[HOUSE OF LORDS.]

WILLIAM DERRY, J. C. WAKEFIELD, M. M. MOORE, J. PETHICK, AND S. J. WILDE . . . . . APPELLANTS;

AND

SIR HENRY WILLIAM PEEK, BARONET. RESPONDENT.

H. L. (E.) 1889 July 1.

Action of Deceit—False Representation—Fraud—"Legal Fraud"—Company—Misrepresentation in Prospectus.

In an action of deceit the plaintiff must prove actual fraud. Fraud is proved when it is shewn that a false representation has been made knowingly, or without belief in its truth, or recklessly, without caring whether it be true or false.

A false statement, made through carelessness and without reasonable ground for believing it to be true, may be evidence of fraud but does not necessarily amount to fraud. Such a statement, if made in the honest belief that it is true, is not fraudulent and does not render the person making it liable to an action of deceit.

A special Act incorporating a tramway company provided that the carriages might be moved by animal power, and, with the consent of the Board of Trade, by steam power. The directors issued a prospectus containing a statement that by their special Act the company had the right to use steam power instead of horses. The plaintiff took shares on the faith of this statement. The Board of Trade afterwards refused their consent to the use of steam power and the company was wound up. The plaintiff having brought an action of deceit against the directors founded upon the false statement:—

Held, reversing the decision of the Court of Appeal and restoring the decision of Stirling J. (37 Ch. D. 541), that the defendants were not liable, the statement as to steam power having been made by them in the honest belief that it was true.

APPEAL from a decision of the Court of Appeal. The facts are set out at length in the report of the decisions below (1). For the present report the following summary will suffice:—

By a special Act (45 & 46 Vict. c. clix.) the Plymouth, Devonport and District Tramways Company was authorized to make certain tramways.

(1) 37 Ch. D. 541.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK.

By sect. 35 the carriages used on the tramways might be moved by animal power and, with the consent of the Board of Trade, by steam or any mechanical power for fixed periods and subject to the regulations of the Board.

By sect. 34 of the Tramways Act 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 78), which section was incorporated in the special Act, "all carriages used on any tramway shall be moved by the power prescribed by the special Act, and where no such power is prescribed, by animal power only."

In February 1883 the appellants as directors of the company issued a prospectus containing the following paragraph:—

"One great feature of this undertaking, to which considerable importance should be attached, is, that by the special Act of Parliament obtained, the company has the right to use steam or mechanical motive power, instead of horses, and it is fully expected that by means of this a considerable saving will result in the working expenses of the line as compared with other tramways worked by horses."

Soon after the issue of the prospectus the respondent, relying, as he alleged, upon the representations in this paragraph and believing that the company had an absolute right to use steam and other mechanical power, applied for and obtained shares in the company.

The company proceeded to make tramways, but the Board of Trade refused to consent to the use of steam or mechanical power except on certain portions of the tramways.

In the result the company was wound up, and the respondent in 1885 brought an action of deceit against the appellants claiming damages for the fraudulent misrepresentations of the defendants whereby the plaintiff was induced to take shares in the company.

At the trial before Stirling J. the plaintiff and defendants were called as witnesses. The effect given to their evidence in this House will appear from the judgments of noble and learned Lords.

Stirling J. dismissed the action; but that decision was reversed by the Court of Appeal (Cotton L.J., Sir J. Hannen, and Lopes L.J.) who held that the defendants were liable to make good to the plaintiff the loss sustained by his taking the shares,

and ordered an inquiry (1). Against this decision the defendants appealed.

March 28, 29; April 5, 9, 11. Sir *Horace Davey* Q.C. and *Moulton* Q.C. (*M. Muir Mackenzie* with them) for the appellants:—

The law as laid down by the Court of Appeal goes much further than any previous decision and is unsound. To support an action of deceit it always was necessary at common law and still is both there and in Chancery to prove fraud, i.e., that the thing was done fraudulently. Fraud never has been and never will be exhaustively defined, the forms which deceit may take being so many and various. There is a negative characteristic: it must be something which an honest man would not do; not merely what a logical or clear-headed man would not do. However unbusinesslike a man may be he is not fraudulent if he acts honestly. The natural consequences of words or acts must be taken to have been intended, but not so as to impute fraud to honesty. No honest mistake, no mistake not prompted by a dishonest intention, is fraud. The shape of the mistake does not make it more or less a fraud if it is a mistake. Once establish that a man honestly intended to do his duty, the consequences cannot turn his words or acts into a fraud. There may be an obligation to see that no untrue statement is made, but the failure to meet that obligation is not fraud, if there is no dishonest intention. The statement may be inaccurate, yet if the defendants honestly—though mistakenly—believed that it substantially represented the truth, there is no fraud, and an action of deceit will not lie. The decision of the Court of Appeal is that to such a statement the law attaches a meaning which makes it fraudulent. A material misstatement may be a ground for rescinding the contract, but the consequences of fraud and of breach of contract are widely different. In an action for breach of contract the defendant must make good his words. In an action founded on fraud he must bear the whole of the consequences which have been induced by the fraudulent statement, which may be very extensive. The essence of fraud is the tricking a person into the bargain. If the fact that the consent of the Board of Trade

(1) 37 Ch. D. 541, 591.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK.

was necessary was suppressed by these defendants in order to make the bait more alluring there was fraud. The issue then is one of fact, was there an intention to make the bait more alluring? It is not the carelessness leading to an untrue statement which makes fraud; it is the carelessness whether the statement is untrue or not. It is in this sense that the authorities have held defendants liable for fraud when they have made untrue statements "recklessly." The above propositions are the result of the authorities. The law laid down in the earlier cases is well exemplified by *Taylor* v. *Ashton* (1), where, however, the head-note does not truly represent the effect of the decision, and *Joliffe* v. *Baker* (2). In *Polhill* v. *Walter* (3)—which may be relied on by the respondent—the Court considered that the misrepresentation was made by the defendant *knowing it to be untrue.* The idea that something less than fraud was necessary to found an action of deceit crept in first in Lord Chelmsford's observations in *Western Bank of Scotland* v. *Addie* (4), and was extended by Cotton L.J. in *Weir* v. *Bell* (5), where he treats "recklessly" as if it meant "negligently," whereas it means "indifferent whether the statement be true or false." This confusion has arisen mainly since the Judicature Act, actions of deceit being tried in Chancery by judges who, sitting without juries, have confounded issues of fact with issues of law. Here the Court of Appeal held that an action of deceit lies if the defendant makes an untrue statement, without reasonable ground for believing it to be true, though he did in fact honestly believe it to be true. If that be the law a negligent, improvident, or wrong-headed man is a fraudulent man. A want of reasonable ground may be evidence of fraud, but it is not the same thing as fraud.

As to the facts, Stirling J. found that the defendants believed the misstatement to be true, and that finding ought to be conclusive. The Court of Appeal do not contradict that finding.

The misstatement complained of really meant that the company had obtained the necessary statutory authority to use steam power, without which authority no consents could have given

(1) 11 M. & W. 401.
(2) 11 Q. B. D. 255.
(3) 3 B. & Ad. 114.
(4) Law Rep. 1 H. L. (Sc.) 145, 162.
(5) 3 Ex. D. at p. 242.

authority, because by the Tramways Act 1870 (33 & 34 Vict. c. 78 s. 34) steam power is prohibited except where the special Act authorizes steam power. It may be that the defendants knew the statement was not strictly accurate, but if so they honestly thought that the statement conveyed a substantially accurate representation of the fact, either because they thought it not worth while to encumber the prospectus with the qualifications, or because those qualifications were not present to their minds when they made the statement. In the prospectus reference is made to the special Act, so that any one who consulted the Act could see for himself what the authority was.

Lastly, the plaintiff was no doubt in some degree influenced by the misstatement, but there was no evidence that he would not have taken the shares if the statement had contained the full truth as to the necessary consents being obtained.

Bompas Q.C., and *Byrne* Q.C. (*Patullo* with them) for the respondent:—

The decision of the Court of Appeal is right and for the reasons there given. Directors are liable not only for a false statement which they know to be false, but for a false statement which they ought to have known to be false. This proposition is supported by the obiter dictum of Lord Westbury in *New Brunswick &c. Co.* v. *Conybeare* (1), and by the obiter dicta of the Lords in *Peek* v. *Gurney* (2) as to what the liability of the defendants would have been to original shareholders, and by the judgment of Jessel M.R. in *Smith* v. *Chadwick* (3).

It is not necessary that there should be carelessness whether the statement is true or not: it is enough if there be carelessness or negligence in making the statement. Making an untrue statement without reasonable ground is negligence which will support an action of deceit. In support of the respondent's contention the following authorities are relied on: *Slim* v. *Croucher* (4); *Evans* v. *Bicknell* (5); *Brownlie* v. *Campbell* (6); *Polhill* v. *Walter* (7); *Milne* v. *Marwood* (8); *Denton* v. *Great*

(1) 9 H. L. C. 725, 726.
(2) Law Rep. 6 H. L. 377.
(3) 20 Ch. D. 44.
(4) 1 D. F. & J. 518, 523.
(5) 6 Ves. at p. 183.
(6) 5 App. Cas. 925, 935, 950.
(7) 3 B. & Ad. 114.
(8) 15 C. B. 778, 781.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK.

