
2. Corporation—Railways Carriers—Contract—Damages.....	313
3. Excess of Authority—Liability of Principal—Mortgage—Authority to Pledge Title Deeds for a Particular Sum—Forged Deeds—Redemption.....	636
5. Power of Attorney—Effect of—Power to Borrow must be Express—Indorsement of Bills "Per Pro".....	452
6. President, etc., of Incorporated University—Orders to Architect.....	312
7. Bank Agent to Institute Criminal Proceedings against a Debtor of the Bk.—Excess of Authority—Liability.....	503
8. Travelling Salesman—Implied Authority to Collect Money.....	590
(See also Banks 1, 2—Bills and Notes 1—Companies 1—Insurance 25, 26, 27, 114, 115, 116, 170.)	
9. Bills & Notes—Payment—Agency—Scope Presumption.....	186
10. Bona Fide Holder for Value—Abuse of Power by Agent.....	37
11. Investment of Funds.....	239
12. Mutuality of Contract.....	103
13. Personal Liability—Acting without Authority.....	312
14. Proof of—Admissibility.....	357
15. Ratification of Agent's Acts.....	37
16. Sub-Agent—Power to Appoint.....	558
17. Employment of by Agent—Agent Represented to be Principal—Money Received by Sub-Agent—Right of Sub-Agent to set off against Debt due to Him by Agent—Estoppel.....	558
18. Appointment of by Agent—Exception to the Rule in this Respect.....	300
19. Undisclosed Principal—Liability of.....	451
(See also Elections 4.—Ships 6.)	
<b>PRINCIPAL AND SURETY.</b>	
1. Bills and Notes—Joint Promissory Note.....	37
2. Non Negotiable.....	33
3. Discharge of Surety—Appeal Bond.....	110
4. Delivery.....	239
5. Conditions of Surety—Bond—Contract of Employment.....	313
6. Notice to Surety.....	313
7. Concealment by Creditor of Material Facts.....	500
8. Novation—Release of Principal Debtor—Tasmania—Appeal to Privy Council.....	50

	PAGES.
<b>PRINCIPAL AND SURETY.</b>	
9. Liability of Surety—Agent's Bond.....	91
10. Obligation with a Term—Insolvency of Principal Debtor—Arts. 1933, 1934 C. C.....	319
<b>PRINTED WORDS—See Ships etc. 2.</b>	
<b>PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS—See Government Employee—Attorney and Client 5.</b>	
<b>PRIVILEGE OF UNPAID VENDOR—See Vendor and Purchaser.</b>	
<b>PRIVY COUNCIL.</b>	
Practice as to Raising a New Point—New South Wales.....	493
<b>PROBABLE CAUSE—See False Arrest—Damages 17, 18.—Malicious Prosecution 2, 3, 4, 5.—Libel and Slander.</b>	
<b>PROCEDURE.</b>	
1. Arguments of Counsel Carriers of Passengers.....	320
2. Election Petition—Time for Filing—Solar Time.....	36
3. Exhibits—Discovery—Photograph of Documents—Order XXXI, R. 14: Order L. R. 3.....	502
4. Photograph of Documents—Belgian and French Law....	502
5. Privy Council—Practice as to Raising a new Point.....	493
6. Renewal of Writ—Setting Aside Order for—Statute of Limitations.....	590
7. Service of Writ of Summons—Constructive Service—Judgment by Default—Setting Aside.....	42
8. of Writ of Summons—Defendant without the Jurisdiction—Action on Foreign Judgment—Rules 270, 271, Ont.....	111
9. of Foreign Corporation—Domicile Art. 27 C. C.—Arts. 34, 61, 61, C. P. C.....	221
<i>(See Servitude—Que Warranto—Privy Council.)</i>	
<b>PROFESSIONAL DESIGNATION—See Injunction 2.</b>	
<b>PROHIBITION.</b>	
1. Police Magistrate—Witness for Defence..	103
2. Writ of—See Constitutional Law 6.	
<b>PROSTITUTION—See Crim. Law 77.</b>	
<b>"PROXIMATE CAUSE"—See Neg. 118-121.</b>	
<b>PULMAN CAR CO., LIABILITY OF FOR LOSS OF BAGGAGE—See Carriers 35-36.</b>	
<b>PUBLIC POLICY—See Contracts 23, 43, 46—Restraint of Trade.</b>	
<b>QUANTUM MERUIT—See Mun. Corp. 30.</b>	
<b>QUASI CONTRACTS—See Counties 2.</b>	
<b>QUO WARRANTO.</b>	
Procedure In.....	37
<i>(See also Mun. Corp. 70.)</i>	
<b>RAILWAY COMPANIES.</b>	
1. Accid. & Neg. Cases—Animals Straying on Track—Horses Killed.....	591 31
<i>(See also Nixon v. G. T. R. Co., 29 Can. Law Journal 119.)</i>	
2. Animals Straying on Track—Evidence of the Blood and Excellence of the Sire and Dam of the Animal Killed.....	559
3. Animals Straying on Track—Defect. Fence..	30