Northern Railway Company (1); *Thorn* v. *Bigland* (2); *Smout* v. *Ilbery* (3); *Rawlins* v. *Wickham* (4); *Hallows* v. *Fernie* (5); *Mathias* v. *Yetts* (6); *Smith* v. *Chadwick* (7); *Pasley* v. *Freeman* (8); *Chandelor* v. *Lopus* (9). [LORD HALSBURY L.C. referred to *Haycraft* v. *Cressy* (10).]

But it is not necessary to go the full length of the propositions contended for. Even if the fourth proposition of Lopes L.J. is not law, the appellants are nevertheless liable; for the evidence shews that the statements were made either with the knowledge that they were untrue or with no belief on the subject.

It was stated that it was fully expected that a considerable saving would be effected by the use of steam. In fact the directors had not considered the matter, and when they did so afterwards there was a majority of one only in favour of steam. The effect of the evidence is not the same as to all the directors. As to Derry, the inference is that he never took the trouble to consider whether the statement was true or false. Wakefield and Wilde had complete knowledge but made statements which they knew not to be true at the time, thinking the requisite consents would be given. Pethick's evidence is inconsistent with itself. At one moment he says that he thought the Board of Trade had no right to refuse consent if its reasonable requirements were met, at another that he thought they had an absolute right to refuse. Moore, it must be admitted, stands in a different position, and can only be held liable under the fourth proposition of Lopes L.J.

The respondents are entitled to judgment on the grounds accepted by Lord Cranworth in *Western Bank of Scotland* v. *Addie* (11) and by the Earl of Selborne in *Smith* v. *Chadwick* (12): The belief which would justify the appellants must be one founded on an exercise of judgment. Grounds which would be sufficient in some cases would not be so in others, where uberrima fides is required, e.g. in statements made to an intending partner. As

(1) 25 L. J. (Q.B.) 129.
(2) 8 Ex. 725.
(3) 10 M. & W. 1, 10.
(4) 3 D. & J. 304, 312.
(5) Law Rep. 3 Ch. 467.
(6) 46 L. T. (N.S.) 497, 502.
(7) 20 Ch. D. 27, 44.
(8) 2 Sm. L. C., 9th ed. p. 74.
(9) 1 Ibid. p. 186.
(10) 2 East, 92.
(11) Law Rep. 1 H. L. (Sc.) 145, 164.
(12) 9 App. Cas. 187, 190.

to the duty of a director to persons about to take shares in a company, see *New Brunswick and Canada Railway Company* v. *Muggeridge* (1) and *Henderson* v. *Lacon* (2).

The House took time for consideration, LORD HALSBURY L.C. saying that notice would be given to the appellants if their Lordships desired to hear a reply.

July 1. LORD HALSBURY L.C. :—

My Lords, I have so recently expressed an opinion in the Court of Appeal on the subject of actions of this character that I do not think it necessary to do more than say that I adhere to what I there said (3). To quote the language now some centuries old in dealing with actions of this character, "fraud without damage or damage without fraud" does not give rise to such actions. I have had also the opportunity of reading the judgment of my noble and learned friend Lord Herschell, and I could desire to add nothing to his exhaustive and lucid treatment of the authorities.

My Lords, when I turn to the question of fact I confess I am not altogether satisfied. In the first place I think the statement in the prospectus was untrue,—untrue in fact, and to the minds of such persons as were likely to take shares I think well calculated to mislead. I think such persons would have no idea of the technical division between tramways that had rights to use mechanical means and tramways that had not. What I think they would understand would be that this particular tramway was in an exceptionably advantageous position,—that the statement was of a present existing fact, that it had at the time of the invited subscription for shares the right to use steam. And I think such a statement if wilfully made with the consciousness of its inaccuracy would give rise to an action for deceit, provided that damage had been sustained if a person had acted upon a belief induced by such a prospectus.

But upon the question whether these statements were made with a consciousness of their misleading character, I cannot but

(1) 1 Dr. & S. 363, 381. (2) Law Rep. 5 Eq. 249.
(3) See *Arnison* v. *Smith*, 41 Ch. D. 348, 367.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Halsbury, L.C.

be influenced by the opinions entertained by so many of your Lordships that they are consistent with the directors' innocence of any intention to deceive.

The learned judge who saw and heard the witnesses acquitted the defendants of intentional deceit, and although the Court of Appeal held them liable, overruling the decision of the learned judge below, they appear to me to have justified their decision upon grounds which I do not think tenable, namely, that they, the directors, were liable because they had no reasonable ground for the belief which nevertheless it is assumed they sincerely entertained.

My Lords, I think it would have been satisfactory to have had a more minute and exact account of how this prospectus was framed, the actual evidence of the draftsman of it, and the discussions which took place upon the alteration in form; which alteration gave such marked and peculiar prominence to the special feature of this particular tramway, in respect of the possession of power to use steam. Nevertheless, if, as I have said, the facts are reconcilable with the innocence of the directors, and with the absence of the mens rea which I consider an essential condition of an action for deceit, the mere fact of the inaccuracy of the statement ought not to be pressed into constituting a liability which appears to me not to exist according to the law of England.

As to the question whether Sir Henry Peek was induced to take his shares by reliance on the misleading statement, I admit that I have very considerable doubt. On the one hand I do not believe that any one can so far analyse his mental impressions as to be able to say what particular fact in a prospectus induced him to subscribe. On the other hand the description of Sir Henry Peek, even now that the question has been pointedly raised and brought to his mind, of what did or did not induce him to take his shares is hardly reconcilable with his having been substantially induced by the statement in question to take them.

On the whole I acquiesce in the judgment which one of your Lordships is about to move, namely, that the judgment appealed from be reversed.

LORD WATSON:—

My Lords, I agree with Stirling J. that, as matter of fact, the appellants did honestly believe in the truth of the representation upon which this action of deceit is based. It is by no means clear that the learned judges of the Court of Appeal meant to differ from that conclusion; but they seem to have held that a man who makes a representation with the view of its being acted upon, in the honest belief that it is true, commits a fraud in the eye of the law, if the court or a jury shall be of opinion that he had not reasonable grounds for his belief. I have no hesitation in rejecting that doctrine, for which I can find no warrant in the law of England. But I shall not trouble your Lordships with any observations of mine, because I accept without reserve the opinion about to be delivered by my noble and learned friend upon my left (Lord Herschell).

LORD BRAMWELL:—

My Lords, I am of opinion that this judgment should be reversed. I am glad to come to this conclusion; for, as far as my judgment goes, it exonerates five men of good character and conduct from a charge of fraud, which, with all submission, I think wholly unfounded, a charge supported on such materials as to make all character precarious. I hope this will not be misunderstood; that promoters of companies will not suppose that they can safely make inaccurate statements with no responsibility. I should much regret any such notion; for the general public is so at the mercy of company promoters, sometimes dishonest, sometimes over sanguine, that it requires all the protection that the law can give it. Particularly should I regret if it was supposed that I did not entirely disapprove of the conduct of those directors who accepted their qualification from the contractor or intended contractor. It is wonderful to me that honest men of ordinary intelligence cannot see the impropriety of this. It is obvious that the contractor can only give this qualification because he means to get it back in the price given for the work he is to do. That price is to be fixed by the directors who have taken his money. They are paid by him to give

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Bramwell.

him a good price, as high a price as they can, while their duty to their shareholders is to give him one as low as they can.

But there is another thing. The public, seeing these names, may well say, "These are respectable and intelligent men who think well enough of this scheme to adventure their money in it; we will do the same," little knowing that those thus trusted had made themselves safe against loss if the thing turned out ill, while they might gain if it was successful. I am glad to think that Mr. Wilde, a member of my old profession, was not one of those so bribed. The only shade of doubt I have in the case is, that this safety from loss in the directors may have made them less careful in judging of the truth of any statements they have made.

There is another matter I wish to dispose of before going into the particular facts of the case. I think we need not trouble ourselves about "legal fraud," nor whether it is a good or bad expression; because I hold that actual fraud must be proved in this case to make the defendants liable, and, as I understand, there is never any occasion to use the phrase "legal fraud" except when actual fraud cannot be established. "Legal fraud" is only used when some vague ground of action is to be resorted to, or, generally speaking, when the person using it will not take the trouble to find, or cannot find, what duty has been violated or right infringed, but thinks a claim is somehow made out. With the most sincere respect for Sir J. Hannen I cannot think the expression "convenient." I do not think it is "an explanation which very clearly conveys an idea;" at least, I am certain it does not to my mind. I think it a mischievous phrase, and one which has contributed to what I must consider the erroneous decision in this case. But, with these remarks, I have done with it, and will proceed to consider whether the law is not that actual fraud must be proved, and whether that has been done.

Now, I really am reluctant to cite authorities to shew that actual fraud must be established in such a case as this. It is one of the first things one learned, and one has never heard it doubted until recently. I am very glad to think that my noble and learned friend (Lord Herschell) has taken the trouble to go into the authorities fully; but to some extent I deprecate it,

because it seems to me somewhat to come within the principle Qui s'excuse s'accuse. When a man makes a contract with another he is bound by it; and, in making it, he is bound not to bring it about by fraud. Warrantizando vendidit gives a cause of action if the warranty is broken. Knowingly and fraudulently stating a material untruth which brings about, wholly or partly, the contract, also gives a cause of action. To this may now be added the equitable rule (which is not in question here), that a material misrepresentation, though not fraudulent, may give a right to avoid or rescind a contract where capable of such rescission. To found an action for damages there must be a contract and breach, or fraud. The statement of claim in this case states fraud. Of course that need not be proved merely because it is stated. But no one ever heard of or saw a statement of claim or declaration for deceit without it. There is not an authority at common law, or by a common law lawyer, to the contrary; none has been cited, though there may be some incautious, hesitating, expressions which point that way. Every case from the earliest in Comyns' Digest to the present day alleges it. Further, the learned judges of the Court of Appeal hardly deny it. There is indeed an opinion to the contrary of the late Master of the Rolls, but it must be remembered that his knowledge of actions of deceit was small, if any. I did not think, then, that it was necessary to cite cases to shew that to maintain this action fraud in the defendant must be shewn, though I am glad it has been done.

Now, as to the evidence. The plaintiff's case is that the defendants made an untrue statement, which they knew to be untrue, and likely to influence persons reading it; therefore they were fraudulent. It is not necessary to consider whether a primâ facie case was made out by the plaintiff. We have all the evidence before us, and must judge on the whole. The alleged untrue statement is that, "The company has the right to use steam or mechanical power instead of horses," and that a saving would be thereby effected. Now, this is certainly untrue, because it is stated as an absolute right, when in truth it was conditional on the approval of the Board of Trade, and the sanction or consent of two local boards; and a conditional right is

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Bramwell.

not the same as an absolute right. It is also certain that the defendants knew what the truth was, and therefore knew that what they said was untrue. But it does not follow that the statement was fraudulently made. There are various kinds of untruth. There is an absolute untruth, an untruth in itself, that no addition or qualification can make true; as, if a man says a thing he saw was black, when it was white, as he remembers and knows. So, as to *knowing* the truth. A man may know it, and yet it may not be present to his mind at the moment of speaking; or, if the fact is present to his mind, it may not occur to him to be of any use to mention it. For example, suppose a man was asked whether a writing was necessary in a contract for the making and purchase of goods, he might well say "Yes," without adding that payment on receipt of the goods, or part, would suffice. He might well think that the question he was asked was whether a contract for goods to be made required a writing like a contract for goods in existence. If he was writing on the subject he would, of course, state the exception or qualification.

Now, consider the case here. These directors naturally trust to their solicitors to prepare their prospectus. It is prepared and laid before them. They find the statement of their power to use steam without qualification. It does not occur to them to alter it. They swear they had no fraudulent intention. At the very last they cannot see the fraud. There is their oath, their previous character unimpeached, and there is to my mind this further consideration: the truth would have served their purpose as well. "We have power to use steam, etc., of course with the usual conditions of the approval of the Board of Trade and the consent of the local authorities, but we may make sure of these being granted, as the Board of Trade has already allowed the power to be inserted in the Act, and the local authorities have expressed their approbation of the scheme." (See plaintiff's answer, 313 (1), which shews that he would have been content with that statement.)

During the argument I said I am not sure that I should not have passed the prospectus. I will not say so now, because

(1) The references are to the Appendix printed for the House.

certainly I would not pass it now after knowing the unfortunate use made of the statement, and no one can tell what would have been the state of his mind if one of the factors influencing it was wanting. But I firmly believe it might have been, and was, honestly done by these defendants. Stirling J. saw and heard them, and was of that opinion. It is difficult to say that the plaintiff was not. The report of the 6th of November 1884 shewed that the consent of the Board of Trade was necessary, shewed also that the corporation of Devonport would not consent, shewed therefore the "untruth" and the defendants' knowledge of it, and yet the plaintiff "had every confidence in the directors;" and see his answers to questions 53 and 365.

I now proceed to consider the judgments that have been delivered. It is not necessary to declare my great respect for those who have delivered them. Stirling J. refuses to say whether actual fraud must be shewn, and deals with the case on the footing that the question is whether the defendants had reasonable grounds for making the statement they did. He holds, as I do, that they thought the company had the right, as put in the prospectus, to use steam. Then he says he must "come to the conclusion that they had reasonable grounds for their belief; at all events, that their grounds were not so unreasonable as to justify me in charging them with being guilty of fraud." It is singular that the learned judge seems to consider that unreasonableness must be proved to such an extent as to shew fraud. He then proceeds, for what seem to me unanswerable reasons, to shew that they did every one believe that they had the right stated in the prospectus. He refers to what he saw of them in the box. He says he cannot come to the conclusion that their belief was so unreasonable and so unfounded, and their proceedings so reckless or careless that they ought to be fixed with the consequences of deceit. He makes an excellent remark, that "mercantile men dealing with matters of business would be the first to cry out if I extended the notion of deceit into what is honestly done in the belief that these things would come about, and when they did not come about, make them liable in an action of fraud." My only variation of this would be that it may be that the objection did not, and naturally did not, occur to them. It has

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Bramwell.

not been argued, and I will say no more on the question, whether had the plaintiff known the contents of the Act he would or would not have applied for the shares, than that I agree with Stirling J.

Cotton L.J. says the law is "that where a man makes a statement to be acted on by others which is false, and which is known by him to be false, or is made by him recklessly, or without care whether it is true or false, that is without any reasonable ground for believing it to be true," he is liable to an action for deceit. Well, I agree to all before the "that is" and I agree to what comes after if it is taken as equivalent to what goes before, viz., "recklessly or without care whether it is true or false," understanding "recklessly" as explained by "without care whether it is true or false." For a man who makes a statement without care and regard for its truth or falsity commits a fraud. He is a rogue. For every man who makes a statement says "the truth is so and so, and I know it or believe it." I say I agree to this as I understand it.

It seems to me, with great respect, that the learned Lord Justice lost sight of his own definition, and glided into a different opinion. He says (p. 451, F.), "There is a duty cast upon a director who makes that statement to take care that there are no statements in it which in fact are false; to take care that he has reasonable ground for the material statements which are contained in that document (prospectus), which he intends to be acted on by others. And although in my opinion it is not necessary there should be what I should call fraud, there must be a departure from duty, . . . and he has violated the right which those who receive the statement have to have true statements only made to them." This seems to be a most formidable matter. I agree there is some such duty. I agree that not only directors in prospectuses, but all persons in all dealings should tell the truth. If they do not they furnish evidence of fraud; they subject themselves to have the contract rescinded. But to say that there is "a right to have true statements only made," I cannot agree, and I think it would be much to be regretted if there was any such right. Mercantile men, as Stirling J. says, would indeed cry out. No qualification is stated.

If this is law the statement may be reasonably believed to be true by him who makes it, but if untrue there is to be a cause of action; and that although he may have refused a warranty. I hope not. There is a duty to tell the truth, or, rather, what is believed to be the truth. At page 452, B., his Lordship says: "Where a man makes a false statement without reasonable ground to suppose it to be true, and without taking care to ascertain if it is true, he is liable civilly as much as a person who commits what is usually called fraud." I say I agree if that means making a statement of which he knows or believes not the truth. His Lordship proceeds to examine whether the defendants had reasonable ground for believing what they said, and comes to the conclusion that they had not, and so holds them liable, not because they were dishonest, but because they were unreasonable. I say they never undertook to be otherwise. He says (461 G.): "It is not that I attribute to them any intention to commit fraud, but they have made a statement without any sufficient reason for believing it to be true."

Sir James Hannen says that he agrees with Cotton L.J.'s statement of the law, and adds: "If a man takes upon himself to assert a thing to be true, which he does not know to be true, and has no reasonable ground to believe to be true," it is sufficient in an action of deceit. I agree, if he knows he has no such reasonable ground and the knowledge is present to his mind; otherwise, with great respect, I differ. He cites Lord Cairns (465 F.), that, "if persons take upon themselves to make assertions as to which they are ignorant whether they are true or untrue, they must in a civil point of view be held as responsible as if they had asserted that which they knew to be untrue." So say I, but this does not support Sir James's proposition. Nor does he deal with what he quotes from Lord Cranworth. But further (466), he speaks of legal fraud as meaning "that degree of moral culpability in the statement of an untruth to induce another to alter his position, to which the law attaches responsibility." But if there is moral culpability, I agree there is responsibility. But to believe without reasonable grounds is not moral culpability, but, (if there is such a thing) mental culpability. He says, "the word 'fraud' is in common parlance reserved for actions of great turpitude, but

H. L. (E.) 1889. DERBY v. PEEK. Lord Bramwell.

the law applies it to lesser breaches of moral duty." I agree the law applies it to all breaches of the moral duty to tell the truth in dealing with others; but that duty cannot be honestly broken. To be actionable, a breach of that duty must be dishonest. Nay, it is a man's duty sometimes to tell an untruth. For instance, when asked as to a servant's character, he must say what he believes is the truth, however he may have formed his opinion, and however wrong it may be. His Lordship says he cannot think the directors had any reasonable ground for believing the prospectus to be true. But had they the matter present to their minds? Even if this were the question I should decide in their favour.