	PAGES.
4. Animals Straying on Track—Fences—Gates—Crossings—(51 V., c. 29, ss. 191-199).....	501 99
5. Alighting from Train—Pleading.....	33
6. Duties of Railroads toward passengers known to have Fallen from Train on to the Track..	309
7. Collis'n with Street Car	32
8. of Trains—Both Companies bound to same Degree of Care... 314	314
9. Fire Caused by Sparks from Engine—Contrib. Neg.—Scotch Law.....	352
10. Fire Caused by Sparks from Engine (Affirmed by House of Lords Scot. Law Rep. 591)....	360
11. Fire Caused by Spark from Engine—Co-Proprietors of Line.....	591
12. Injuries to Persons on Track..... 307, 553, 160, 494, 495, 308, 241	307, 553, 160, 494, 495, 308, 241
13. Injuries to Persons on Track—Exit—Station—Custom—Flagman.....	306
14. Injuries to Persons on Track after being Wrongfully Ejected from Train.....	553
15. Injuries to Persons at Crossings 162, 160, 31, 32, 308, 359, 240	162, 160, 31, 32, 308, 359, 240
16. Limitation of Actions C. S. C., c. 66, s. 83—51 V., c. 29, s. 287 (affirmed by Court of Appeal on other Grounds 19 Ont. App. 767).....	313
17. Turntables—Injuries to at (Nos. 5 & 8).....	31
18. Statutory Powers—Want of Precautions in Conducting Dangerous Operations.....	495
19. Unloading Cars.....	234
<i>(See also Negligence 6, 7, 8, 9, 12.)</i>	
20. Arbitration—Award—Prolongation of Delay for Making Award.....	33
21. Construct'n of Line under Charter—Money Advanced and Control Exercised by another Company—Liability of latter as to it—Tort—Feasor.....	104
22. Defective Bridge.....	240
23. Elevated Railroad—Damage—Market—Value of Lands—Benefits.....	314
24. Continuing Trespass—Injunction.....	33
25. Expropriation of Land—Injunction.....	33
25}. .....	240
<i>(See also Expropriation 8.)</i>	
26. Bonds and Mortgages.....	455
27. Complaint of Express Company against Railway Company—Mandamus—Railway Act of Canada.....	104

RAILWAY COMPANIES.		PAGES.
28. Continuing Trespass by E	vated Railroad — Injunction.....	38
29. Contagious Diseases — Ticket Agent.....		210
30. Carriers — Liability as.....		455
31. Grant of Easement by — User — “ Ultra Vires ” — Title by Prescription.....		359
32. Lease or Partnership.....		637
33. Overflow caused by Railway Embankment		314
34. Question whether Statutory Obligation to Stop all ordinary Trains at a certain Station was Temporary or Permanent — Title to Sue.....		592
35. Right to Exclude Hacks from Depot — Exclusive Privilege.....		210
36. Right of Way—Injunction.....		38
37. Abandonment of — Condition Subsequent.....		211
38. Release of—Construction & Effect.....		240
39. Condemning — Action — Damage to Crops.....		311
40. Railway Clauses Act (Eng.) Temporary Occupation of Land — “ Roads ” — Tramway — Necessity.....		314
41. Streets — Right of City to Extend, across Railroads already Constructed..		165
42. Damages for Using.....		38
43. Widening Embankment — Damages.....		314
44. Crossing — Change of Grade ..		559
45. Title to Land — Tenant for Life — Conveyance to Railway Company by — Railway Acts — C. S. C. c. 66, s. 11, ss. 1 — 24 Vic., c. 17, s. 1 — Ontario.....		591
46. Undue Preference — Unequal Mileage Rates — Rival Traders — Access to Competing Line — Grouping—Railway Clauses Consolidation Act, 1845 (8 & 9 V., c. 20) s. 90 — Railway and Canal Traffic Act, 1885 (51 & 52 V., c. 25), ss. 17, 27, 29 & 55.).....		359
47. Wrong Train.....		566
<i>(See also Carriers — Damages 4. (Construction of Sidings on Side-walk)—Mast. &amp; Scrvt. 15 (Ticket Agt.)—Mandamus 2. (Maintenance of Station)—Taxation 18. 19.—Mun. Corp. 11.)</i>		
REAL ESTATE AGENT.		
1. Commissions—Right to (Nos. 1 & 2).....		211
2. Extent of Authority.....		101
“ REASONABLE EFFORTS ”—See Contracts 29.		
“ REASONABLE TIME ”—See Contracts 7.—Carriers 3.—Bills and Notes 16.		
RECEIPT.		
1. Signature by Cross—Evidence.....		409
2. Error—See Account.		
REGISTRATION—See Donation 1. 2.		
REGISTRY LAWS.		
R. S. N. S. 5th Ser., c. 84, s. 21 — Registered Judgment—Priority—Mortgage—Rectification of Mistake—Nova Scotia.....		360
RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES.		
Incorporation—Notice—Withdrawal of Faction.....		315
RES JUDICATA—Plea of.....		242
Negligence.....		104
<i>(See also Expropriation 9.—Counties 1.—Companies 51.—Action.)</i>		
RESTRAINT OF TRADE.		
1. Epitome of the Common Law Doctrine by Bowen J., in the Nordenfelt Case.....		510