As to the judgment of Lopes L.J., I quite agree with what he says: "I know of no fraud which will support an action of deceit to which some moral delinquency does not belong." I think that shews the meaning of what he says "fourthly," though that is made doubtful by what he says at 472 D.

I think, with all respect, that in all the judgments there is, I must say it, a confusion of unreasonableness of belief as evidence of dishonesty, and unreasonableness of belief as of itself a ground of action.

I have examined these judgments at this length owing to my sense of their importance and the importance of the question they deal with. I think it is most undesirable that actions should be maintainable in respect of statements, made unreasonably perhaps, but honestly. I think it would be disastrous if there was "a right to have true statements only made." This case is an example. I think that in this kind of case, as in some others, Courts of Equity have made the mistake of disregarding a valuable general principle in their desire to effect what is, or is thought to be, justice in a particular instance. It might, perhaps, be well to enact that in prospectuses of public companies there should be a warranty of the truth of all statements except where it was expressly said there was no warranty. The objection is to exceptional legislation, and to the danger of driving respectable and responsible men from being promoters, and of substituting for them those who are neither.

In this particular case I hold that unless fraud in the defendants could be shewn, the action is not maintainable. I am

satisfied there was no fraud. Further, if an unreasonable misstatement were enough, I hold there was none. Still further, I do not believe that the plaintiff was influenced by the misstatement, though I am entirely satisfied that he was an honest witness.

LORD FITZGERALD :—

My Lords, the pleadings and the facts have been already referred to by the noble Lords who have addressed the House. The action is for deceit. The writ was sued out in February 1885, and originally claimed rescission of the contract with the company. It was subsequently amended by striking out the company as defendants, and also the prayer for rescission, and it assumed the character of an action for deceit against the present appellants (five of the directors), and claimed "damages for the fraudulent misrepresentations of the defendants."

The statement of claim, which is sufficient in form to raise the real question, alleged the misrepresentation to exist in the prospectus issued in February 1883, and to consist of the paragraph so often read, that the company had a right to use steam or other mechanical motive power; and it was further alleged "that the defendants intended thereby to represent that the company had an absolute right to use steam and other mechanical power," and that such representation was made fraudulently, and with the view to induce the plaintiff to take shares in the company.

So far, my Lords, the real issue seems to have been raised fairly and clearly, and to depend on matters of fact. There were circumstances connected with the promotion of the company, and the procuring of four of the defendants to act as directors, which tended to create suspicion as to their statements and their bona fides, and attracted directly the attention of the learned judge before whom the case was tried. The defendants, who were severally produced as witnesses at the trial, were exposed to a very lengthened and searching cross-examination by counsel for the plaintiff, and were also carefully examined by the judge as to these transactions, with the result apparently of freeing them from any imputation therein of moral misconduct.

The question which I am about to examine in the first in-

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord FitzGerald.

stance, and excluding for the present the element of fraud, is, whether the impugned statement in the prospectus was a false statement in the sense of being untrue. That it was inaccurate so far as it purported to give the legal effect of the special Act I do not doubt, but was it untrue as representing the position of the company in a popular and business sense? The General Tramways Act (33 & 34 Vict. c. 78), which regulates tramways generally, but subject to the provisions of the special Act, if any, of each company, places them under the supervision of the Board of Trade with a view to public safety, and for public protection generally, and by its 34th section it provides "that all carriages used on tramways shall be moved by the power prescribed by the special Act."

The special Act of this company became law on the 24th of July 1882, and by ss. 4 and 5 the company incorporated by the Act is empowered to make the seven tramways in question in all respects in accordance with the plans and sections. Sect. 15 provides minutely for their formation, subject to the orders of the Board of Trade, and by sect. 16 the tramway is not to be opened for public traffic until it shall have been inspected and certified by the Board of Trade to be fit for such traffic.

Before referring to the 35th section of the special Act we may glance at sect. 37 of that Act, which empowers the Board of Trade to make bye-laws as to any of the tramways on which steam may be used under the authority of the Act, and sect. 44, which provides that where the company intends to use steam they shall give two months' notice.

There are several other sections providing for the use of steam power if the company should elect to use it as the motor.

In the light of those sections of the special Act, and of sect. 34 of the general Act, let us now look at the particular paragraph of the prospectus, and sect. 35 of the special Act. By that section Parliament has done that which Parliament could do, and which the Board of Trade could not do. It has conferred on the company authority to use steam as its motive power. It has not imposed on the company the use of steam power, but it says that they may use it if they elect to do so. Before dealing with the consent of the Board of Trade I desire to call attention

to the proviso in the 35th section, "that the exercise of the powers hereby conferred with respect to the use of steam shall be subject to the regulations in Schedule 'A,' and to any regulations which may be added thereto or substituted therefor by the Board of Trade for securing to the public all reasonable protection against danger in the exercise of the powers by this Act conferred with respect to the use of steam."

Schedule A., referred to in sect. 35, contains no less than ten regulations for the direction of the company in the exercise of the right so conferred to use steam power.

Now, turning back to the words "with the consent of the Board of Trade," in sect. 35 of the special Act, that consent could not confer, nor would its absence take away, the right conferred by the legislature to use steam as a motor. Its true character is that of a precaution imposed by the legislature to defer the actual exercise of the right conferred until the supervision of the Board of Trade secures to the public all reasonable protections against danger. To attain these objects the legislature provides that the powers it has conferred should not be actually exercised without the consent of the Board of Trade.

My Lords, I have, though with difficulty, arrived at the conclusion that the statement in the prospectus, that by the special Act the company had the right to use steam power, was not untrue in a popular or business sense.

Let us see for a moment in what way and with what meaning General Hutchinson used similar expressions. In his report of the 12th of July 1884 he says: "The Act of 1882 gives, however, the company authority to use mechanical power over all their system, and I think it would be most objectionable that this power should be exercised on parts of Tramway No. 1 on account of the narrowness of three of the roads."

The remainder of the incriminated paragraph of the prospectus is, "and it is fully expected that by means of this (i.e., the use of steam) a considerable saving will result in the working expenses of the line as compared with other tramways worked by horses." This was not untrue: there had been a division of opinion in the directory on the subject, which was finally and before the issue of the prospectus resolved in favour of steam.

H. L. E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord FitzGerald.

The conclusion I have arrived at, my Lords, is that this paragraph of the prospectus, though inaccurate in point of law in one particular, seems on the whole to have been morally true.

If this view is correct it is an answer to the action, but assuming that it is not correct, or that your Lordships are not prepared to adopt it, I proceed to express my opinion on the remaining substance of the action. Cotton L.J. describes the action as "an action of deceit, a mere common law action." The description is accurate, and I proceed to deal with it as a mere common law action. It has not been in the least altered in its characteristics by having been instituted in the Chancery Division, or tried by a judge without the aid of a jury, nor are your Lordships necessarily driven to consider on the present appeal some of the subtle and refined distinctions which have been engrafted on the clear and simple principles of the common law. The action for deceit at common law is founded on fraud. It is essential to the action that moral fraud should be established, and since the case of *Collins* v. *Evans* (1), in the Exchequer Chamber, it has never been doubted that fraud must concur with the false statement to maintain the action. It would not be sufficient to shew that a false representation had been made. It must further be established that the defendant knew at the time of making it that the representation was untrue, or, to adopt the language of the learned editors of the Leading Cases, that "the defendant must be shewn to have been actually and fraudulently cognisant of the falsehood of his representation or to have made it fraudulently without belief that it was true." The leading counsel for the respondent met the argument fairly on the allegations of fact. He alleged "that the defendants were not honest; that they stated in the prospectus a definite lie, and knew that it was a lie." That is the very issue, in fact, in the case.

The whole law and all the cases on the subject will be found in the notes to *Chandelor* v. *Lopus* (2) and *Pasley* v. *Freeman* (3). There is also a clear and able summary of the decisions, both in law and in equity, brought down to the present time in the recent edition of Benjamin on Sales, by Pearson-Gee and Boyd.

(1) 5 Q. B. 804, 820. (2) 1 Smith's L. C. 9th Ed. p. 186.
(3) 2 Smith's L. C. 9th Ed. p. 74.

I desire to make an observation on *Chandelor* v. *Lopus* (1). The report in Cro. Jac. 4 would seem to have but little direct bearing on the present case were it not for the opinion attributed to Anderson J.; but there is a valuable note in 1 Dyer by Vaillant (75a) which is as follows: Lopus brought an action upon the case against Chandelor, and shewed that, whereas the defendant was a goldsmith, and skilled in the nature of precious stones, and being possessed of a stone which the defendant asserted and assured the said plaintiff to be a true and perfect stone called a bezoar stone &c., upon which the plaintiff bought it &c. There the opinion of Popham C.J. was "that if I have any commodities which are damaged (whether victuals or otherwise), and I, *knowing them to be so,* sell them for good, and affirm them to be so, an action upon the case lies for the deceit: but although they be damaged, if I, *knowing not that,* affirm them to be good, still no action lies, without I warrant them to be good." The action seems originally to have been on a warranty which failed in fact, as there had been no warranty, and it was then sought to support it as an action for deceit; but it was not alleged in the count that the defendant knew the representation to be untrue. It was in reference to that that the observation of Popham C.J. was made. He had the reputation of being a consummate lawyer.

The note in 1 Dyer (75a) was probably by Mr. Treby, afterwards Chief Justice Treby. He edited an edition of Dyer published in 1688. I have not had an opportunity of referring to it, but it is said that he gave the public some highly authoritative notes in that edition. I have quoted from Mr. Vaillant's edition, published in 1794.

The whole evidence given on this appeal has been laid before your Lordships, and we have to deal with it as a whole. That evidence has been already so fully stated and criticised that it is not necessary for me to do more than to state the conclusions of fact which in my opinion are reasonably to be deduced from it, viz. that the several defendants did not know that the incriminated statement in the prospectus was untrue, and that, on the contrary, they severally and in good faith believed it to be

(1) 1 Smith's L. C. 9th Ed. p. 186.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord FitzGerald.

true. The conclusions, in fact, at which I have arrived, render it unnecessary for me to consider the long and rather bewildering list of authorities to which your Lordships were referred, or to criticise the reasons given in the Court of Appeal for their decision in the present case. I desire, however, to make a single observation.

There is one characteristic which, as it seems to me, pervades each of the several judgments in the Court of Appeal, viz. that the bonâ fide belief of the defendants in the truth of the representation was unavailing unless it was a reasonable belief resting on reasonable grounds. If this is correct, it seems to me that in an action for "deceit" it would be necessary to submit to the jury (if tried before that tribunal) not only the existence of that belief bonâ fide, but also the grounds on which it was arrived at, and their reasonableness.

I am by no means satisfied that such is the law, and if now driven to express an opinion on it, I would prefer following the opinion of Lord Cranworth in *Western Bank of Scotland* v. *Addie* (1), in which he said: "I confess that my opinion was that in what his Lordship (the Lord President) thus stated, he went beyond what principle warrants. If persons in the situation of directors of a bank make statements as to the condition of its affairs, which they bonâ fide believe to be true, I cannot think they can be guilty of fraud, because other persons think, or the Court thinks, or your Lordships think, that there was no sufficient ground to warrant the opinion which they had formed. If a little more care and caution must have led the directors to a conclusion different from that which they put forth, this may afford strong evidence to shew that they did not really believe in the truth of what they stated, and so that they were guilty of fraud. But this would be the consequence, not of their having stated as true what they had not reasonable ground to believe to be true, but of their having stated as true what they did not believe to be true."

A director is bound in all particulars to be careful and circumspect, and not, either in his statements to the public or in the performance of the duties he has undertaken, to be careless

(1) Law Rep. 1 H. L., Sc. 145, 168.

or negligent, or rash. Want of care or circumspection, as well as recklessness, may in such a case as the present be taken into consideration in determining at every stage the question of bona fides.

My Lords, I am of opinion that the decision of the Court of Appeal should be reversed.

LORD HERSCHELL:—

My Lords, in the statement of claim in this action the respondent, who is the plaintiff, alleges that the appellants made in a prospectus issued by them certain statements which were untrue, that they well knew that the facts were not as stated in the prospectus, and made the representations fraudulently, and with the view to induce the plaintiff to take shares in the company.

"This action is one which is commonly called an action of deceit, a mere common law action." This is the description of it given by Cotton L.J. in delivering judgment. I think it important that it should be borne in mind that such an action differs essentially from one brought to obtain rescission of a contract on the ground of misrepresentation of a material fact. The principles which govern the two actions differ widely. Where rescission is claimed it is only necessary to prove that there was misrepresentation; then, however honestly it may have been made, however free from blame the person who made it, the contract, having been obtained by misrepresentation, cannot stand. In an action of deceit, on the contrary, it is not enough to establish misrepresentation alone; it is conceded on all hands that something more must be proved to cast liability upon the defendant, though it has been a matter of controversy what additional elements are requisite. I lay stress upon this because observations made by learned judges in actions for rescission have been cited and much relied upon at the bar by counsel for the respondent. Care must obviously be observed in applying the language used in relation to such actions to an action of deceit. Even if the scope of the language used extend beyond the particular action which was being dealt with, it must be remembered that the learned judges were not engaged in deter-

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

mining what is necessary to support an action of deceit, or in discriminating with nicety the elements which enter into it.

There is another class of actions which I must refer to also for the purpose of putting it aside. I mean those cases where a person within whose special province it lay to know a particular fact, has given an erroneous answer to an inquiry made with regard to it by a person desirous of ascertaining the fact for the purpose of determining his course accordingly, and has been held bound to make good the assurance he has given. *Burrowes* v. *Lock* (1) may be cited as an example, where a trustee had been asked by an intended lender, upon the security of a trust fund, whether notice of any prior incumbrance upon the fund had been given to him. In cases like this it has been said that the circumstance that the answer was honestly made in the belief that it was true affords no defence to the action. Lord Selborne pointed out in *Brownlie* v. *Campbell* (2) that these cases were in an altogether different category from actions to recover damages for false representation, such as we are now dealing with.

One other observation I have to make before proceeding to consider the law which has been laid down by the learned judges in the Court of Appeal in the case before your Lordships. "An action of deceit is a common law action, and must be decided on the same principles, whether it be brought in the Chancery Division or any of the Common Law Divisions, there being, in my opinion, no such thing as an equitable action for deceit." This was the language of Cotton L.J. in *Arkwright* v. *Newbould* (3). It was adopted by Lord Blackburn in *Smith* v. *Chadwick* (4), and is not, I think, open to dispute.

In the Court below Cotton L.J. said: "What in my opinion is a correct statement of the law is this, that where a man makes a statement to be acted upon by others which is false, and which is known by him to be false, or is made by him recklessly, or without care whether it is true or false, that is, without any reasonable ground for believing it to be true, he is liable in an action of deceit at the suit of anyone to whom it was addressed or anyone of the class to whom it was addressed and who was

(1) 10 Ves. 470.
(2) 5 App. Cas. at p. 935.
(3) 17 Ch. D. 320.
(4) 9 App. Cas. 193.

materially induced by the misstatement to do an act to his prejudice." About much that is here stated there cannot, I think, be two opinions. But when the learned Lord Justice speaks of a statement made recklessly or without care whether it is true or false, *that is* without any reasonable ground for believing it to be true, I find myself, with all respect, unable to agree that these are convertible expressions. To make a statement careless whether it be true or false, and therefore without any real belief in its truth, appears to me to be an essentially different thing from making, through want of care, a false statement, which is nevertheless honestly believed to be true. And it is surely conceivable that a man may believe that what he states is the fact, though he has been so wanting in care that the Court may think that there were no sufficient grounds to warrant his belief. I shall have to consider hereafter whether the want of reasonable ground for believing the statement made is sufficient to support an action of deceit. I am only concerned for the moment to point out that it does not follow that it is so, because there is authority for saying that a statement made recklessly, without caring whether it be true or false, affords sufficient foundation for such an action.

That the learned Lord Justice thought that if a false statement were made without reasonable ground for believing it to be true an action of deceit would lie, is clear from a subsequent passage in his judgment. He says that when statements are made in a prospectus like the present, to be circulated amongst persons in order to induce them to take shares, "there is a duty cast upon the director or other person who makes those statements to take care that there are no expressions in them which in fact are false; to take care that he has reasonable ground for the material statements which are contained in that document which he prepares and circulates for the very purpose of its being acted upon by others."

The learned judge proceeds to say: "Although in my opinion it is not necessary that there should be what I should call fraud, yet in these actions, according to my view of the law, there must be a departure from duty, that is to say, an untrue statement made without any reasonable ground for believing that statement

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

to be true; and in my opinion when a man makes an untrue statement with an intention that it shall be acted upon without any reasonable ground for believing that statement to be true he makes a default in a duty which was thrown upon him from the position he has taken upon himself, and he violates the right which those to whom he makes the statement have to have true statements only made to them."

Now I have first to remark on these observations that the alleged "right" must surely be here stated too widely, if it is intended to refer to a legal right, the violation of which may give rise to an action for damages. For if there be a right to have true statements only made, this will render liable to an action those who make untrue statements, however innocently. This cannot have been meant. I think it must have been intended to make the statement of the right correspond with that of the alleged duty, the departure from which is said to be making an untrue statement without any reasonable ground for believing it to be true. I have further to observe that the Lord Justice distinctly says that if there be such a departure from duty an action of deceit can be maintained, though there be not what he should call fraud. I shall have by-and-by to consider the discussions which have arisen as to the difference between the popular understanding of the word "fraud" and the interpretation given to it by lawyers, which have led to the use of such expressions as "legal fraud," or "fraud in law;" but I may state at once that, in my opinion, without proof of fraud no action of deceit is maintainable. When I examine the cases which have been decided upon this branch of the law, I shall endeavour to shew that there is abundant authority to warrant this proposition.