	PAGES.
2. Article—Comparison of the Civil and Common Law Doctrines—Recent Cases — Canadian Decisions.....	48
3. Combinations—to Keep up Rate of Freight — Exclusion of Rival Traders from Combination.....	77
4. Stenographers.....	212
5. “ Trusts ” — “ Ultra Vires ”.....	271
6. Cotton Seed Mills.....	381
7. Construction of Provisions of Act of Congress July 1890.....	559
8. Lumber Retail Dealer.....	585
9. Covenant not to engage in same business.....	8
10. ....	297
11. ....	455
12. ....	455
13. ....	650
14. ....	617
<i>(See also Companies 6 — Injunctions 1 — Trade-Unions 3.)</i>	
RESULTING TRUST—See Insolvency 4.	
REVISING OFFICER—See Mandamus 3.	
RIPARIAN RIGHTS.	
1. Diversion of Water by Railway Company — Damages.....	105
2. Navigable Waters—Powers of City—Dock Line.....	166
3. Navigable Stream — Obstruction of—Right to Damages — Rights of Public in Private Canal.....	569
<i>(See Water &amp; Water Courses 3.)</i>	
SALE OF GOODS.	
1. Acceptance—Manufact'd articles—Evid.....	316
2. Statute of Frauds.....	315 41
3. Contract for Sale of Binder — Reasonable Time.....	167
4. Order obtained by Com. Traveller.....	106
5. What Constitutes.....	505
6. By President of Company — Power of to Make.....	315
7. Sample — Inspect'n at Place of Delivery.....	456
8. Weight.....	40
9. Commercial Traveller — Acceptance.....	106
10. Tender — Extending Time.....	107
11. Contract of — Construction—Title to goods Delivery.....	39
12. Assignment—Partially Executed.....	243
13. Made on Sunday — Ratification.....	39
14. Commission.....	39
15. When Perfect — Sale by Weight—Art. 1474 C. C.....	40
16. Damage—Date of Shipment — Performance — Major v. Kehler, 1 Off. Rep., Q. B. 23.....	244
17. Delivery.....	637, 41 569
18. Evidence of.....	375
19. Parol.....	106
20. Book — Entries — Delivery.....	41
21. Laches.....	41 316
22. Latent Defects—Sealskin Jacket — Rejection — Timeous.....	564
23. Panels — Manufactured Articles.....	41
24. Salted Salmon—Laches.....	41
24. Market Price.....	106
25. Of Debts—Collection of Notices—Warranty.....	510
26. Building Material.....	106