I return now to the judgments delivered in the Court of Appeal. Sir James Hannen says: "I take the law to be that if a man takes upon himself to assert a thing to be true which he does not know to be true, and has no reasonable ground to believe to be true, in order to induce another to act upon the assertion, who does so act and is thereby damnified, the person so damnified is entitled to maintain an action for deceit." Again, Lopes L.J. states what, in his opinion, is the result of the

cases. I will not trouble your Lordships with quoting the first three propositions which he lays down, although I do not feel sure that the third is distinct from, and not rather an instance of, the case dealt with by the second proposition. But he says that a person making a false statement, intended to be and in fact relied on by the person to whom it is made, may be sued by the person damaged thereby: "Fourthly, if it is untrue in fact, but believed to be true, but without any reasonable grounds for such belief."

It will thus be seen that all the learned judges concurred in thinking that it was sufficient to prove that the representations made were not in accordance with fact, and that the person making them had no reasonable ground for believing them. They did not treat the absence of such reasonable ground as evidence merely that the statements were made recklessly, careless whether they were true or false, and without belief that they were true, but they adopted as the test of liability, not the existence of belief in the truth of the assertions made, but whether the belief in them was founded upon any reasonable grounds. It will be seen, further, that the Court did not purport to be establishing any new doctrine. They deemed that they were only following the cases already decided, and that the proposition which they concurred in laying down was established by prior authorities. Indeed, Lopes L.J. expressly states the law in this respect to be well settled. This renders a close and critical examination of the earlier authorities necessary.

I need go no further back than the leading case of *Pasley* v. *Freeman* (1). If it was not there for the first time held that an action of deceit would lie in respect of fraudulent representations against a person not a party to a contract induced by them, the law was at all events not so well settled but that a distinguished Judge, Grose J., differing from his brethren on the Bench, held that such an action was not maintainable. Buller J., who held that the action lay, adopted in relation to it the language of Croke J., in 3 Bulstrode 95, who said: "Fraud without damage, or damage without fraud, gives no cause of action, but where these two concur an action lies." In reviewing the case

(1) 2 Smith's L. C. 74.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell,

of *Crosse* v. *Gardner* (1) he says: "Knowledge of the falsehood of the thing asserted is fraud and deceit;" and further, after pointing out that in *Risney* v. *Selby* (2) the judgment proceeded wholly on the ground that the defendant knew what he asserted to be false, he adds: "The assertion alone will not maintain the action, but the plaintiff must go on to prove that it was false, *and that the defendant knew it to be so*," the latter words being specially emphasised. Kenyon C.J. said: "The plaintiffs applied to the defendant, telling him that they were going to deal with Falch, and desired to be informed of his credit, when the defendant fraudulently, and knowing it to be otherwise, and with a design to deceive the plaintiffs, made the false affirmation stated on the record, by which they sustained damage. Can a doubt be entertained for a moment but that this is injurious to the plaintiffs?" In this case it was evidently considered that fraud was the basis of the action, and that such fraud might consist in making a statement known to be false.

Haycraft v. *Creasy* (3) was again an action in respect of a false affirmation made by the defendant to the plaintiff about the credit of a third party whom the plaintiff was about to trust. The words complained of were, "I can assure you of my own knowledge that you may credit Miss R. to any amount with perfect safety." All the judges were agreed that fraud was of the essence of the action, but they differed in their view of the conclusion to be drawn from the facts. Lord Kenyon thought that fraud had been proved, because the defendant stated that to be true within his own knowledge which he did not know to be true. The other judges thinking that the defendant's words vouching his own knowledge were no more than a strong expression of opinion, inasmuch as a statement concerning the credit of another can be no more than a matter of opinion, and that he did believe the lady's credit to be what he represented, held that the action would not lie. It is beside the present purpose to inquire which view of the facts was the more sound. Upon the law there was no difference of opinion. It is a distinct decision that knowledge of the falsity of the affirmation made is essential to the

(1) Carth. 90. (2) 1 Salk. 211.
(3) 2 East, 92.

maintenance of the action, and that belief in its truth affords a defence.

I may pass now to *Foster* v. *Charles* (1). It was there contended that the defendant was not liable, even though the representation he had made was false to his knowledge, because he had no intention of defrauding or injuring the plaintiff. This contention was not upheld by the Court, Tindal C.J. saying: "It is fraud in law if a party makes representations which he knows to be false, and injury ensues, although the motives from which the representations proceeded may not have been bad." This is the first of the cases in which I have met with the expression "fraud in law." It was manifestly used in relation to the argument that the defendant was not actuated by a desire to defraud or injure the person to whom the representation was made. The popular use of the word "fraud" perhaps involves generally the conception of such a motive as one of its elements. But I do not think the Chief Justice intended to indicate any doubt that the act which he characterised as a fraud in law was in truth fraudulent as a matter of fact also. Wilfully to tell a falsehood, intending that another shall be led to act upon it as if it were the truth, may well be termed fraudulent, whatever the motive which induces it, though it be neither gain to the person making the assertion nor injury to the person to whom it is made.

Foster v. *Charles* (1) was followed in *Corbett* v. *Brown* (2), and shortly afterwards in *Polhill* v. *Walter* (3). The learned counsel for the respondent placed great reliance on this case, because although the jury had negatived the existence of fraud in fact the defendant was nevertheless held liable. It is plain, however, that all that was meant by this finding of the jury was, that the defendant was not actuated by any corrupt or improper motive, for Lord Tenterden says, "It was contended that . . . in order to maintain this species of action it is not necessary to prove that the false representation was made from a corrupt motive of gain to the defendant or a wicked motive of injury to the plaintiff; it was said to be enough if a representation is made which the party

(1) 7 Bing. 105. (2) 8 Bing. 33.
(3) 3 B. & Ad. 114.

H. L. (E.) 1889. DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

making it knows to be untrue, and which is intended by him, or which from the mode in which it is made is calculated, to induce another to act on the faith of it in such a way as that he may incur damage, and that damage is actually incurred. A wilful falsehood of such a nature was contended to be in the legal sense of the word *a fraud*, and for this position was cited *Foster* v. *Charles* (1), to which may be added the recent case of *Corbett* v. *Brown* (2). The principle of these cases appears to us to be well founded, and to apply to the present."

In a later case of *Crawshay* v. *Thompson* (3) Maule J. explains *Polhill* v. *Walter* (4) thus: "If a wrong be done by a false representation of a party who knows such representation to be false, the law will infer an intention to injure. That is the effect of *Polhill* v. *Walter*" (4). In the same case, Cresswell J. defines "fraud in law," in terms which have been often quoted. "The cases," he says, "may be considered to establish the principle that fraud in law consists in knowingly asserting that which is false in fact to the injury of another."

In *Moens* v. *Heyworth* (5), which was decided in the same year as *Crawshay* v. *Thompson* (3), Lord Abinger having suggested that an action of fraud might be maintained where no moral blame was to be imputed, Parke B. said: "To support that count (viz., a count for fraudulent representation) it was essential to prove that the defendants *knowingly*" (and I observe that this word is emphasised), "by words or acts, made such a representation as is stated in the third count, relative to the invoice of these goods, as they knew to be untrue."

The next case in the series, *Taylor* v. *Ashton* (6), is one which strikes me as being of great importance. It was an action brought against directors of a bank for fraudulent representations as to its affairs, whereby the plaintiff was induced to take shares. The jury found the defendants not guilty of fraud, but expressed the opinion that they had been guilty of gross negligence. Exception was taken to the mode in which the case was left to the jury, and it was contended that their verdict was sufficient

(1) 7 Bing. 105.
(2) 8 Bing. 33.
(3) 4 M. & Gr. 357.
(4) 3 B. & Ad. 114.
(5) 10 M. & W. at p. 157.
(6) 11 M. & W. 401.

to render the defendants liable; Parke B., however, in delivering the opinion of the Court said: "It is insisted that even that (viz., the gross negligence which the jury had found), accompanied with a damage to the plaintiff in consequence of that gross negligence, would be sufficient to give him a right of action. From this proposition we entirely dissent, because we are of opinion that, independently of any contract between the parties, no one can be made responsible for a representation of this kind unless it be *fraudulently made*. . . . But then it was said that in order to constitute that fraud, it was not necessary to shew that the defendants *knew* the fact they stated to be untrue, that it was enough that the fact *was* untrue if they communicated that fact for a deceitful purpose, and to that proposition the Court is prepared to assent. It is not necessary to shew that the defendants knew the facts to be untrue; if they stated a fact which was untrue for a fraudulent purpose, they at the same time *not believing* that fact to be true, in that case it would be both a legal and moral fraud."

Now it is impossible to conceive a more emphatic declaration than this, that to support an action of deceit fraud must be proved, and that nothing less than fraud will do. I can find no trace of the idea that it would suffice if it were shewn that the defendants had not reasonable grounds for believing the statements they made. It is difficult to understand how the defendants could, in the case on which I am commenting, have been guilty of gross negligence in making the statements they did, if they had reasonable grounds for believing them to be true, or if they had taken care that they had reasonable grounds for making them.

All the cases I have hitherto referred to were in courts of first instance. But in *Collins* v. *Evans* (1) they were reviewed by the Exchequer Chamber. The judgment of the Court was delivered by Tindal C.J. After stating the question at issue to be "whether a statement or representation which is false in fact, but not known to be so by the party making it, but, on the contrary, made honestly and in the full belief that it is true, affords a ground of action," he proceeds to say: "The current of

(1) 5 Q. B. 804, 820.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

the authorities, from *Pasley* v. *Freeman* (1) downwards, has laid down the general rule of law to be, that fraud must concur with the false statement in order to give a ground of action." Is it not clear that the Court considered that fraud was absent if the statement was "made honestly, and in the full belief that it was true"?

In *Evans* v. *Edmonds* (2) Maule J. expressed an important opinion, often quoted, which has been thought to carry the law further than the previous authorities, though I do not think it really does so. He said: "If a man having no knowledge whatever on the subject takes upon himself to represent a certain state of facts to exist he does so at his peril, and if it be done either with a view to secure some benefit to himself or to deceive a third person he is in law guilty of a fraud, for he takes upon himself to warrant his own belief of the truth of that which he so asserts. Although the person making the representation may have no knowledge of its falsehood the representation may still have been fraudulently made." The foundation of this proposition manifestly is, that a person making any statement which he intends another to act upon must be taken to warrant his belief in its truth. Any person making such a statement must always be aware that the person to whom it is made will understand, if not that he who makes it *knows*, yet at least that he *believes* it to be true. And if he has no such belief he is as much guilty of fraud as if he had made any other representation which he knew to be false, or did not believe to be true.

I now arrive at the earliest case in which I find the suggestion that an untrue statement made without reasonable ground for believing it will support an action for deceit. In *Western Bank of Scotland* v. *Addie* (3) the Lord President told the jury "that if a case should occur of directors taking upon themselves to put forth in their report statements of importance in regard to the affairs of the bank false in themselves and which they did not believe, or had no reasonable ground to believe to be true, that would be a misrepresentation and deceit." Exception having been taken to this direction without avail in the Court of Session, Lord Chelmsford in this House said: "I agree in the propriety of this

(1) 2 Smith's L. C. 74. (2) 13 C. B. 777.
(3) Law Rep. 1 H. L., Sc. 145, 162.

interlocutor. In the argument upon this exception the case was put of an honest belief being entertained by the directors, of the reasonableness of which it was said the jury, upon this direction, would have to judge. But supposing a person makes an untrue statement which he asserts to be the result of a bonâ fide belief in its truth, how can the bona fides be tested except by considering the grounds of such belief? And if an untrue statement is made founded upon a belief which is destitute of all reasonable grounds, or which the least inquiry would immediately correct, I do not see that it is not fairly and correctly characterised as misrepresentation and deceit."

I think there is here some confusion between that which is evidence of fraud, and that which constitutes it. A consideration of the grounds of belief is no doubt an important aid in ascertaining whether the belief was really entertained. A man's mere assertion that he believed the statement he made to be true is not accepted as conclusive proof that he did so. There may be such an absence of reasonable ground for his belief as, in spite of his assertion, to carry conviction to the mind that he had not really the belief which he alleges. If the learned Lord intended to go further, as apparently he did, and to say that though the belief was really entertained, yet if there were no reasonable grounds for it, the person making the statement was guilty of fraud in the same way as if he had known what he stated to be false, I say, with all respect, that the previous authorities afford no warrant for the view that an action of deceit would lie under such circumstances. A man who forms his belief carelessly, or is unreasonably credulous, may be blameworthy when he makes a representation on which another is to act, but he is not, in my opinion, fraudulent in the sense in which that word was used in all the cases from *Pasley* v. *Freeman* (1) down to that with which I am now dealing. Even when the expression "fraud in law" has been employed, there has always been present, and regarded as an essential element, that the deception was wilful either because the untrue statement was known to be untrue, or because belief in it was asserted without such belief existing.

(1) 2 Smith's L. C. 74.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

I have made these remarks with the more confidence because they appear to me to have the high sanction of Lord Cranworth. In delivering his opinion in the same case he said: "I confess that my opinion was that in what his Lordship (the Lord President) thus stated, he went beyond what principle warrants. If persons in the situation of directors of a bank make statements as to the condition of its affairs which they bonâ fide believe to be true, I cannot think they can be guilty of fraud because other persons think, or the Court thinks, or your Lordships think, that there was no sufficient ground to warrant the opinion which they had formed. If a little more care and caution must have led the directors to a conclusion different from that which they put forth, this may afford strong evidence to shew that they did not really believe in the truth of what they stated, and so that they were guilty of fraud. But this would be the consequence not of their having stated as true what they had not reasonable ground to believe to be true, but of their having stated as true what they did not believe to be true."

Sir James Hannen, in his judgment below, seeks to limit the application of what Lord Cranworth says to cases where the statement made is a matter of opinion only. With all deference I do not think it was intended to be or can be so limited. The direction which he was considering, and which he thought went beyond what true principle warranted, had relation to making false statements of importance in regard to the affairs of the bank. When this is borne in mind, and the words which follow those quoted by Sir James Hannen are looked at, it becomes to my mind obvious that Lord Cranworth did not use the words "the opinion which they had formed" as meaning anything different from "the belief which they entertained."

The opinions expressed by Lord Cairns in two well-known cases have been cited as though they supported the view that an action of deceit might be maintained without any fraud on the part of the person sued. I do not think they bear any such construction. In the case of *Reese Silver Mining Co.* v. *Smith* (1) he said: "If persons take upon themselves to make assertions as to which they are ignorant whether they are true or untrue

(1) Law Rep. 4 H. L. 64, 79.

they must, in a civil point of view, be held as responsible as if they had asserted that which they knew to be untrue." This must mean that the persons referred to were conscious when making the assertion that they were ignorant whether it was true or untrue. For if not it might be said of any one who innocently makes a false statement. He must be ignorant that it is untrue, for otherwise he would not make it innocently; he must be ignorant that it is true, for by the hypothesis it is false. Construing the language of Lord Cairns in the sense I have indicated, it is no more than an adoption of the opinion expressed by Maule J. in *Evans* v. *Edmonds* (1). It is a case of the representation of a person's belief in a fact when he is conscious that he knows not whether it be true or false, and when he has therefore no such belief. When Lord Cairns speaks of it as not being fraud in the more invidious sense, he refers, I think, only to the fact that there was no intention to cheat or injure.

In *Peek* v. *Gurney* (2) the same learned Lord, after alluding to the circumstance that the defendants had been acquitted of fraud upon a criminal charge, and that there was a great deal to shew that they were labouring under the impression that the concern had in it the elements of a profitable commercial undertaking, proceeds to say: "They may be absolved from any charge of a wilful design or motive to mislead or defraud the public. But in a civil proceeding of this kind all that your Lordships have to examine is the question, was there, or was there not, misrepresentation in point of fact? If there was, however innocent the motive may have been, your Lordships will be obliged to arrive at the consequences which properly would result from what was done." In the case then under consideration it was clear that if there had been a false statement of fact it had been knowingly made. Lord Cairns certainly could not have meant that in an action of deceit the only question to be considered was whether or not there was misrepresentation in point of fact. All that he there pointed out was that in such a case motive was immaterial: that it mattered not that there was no design to mislead or defraud the public if a false representation were knowingly made. It was therefore but an affirmation of the law laid down in *Foster*

(1) 13 C. B. 777.

(2) Law Rep. 6 H. L. 377, 409.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

v. *Charles* (1), *Polhill* v. *Walter* (2), and other cases I have already referred to.

I come now to very recent cases. In *Weir* v. *Bell* (3) Lord Bramwell vigorously criticised the expression "legal fraud," and indicated a very decided opinion that an action founded on fraud could not be sustained except by the proof of fraud in fact. I have already given my reasons for thinking that, until recent times at all events, the judges who spoke of fraud in law did not mean to exclude the existence of fraud in fact, but only of an intention to defraud or injure.

In the same case Cotton L.J. stated the law in much the same way as he did in the present case, treating "recklessly" as equivalent to "without any reasonable ground for believing" the statements made. But the same learned judge in *Arkwright* v. *Newbold* (4) laid down the law somewhat differently, for he said: "In an action of deceit the representation to found the action must not be innocent, that is to say, it must be made either with knowledge of its being false, or with a reckless disregard as to whether it is or is not true." And his exposition of the law was substantially the same in *Edgington* v. *Fitzmaurice* (5). In this latter case Bowen L.J. defined what the plaintiff must prove in addition to the falsity of the statement, as "secondly, that it was false to the knowledge of the defendants, or that they made it not caring whether it was true or false."

It only remains to notice the case of *Smith* v. *Chadwick* (6). The late Master of the Rolls there said, "A man may issue a prospectus or make any other statement to induce another to enter into a contract, believing that his statement is true, and not intending to deceive; but he may through carelessness have made statements which are not true, and which he ought to have known were not true, and if he does so he is liable in an action for deceit; he cannot be allowed to escape merely because he had good intentions, and did not intend to defraud." This, like everything else that fell from that learned judge, is worthy of respectful consideration. With the last sentence I quite agree,

(1) 7 Bing. 105.
(2) 3 B. & Ad. 114.
(3) 3 Ex. D. 238.
(4) 17 Ch. D. 301.
(5) 29 Ch. D. 459.
(6) 20 Ch. D. 27, 44, 67.

but I cannot assent to the doctrine that a false statement made through carelessness, and which ought to have been known to be untrue, of itself renders the person who makes it liable to an action for deceit. This does not seem to me by any means necessarily to amount to fraud, without which the action will not, in my opinion, lie.