	PAGES.
<b>SALE OF GOODS.</b>	
27. On Credit — Insolvency of Purchaser — Rights of Seller.....	316
28. Place — Delivery in another County — Intoxicating Liquors.....	361
29. Possession—Judgment Creditors.....	243
30.....	315
31. Price Fixed by Trade Combination—Instructions.....	106
32. Rescission Defects in Quality — Right of Seller to Replace.....	242
33. Defects in Quality—Laches.....	316
34. Sale of Bank Stock—Receiver.....	564
33. Rights of Purchaser.....	39
36. Vendor.....	39 316
37. Statute of Frauds — Delivery and Acceptance.....	11
38. Delivery and Acceptance—Memo in Writing.....	315
39. Acceptance — Memo in Writing.....	455
40. "Subject to Inspection and Re-Gauging" —Buyer Entitled to Appoint his own Gauger — Marking of Casks with Buyer's Initials, when an Acceptance — Condition Precedent.....	505
41. Title, when Passes—Delivery to Carrier.....	560
42. Sale of Hops.....	243
43.....	39
44. Warranty — Machine.....	501
45. By Special Agent—Authority of Agent.....	107
46. Cotton Press.....	243
47. Subsequent Use.....	243
48. "Of same Quality and Kind as Furnished you During the Past Year"—Counter claim—Assignment.....	243
49. Breach of—Counter claim for Damages for — Authority of Agent to Warrant — Assessment of Damages.....	243
50. Sale of Horse.....	242 560
51. Heating Apparatus — Specifications.....	501
52. Delivery.....	110
53. Sale by Description.....	244
54. Patent Defects.....	321
58. Sale of Deals—Arts. 1073, 1473, 1507 C. G.....	637
56. Without Reserve—Sale by Tender — Reception of Tenders — Extending Time.....	107
<b>SALE OF REALTY.</b>	
1. Scales Erected on Realty — Rights of Purchaser with Notice of Previous Sale by Assignee.....	560
2. Land — Error as to Accessory of Thing Sold — Damages.....	40
<i>(See also Taxation 20 — Contracts 41 (Building Restrictions) — Contracts 12 (Decd.)</i>	
<b>SALVAGE—See Ships 30, 33.</b>	
<b>SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS—See Mandamus 4.</b>	
<b>SCIRE FACIAS—See Insurance 51.</b>	
<b>SEPARATE SCHOOLS—See Constitutional Law 5.</b>	
<b>SERVITUDE.</b>	
Action Conessoire — Real Servitude — Apparent — Registration — 44 & 45 Vic. c. 16, ss. 5 & 6 (P.Q.) — Art. 1508 C. C. — Procedure — Matters of, in Appeal — Quebec.....	595

	PAGES.
SET-OFF—See Banks 29, 6—Bills and Notes 65—Companies 16.	
<b>SILVER.</b>	
Transfer of Subject to a Trust—Constructive Notice — Signature of Bank Manager as "Manager in Trust".....	637
"SHEBEN"—See Libel and Slander 22.	
<b>SHERIFF'S SALE—See Judicial Sale.</b>	
<b>SHERIFFS.</b>	
1. Exercise of Discretion by — Interpleader Laches — Protection of Sheriff.....	316
2. Liability for Deposit.....	42
<b>SHIPS AND SHIPPING.</b>	
1. Arrest — Wrongful — <i>Crasna Negligentia</i> — Mala Fides — Damages.....	156
2. Bills of Lading—Construct'n of — Deviation Clause — Printed Words — Liberty to Deviate from Specified Voyage—Extent of Deviation Authorized.....	638
1. Charter-Party — Delay in Taking Delivery Rescission.....	596
3. Freight — Hire to Cease when Ship Inefficient.....	108
6. Liability of Owner of Chartered Ship — Principal and Agent — Master — Registered Managing Owner (House of Lords).....	457
7. Breach Condition Precedent or Warranty — Waiver.....	561
8. Collision — Vessel at Anchor — Inevitable Accident—Steam Steering Gear.....	65
9. Damage to Cargo—Cattle Ship.....	561
10. Demurrage.....	245
11. Restraints of Princes and Rulers — Customary Mode of Loading.....	638
12. "To be discharged with all Despatch Customary"—Strike of Dock Labourers — Habitual and Notorious Dilatoriness of Dock Company in Discharging.....	317
13. Cesser Clause of Charter-Party — Detention at Port of Loading — Lien.....	362
14. Strike.....	457
15. Discharge—Excepted Clause.....	107
16. Custom of the Port.....	6
17. Discharge — Time — Despatch Money — "Sundays and Fête Days Excepted".....	638
18. Exceptions to Political Consequences.....	505 638
19. Loan to Ship's Husband — Liability of Owners.....	245
20. Maritime Lien—Privilege of last Furnisher — (Quebec).....	317
21. Wharfage—Seizure "Super non Domino"—Mortgagor and Mortgagee.....	98
22. Claim for Wages—Master of Vessel — Cast Reported Page 363 Decided in Exchequer Ct. (See 4 West. L. Times 11) ("The Aurora").....	364
23.....	.. 364

	PAGES.
<b>SHIPS AND SHIPPING.</b>	
21. Mast, and Servt.—Owner of Ship and Seaman, Contract between—Obligation of Owner under Merchant Shipping Act, 1876 (39 & 40 V., c. 8), s. 5—"Seaworthiness"—Negligence—Negligence of Captain—Fellow Servant—Common Employment.....	107
25. Disrating—Deduction from Wages—Mer. Ship. Act 1851.....	321
26. Negligence—Who Liable for in a Peculiar Case—Pilot.....	505
27. Inspection of Passenger Boat—Passengers—Who are.....	215
28. Of Physician—Liability of Owners.....	363
29. Stevedore.....	561
30. Salvage—Tug.....	1
31j. General Average—Contribution Cargo left in Peril for Benefit of Vessel—Expense of Subsequent Efforts to Save both Vessel and Cargo.....	158
31. Of Ship and Cargo—Principal and Agent—Power of Attorney given by Crew to Agent of Owners of Salvaging Vessel for Purpose of Adjustment of Salvage Claim—Construction of.....	363
32. Maritime Lien—Claims for Rescue of Vessel—Nature of Services Rendered—Express Agreement for Payment—Extent of Lien—Value of Res at Time of Salvage—Additional Value by Reason of Repairs—Amount of Salvage—Costs.....	364
3. Action by Owner alone—Dilatory Exception.....	457
4. Towage—Detention at Quarantine—Compensation.....	362
<b>SIC UTERE TUO UT ALIENUM NON LÆDAS</b> —See Nuisance 3.	
<b>SLANDER</b> —See Libel and Slander.	
<b>SLEEPING CAR COMPANY</b> —See Carriers 35. —(Liability for Loss of Baggage.)	
<b>SOLICITOR</b> —See Mun. Corp. 25—Companies 14.	
<b>SOLICITOR AND CLIENT.</b>	
1. Bill of Costs—Proceedings before Taxing Officer—Evidence of Settlement—Appeal	109
2. Lien on Documents—Change of Solicitor—Persons Interested—Delivery up.....	246
3. Successive Solicitors in Action—Insufficient Fund—Priority.....	410
4. Sale by Solicitor to Client—Duty of Solicitor.....	596
(See also Trusts 6).	
<b>STALE DEMAND</b> —See Comp.....	74
<b>STATUTE.</b>	
1. Interpretation.....	43
2. Repeal—Distribution of Interstate Estate—Statute of Fraud—New Brunswick....	42

	PAGES
<b>STATUTE OF FRAUDS.</b>	
1. Debt of Another.....	561, 281 282
2. Memorandum—Signature—Agreement to Serve—Agent.....	410
3. Transfer of Personal Property—Preference by—Pressure—Interest.....	216
(See also Foreign Law—Companies 2—Bills & Notes 90—Sale of Goods 2, 37, 38, 39.)	
<b>STATUTORY POWERS</b> —See Mun. Corp. 37—Nuisance 10—Street Rly. 7.	
<b>STREET RAILWAYS.</b>	
1. By-Laws of Ordinance Regulating Time of Running Cars.....	365
2. Electricity as a Nuisance—Interfering with Telephone Service.....	16, 60 457
3. Negligence—Franchise—Liability.....	562
(See also Negligence 94—110, 49, 52.)	
4. Non Compliance with Statute—Jury—Questions Unanswered.....	505
5. Privilege to Use Streets—Construction of Acts.....	639
6. Servitude—Cable Railway.....	412
7. Statutory Authority.....	457
8. Transfers.....	457
9. Wires—Single Trolley—Owners of Lots Fronting Street.....	505
See also Contracts 32—Mast. & Serv. 27—Mun. Corp. 14, 77—Negligence 91, 110, 49, 52.)	
<b>STEVEDORES</b> —See Negligence 93.	
<b>STOCK BROKERS</b> —See Gambling Transactions 3, 4, 5, 6.	
<b>STRIKES</b> —See Carriers 2, 43—Ships 14, 12.	
<b>SUBROGATION.</b>	
What will Effect—Art. 1155, s. 2, Erroneous noting of Deed by Register.....	
81	
(See also Insurance 42, 110.)	
<b>SUBSTITUTION.</b>	
1. Curator to—Action to Account—Indivisibility of—Will—Construction—Transfer—Effect of—Sale of Rights—Mandatory—Negotiorum Gestor—Parties to Suit for Partition—Art. 920, C. C. P.—Purchase by Co-heir while Curator—Art. 1481, C. C.....	413
2. Substituted Property—Registration—Shares—See Banks 46.	
<b>SUMMARY CONVICTION</b> —See Justice of the Peace—Intox. Liquors 7, 89.	
<b>SUMMONS—SERVICE</b> —See Procedure 7, 3, 9.—Intox. Liquors 6.	
<b>SUNDAY LAW.</b>	
1. See Sale of Goods—(Contract of) 13;	
2. Keeping Saloon open.....	318, 319
"SUNKEN WRECK"—See Insurance 176.	
<b>SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER CT. ACTS</b> —See Appeal 9, 10, 11.	
<b>SURETYSHIP</b> —See Bonds 4, 5, 6.—Bills and Notes 6, 7.—Banks 38—Principal and Surety.	
<b>SUSPENSION.</b>	
Law Agent—Misconduct—Law Agents (Scotland) Act 1873.....	
562	
"SWEATING"—See Libel and Slander 17.	
<b>SYPHILIS</b> —See Marriage.	
<b>TARIFF OF FEES</b> —See Fees.	
<b>TAXATION.</b>	
1. Bank Shares—Deduction of Indebtedness—(U. S.).....	43
2. Board of Review—Collateral Attack.....	562

TAXATION.

PAGES.

3. Constitutional Law—Interstate Commerce 270  
 (See also *Constitutional Law* 1. 2. 3. 4. 11. 12. 13. 14.)  
 4. City of Montreal—Sewers..... 247  
 5. Crown Lands -- Exemption — Lands sold or Occupied — Locus — Manitoba..... 169  
 6. By-Law—Validating Acts —Effect of ..... 248  
 7. Corporations—Capital..... 562  
 8. Electric Light'g Companies—Manufacture Exemption—Penalties..... 43  
 9. Exemption—Charitable Institutions..... 43  
 (See also *Mun. Corp.* 78.)  
 10. Foreign Corporations doing Business in the State of New York..... 597  
 11. Illegal Assessment — Public Improvement —Collateral Attack.. 248  
 Ontario Act..... 639  
 12. Obstructing Collection—(U. S.) ..... 43  
 14. Ontario Assessment Act R. S. O., c. 193, Sections 15. 65. — Business Carried on in two Municipalities—Place of Business..... 639  
 15. Pipes—of Gas Company and Mains ..... 169  
 16. of Water Company ..... 610 247  
 17. Property Held in Trust ..... 319  
 18. Railway Companies — Road Bed ..... 328  
 19. Nova Scotia Rly. Act—Exemption—Mining Company — Construction of Railway by..... 639  
 20. Sale of Land for — Nullity—Rights of Purchaser ..... 319  
 21. Telegraph Poles assessed as Real Property 473  
 22. Tax — What is — Water Rent..... 563

(See also *Mun. Corp.* 2. 6.)

TELEGRAPH COMPANIES.

1. Error in Transmission of Despatch — Condition Limiting Responsibility of Company — (1 Rap. Off. Q.B. 1) Arts. 989, 990, 1676 C. C..... 250  
 Contributory Neg.. 249  
 3. Delay in Delivering Message ..... 44  
 1. ..... 169  
 5. Instructions to Jury 170  
 6. Excessive Damages ..... 249  
 Damages..... 249  
 7. Joinder of Actions  
 Use of Blanks — Notice of Claim.. 414  
 9. Measure of Damages..... 249  
 10. 319  
 11. 319  
 12. Connecting Lines —Plead'g — Denial under Oath..... 415  
 Evidence — Delay of Plff. .... 320  
 Contributory Neg. 414  
 Defense ..... 506  
 15. Limiting Liability..... 44  
 17. .... 597

See also *Negligence* 112).

TELEPHONE COMPANIES.

PAGES.

Discrimination by Telephone Company. .... 365  
 (See also *Negligence* 113 — *Trees* 3— *Street Railway* 2 — *Contracts* 18.)  
 TEMPERANCE ACT— See Intox. Liquors.  
 "TEMPORARY" — See Railways 31.  
 TIMBER.  
 Removal of — "Necessary" — Agreement — Construction of — Ontario ..... 457  
 TIMBER LICENSES — See Petition Right.  
 TITLE TO LAND.  
 Action against Estate for Debt of Executor — Purchase by Executor at Sale under Execution — Constructive Trust — Statute of Limitations..... 365  
 (See also *Injunction* 9— *Railways* 45.)  
 TOWAGE — See Ships 31.  
 TRADE MARK.  
 1. "Concurrence Déloyale" — Place Renowned for its Manufactures — Belgium..... 63  
 2. Good-will — Injunction to Restrain use of Name (Reported in Extension) ..... 600  
 3. Injunction — Resemblance..... 506  
 1. .... 458  
 5. Infringement — Deception by Owner ..... 613  
 6. Patents Designs & Trade Marks Act, 1893 (Eng.) Powell's Case..... 506  
 7. Rectification of Register — Infringement — Concurrent User (C.A.)—(Reversing Keekewick, page 416, Paine's Case) ..... 458  
 8. Trade Name—Usurpation — Distant Town — Branch..... 509  
 9. Right of Widow as Successor to Her Husband..... 509  
 See *Good-will* 4.  
 10. (See also *Costs* 2.)

TRADE UNIONS.

1. Conspiracy — Maliciously Procur'g Breach of Contract..... 459  
 2. Procur'g Discharge of Non-Union Laborer — Boycott..... 459  
 3. Unlawful Combination—Restraint of Trade 11  
 (See also *Libel & Slander* 17.)

TRANSFER, EFFECT OF — See Substitution.

TRAVELLERS, WHO ARE — See Intoxicating Liquors 23, 24, 25.

TRAVELLING SALESMAN — See Prin. & Agt. 8.

TREES.

1. Ornamental — Public Street — Property — Damages — City of Montreal..... 110  
 2. Ownership of Roads and Streets — Rights of Private Property Owners — Ownership ad Medium Filum Viæ — R. S. N. 5th Ser. c. 45— Nova Scotia..... 587  
 3. Removing Trees from Sidewalk..... 299  
 (See also *Nuisance* 7.)

TRESPASS TO LAND.

Title—Application for New Trial -- Misdirection—Misconduct of Jurors — Nominal Damages..... 320

TRIAL—See Physical Examination—Venue.

TRUSTS.

1. Action by Trustee — Allowance out of Estate ..... 171  
 2. Creditors, Decd—Construction of — Resulting Trust..... 44  
 3. Powers of Trustees—Partnership — One of Three Trustees—Partner in a Business Forming Part of the Trust Estate—Trust Administration..... 366



	PAGES.
<b>TRUSTS.</b>	
4. of Trustee to Continue Business of Testator .....	507
5. Receivers—Corporations—Equity.....	170
6. Solicitor Trustee—Power to Charge for Professional Services and Trouble—Settlement of Accounts Between Trustees.....	507
7. Wills—Executors and Trustees under—Breach of Trust by one—Notice—Inquiry..	597
<i>(See also Restraint of Trade — Wills 33. — Shares.)</i>	
<b>TRUSTEES—See Trusts.</b>	
<b>TURNTPIKE COMPANY.</b>	
Liability for Defective Construction.....	259
<b>TUTORSHIP.</b>	
Tutor <i>ad hoc</i> —Action by for Injuries received by Minor Daughter.....	597
<i>(See also Indians.)</i>	
<b>ULTRA VIRES—RESTRAINT OF TRADE—See Companies 6.</b>	
See Companies 59. 74. 37. 18. — Banks 11.	
<b>"UNDUE INFLUENCE"—See Donations 2.</b>	
<b>USAGE—See Banks 7.—Custom and Usage.</b>	
<b>VENDITIONI EXPONAS—See Judicial Sale.</b>	
<b>VENDOR AND PURCHASER.</b>	
Unpaid Vendor, Privilege of — Opposition to Sale of Immovable Seized—Art. 637 C. C. P.—Shareholder—Company.....	110
<b>VENUE.</b>	
Change of — Fair Trial — Prejudice—Hostile Feeling against Plaintiff in County where cause of Action arose.....	598
<b>VERDICT.</b>	
1. Excessive — See <i>Carriers</i> 11.	
2. Perverse — New Trial — Duress — Threats of Criminal Prosecution.....	540
<b>VOLENTI NON FIT INJURIA —See Master and Servant 48, 53.</b>	
<b>WAGER — See Lotteries 2.</b>	
<b>WAGES — See Ship. 22 — Master &amp; Servt. 2.</b>	
<b>WAIVER — See Crown 3 — Insurance.</b>	
<b>WAREHOUSE RECEIPTS.</b>	
Bank Act — Promise to Transfer Warehouse Receipts—Goods in Transit. (This Case has Just been Confirmed in the Privy Council)...	251
<b>WARRANTY — See Sale of Goods.</b>	
<b>WATER COMPANIES.</b>	
1. Contract with City—Construction... ..	416
2. Privity of — Rights of Third Parties.....	459
3. ....	322
4. Power to Lay Pipes in Streets — City By-Laws .....	321
5. Regulations—Penalty for non Payment of Water Rates—Reasonableness.....	251
6. Water Supply Act (1885) Barbadoes—Compensation — Past and Future Profits.....	643
<b>WATER RATES—See Taxation 22—Mun. Corp. 80.</b>	
<b>WATER WORKS—See Mun. Corp. 81.</b>	
<b>WATERS AND WATER COURSES.</b>	
1. Easements—Spring.....	563
2. Diversion—Evidence .....	251
3. License to Flood Highway — Liability of Licensor for Negligence of Licensee—Damage by Breaking of Mill Dam—Rights and Liabilities of Riparian Proprietors for Damage.....	251
4. Surface Water—Obstruction. ....	563

	PAGES
<i>(See also Riparian Rights.)</i>	
<b>WEAPONS.</b>	
Carrying Concealed Weapons — Intent Immaterial .....	45
<b>WHARF OWNER, LIABILITY OF—See Neg. 111.</b>	
<b>"WHOLESALE PRICE"—See Contracts 33.</b>	
<b>WILLS.</b>	
1. Charitable Bequests — Bequest to Ecclesiastical Officer—Gift to Pastor of Church not a Charitable Bequest.....	507
2. Public Libraries.....	563
3. Educational Establishment....	599
4. Codicils — Writing on Back of Codicil — Blank Piece of Paper Pasted over Codicil — Order for Removal.....	460
5. Construction — Ambiguities — Description of Legatees.....	252
6. "Relatives Named" — "Transmissible Interest" ..	46
7. Release to Legatees of Pre-Existing Debts .....	253
8. Clause Exempting from Seizure .....	252
9. Cease to Carry on the Business.....	599
10. Children born after Decese but before Distribution of Legacy .....	252
11. Request to Pay Losses to Estate—Sharing of.....	2
12. Legacy—Period of Vesting Children—Grand Children .	367
13. "Effects" — Real Estate whether Included.....	367
14. "Now in my own Occupation" .....	599
15. Usufructuaries— Accretion	563
16. Division of Estate — Right to Postpone .....	561
17. "Survivors".....	561
18. Shares—Debenture Stock..	45
19. Direction to Executor—Personally.....	45
20. Children and their Issue — Estate to be "Equally" Divided—Per Stirpes or Per Capita—Statute of Limitations—Possession — Trustee	366
<i>(See also Substitutions.)</i>	
21. Contest of — Evidence .....	45
22. Lost Will — Administration .....	460
23. Mistake—Erroneous Recital.....	460
24. In Number — Class, Ascertainment of—Gift to Children .....	460
25. Description of Property — Extrinsic Evidence .....	461
26. Probate — Will Proved Abroad — French Law — Probate of Copy .....	41
27. Will Proved Abroad—Original Will in French—Certified Copy — English Translation admitted to Probate — Right of Court to Look at Certified Copy.....	417
28. Revocation—Construction—Codicil.....	253
29. Codicils — Revival — Nova Scotia.....	45
30. Evidence.....	46
31. Codicils — Revival by Void Legacies—R.S.O. ch. 109, s. 24	507

WILLS.	PAGES.		PAGES.
32. Torn Will—Incomplete Restoration—Copy —Grant.....	171	39.	Duo Execution—Signature of Witness..... 460
33. Trust .....	46	10.	Undue Influence .....
34. Two Wills—English and Foreign — Incorporation .....	460	11.	— Ratification. 461 (See also Trusts 7 — Bills & Notes 79 — Married Women 2— Conflict of Laws.)
35. Administration with Will annexed—No Executor Named in Second — Wife Sole Beneficiary — Grant to Wife — Securities Dispensed with — Personal Bond only Required	460	WITNESSES.	
36. Validity—Form of — Will made Abroad — Legacy — Interpretation — Procedure—Intervention — Charitable Institution.....	599	1. Impeachment .....	47
37. Not Executed as Statute demands is Invalid—(New York)...	599	2. Opinion Evidence.....	322
38. Joint Will.....	45	3. Privilege—Attorney and Client.....	253
		1. Physician .....	322
		WORDS — See Particular Words and Phrases — Wills, Construction.	
		“Cease to Carry on the Business” .....	599
		“Now in my own Occupation” .....	599
		“To” “Till” and “Until” .....	78
		WORKMANSHIP.	
		Claim for Value of — Destruction of Object before Acceptance of Work.....	460