It must be remembered that it was not requisite for Sir George Jessel in *Smith* v. *Chadwick* (1) to form an opinion whether a statement carelessly made, but honestly believed, could be the foundation of an action of deceit. The decision did not turn on any such point. The conclusion at which he arrived is expressed in these terms: "On the whole I have come to the conclusion that this, although in some respects inaccurate, and in some respects not altogether free from imputation of carelessness, was a fair, honest, and bonâ fide statement on the part of the defendants, and by no means exposes them to an action for deceit."

I may further note that in the same case, Lindley L.J. said: "The plaintiff has to prove, first, that the misrepresentation was made to him; secondly, he must prove that it was false; thirdly, that it was false to the knowledge of the defendants, or at all events that they did not believe the truth of it." This appears to be a different statement of the law to that which I have just criticised, and one much more in accord with the prior decisions.

The case of *Smith* v. *Chadwick* was carried to your Lordships' House (2). Lord Selborne thus laid down the law: "I conceive that in an action of deceit it is the duty of the plaintiff to establish two things: first, actual fraud, which is to be judged of by the nature and character of the representations made, considered with reference to the object for which they were made, the knowledge or means of knowledge of the person making them, and the intention which the law justly imputes to every man to produce those consequences which are the natural result of his acts; and secondly, he must establish that this fraud was an inducing cause to the contract." It will be noticed that the noble and learned Lord regards the proof of actual fraud as essential, all the other matters to which he refers are elements to be considered in determining whether such fraud has been

(1) 20 Ch. D. 27, 44, 67. (2) 9 App. Cas. 187, 190.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

established. Lord Blackburn indicated that although he nearly agreed with the Master of the Rolls, that learned judge had not quite stated what he conceived to be the law. He did not point out precisely how far he differed, but it is impossible to read his judgment in this case, or in that of *Brownlie* v. *Campbell* (1) without seeing that in his opinion proof of actual fraud or of a wilful deception was requisite.

Having now drawn attention, I believe, to all the cases having a material bearing upon the question under consideration, I proceed to state briefly the conclusions to which I have been led. I think the authorities establish the following propositions: First, in order to sustain an action of deceit, there must be proof of fraud, and nothing short of that will suffice. Secondly, fraud is proved when it is shewn that a false representation has been made (1) knowingly, or (2) without belief in its truth, or (3) recklessly, careless whether it be true or false. Although I have treated the second and third as distinct cases, I think the third is but an instance of the second, for one who makes a statement under such circumstances can have no real belief in the truth of what he states. To prevent a false statement being fraudulent, there must, I think, always be an honest belief in its truth. And this probably covers the whole ground, for one who knowingly alleges that which is false, has obviously no such honest belief. Thirdly, if fraud be proved, the motive of the person guilty of it is immaterial. It matters not that there was no intention to cheat or injure the person to whom the statement was made.

I think these propositions embrace all that can be supported by decided cases from the time of *Pasley* v. *Freeman* (2) down to *Western Bank of Scotland* v. *Addie* (3) in 1867, when the first suggestion is to be found that belief in the truth of what he has stated will not suffice to absolve the defendant if his belief be based on no reasonable grounds. I have shewn that this view was at once dissented from by Lord Cranworth, so that there was at the outset as much authority against it as for it. And I have met with no further assertion of Lord Chelmsford's view until

(1) 5 App. Cas. 925. (2) 2 Smith's L. C. 74.
(3) Law Rep. 1 H. L., Sc. 145.

the case of *Weir* v. *Bell* (1), where it seems to be involved in Lord Justice Cotton's enunciation of the law of deceit. But no reason is there given in support of the view, it is treated as established law. The dictum of the late Master of the Rolls, that a false statement made through carelessness, which the person making it ought to have known to be untrue, would sustain an action of deceit, carried the matter still further. But that such an action could be maintained notwithstanding an honest belief that the statement made was true, if there were no reasonable grounds for the belief, was, I think, for the first time decided in the case now under appeal.

In my opinion making a false statement through want of care falls far short of, and is a very different thing from, fraud, and the same may be said of a false representation honestly believed though on insufficient grounds. Indeed Cotton L.J. himself indicated, in the words I have already quoted, that he should not call it fraud. But the whole current of authorities, with which I have so long detained your Lordships, shews to my mind conclusively that fraud is essential to found an action of deceit, and that it cannot be maintained where the acts proved cannot properly be so termed. And the case of *Taylor* v. *Ashton* (2) appears to me to be in direct conflict with the dictum of Sir George Jessel, and inconsistent with the view taken by the learned judges in the Court below. I observe that Sir Frederick Pollock, in his able work on Torts (p. 243, note), referring, I presume, to the dicta of Cotton L.J. and Sir George Jessel M.R., says that the actual decision in *Taylor* v. *Ashton* (2) is not consistent with the modern cases on the duty of directors of companies. I think he is right. But for the reasons I have given I am unable to hold that anything less than fraud will render directors or any other persons liable to an action of deceit.

At the same time I desire to say distinctly that when a false statement has been made the questions whether there were reasonable grounds for believing it, and what were the means of knowledge in the possession of the person making it, are most weighty matters for consideration. The ground upon which an alleged belief was founded is a most important test of its reality. I can conceive many cases where the fact that an alleged belief was

(1) 3 Ex. D. 238. (2) 11 M. & W. 401.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

destitute of all reasonable foundation would suffice of itself to convince the Court that it was not really entertained, and that the representation was a fraudulent one. So, too, although means of knowledge are, as was pointed out by Lord Blackburn in *Brownlie* v. *Campbell* (1), a very different thing from knowledge, if I thought that a person making a false statement had shut his eyes to the facts, or purposely abstained from inquiring into them, I should hold that honest belief was absent, and that he was just as fraudulent as if he had knowingly stated that which was false.

I have arrived with some reluctance at the conclusion to which I have felt myself compelled, for I think those who put before the public a prospectus to induce them to embark their money in a commercial enterprise ought to be vigilant to see that it contains such representations only as are in strict accordance with fact, and I should be very unwilling to give any countenance to the contrary idea. I think there is much to be said for the view that this moral duty ought to some extent to be converted into a legal obligation, and that the want of reasonable care to see that statements, made under such circumstances, are true, should be made an actionable wrong. But this is not a matter fit for discussion on the present occasion. If it is to be done the legislature must intervene and expressly give a right of action in respect of such a departure from duty. It ought not, I think, to be done by straining the law, and holding that to be fraudulent which the tribunal feels cannot properly be so described. I think mischief is likely to result from blurring the distinction between carelessness and fraud, and equally holding a man fraudulent whether his acts can or cannot be justly so designated.

It now remains for me to apply what I believe to be the law to the facts of the present case. The charge against the defendants is that they fraudulently represented that by the special Act of Parliament which the company had obtained they had a right to use steam or other mechanical power instead of horses. The test which I purpose employing is to inquire whether the defendants knowingly made a false statement in this respect, or whether, on the contrary, they honestly believed what they stated to be a true and fair representation of the facts. Before considering whether the charge of fraud is proved, I may say that I

(1) 5 App. Cas. at p. 952.

approach the case of all the defendants, except Wilde, with the inclination to scrutinise their conduct with severity. They most improperly received sums of money from the promoters, and this unquestionably lays them open to the suspicion of being ready to put before the public whatever was desired by those who were promoting the undertaking. But I think this must not be unduly pressed, and when I find that the statement impeached was concurred in by one whose conduct in the respect I have mentioned was free from blame, and who was under no similar pressure, the case assumes, I think, a different complexion.

I must further remark that the learned judge who tried the cause, and who tells us that he carefully watched the demeanour of the witnesses and scanned their evidence, came without hesitation to the conclusion that they were witnesses of truth, and that their evidence, whatever may be its effect, might safely be relied on. An opinion so formed ought not to be differed from except on very clear grounds, and after carefully considering the evidence, I see no reason to dissent from Stirling J.'s conclusion. I shall therefore assume the truth of their testimony.

I agree with the Court below that the statement made did not accurately convey to the mind of a person reading it what the rights of the company were, but to judge whether it may nevertheless have been put forward without subjecting the defendants to the imputation of fraud, your Lordships must consider what were the circumstances. By the General Tramways Act of 1870 it is provided that all carriages used on any tramway shall be moved by the power prescribed by the special Act, and where no such power is prescribed, by animal power only (1). In order, therefore, to enable the company to use steam-power, an Act of Parliament had to be obtained empowering its use. This had been done, but the power was clogged with the condition that it was only to be used with the consent of the Board of Trade. It was therefore incorrect to say that the company had the right to use steam; they would only have that right if they obtained the consent of the Board of Trade. But it is impossible not to see that the fact which would impress itself upon the minds of those connected with the company was that they had, after submitting

(1) 33 & 34 Vict. c. 78, s. 34.

H L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

the plans to the Board of Trade, obtained a special Act empowering the use of steam. It might well be that the fact that the consent of the Board of Trade was necessary would not dwell in the same way upon their minds, if they thought that the consent of the Board would be obtained as a matter of course if its requirements were complied with, and that it was therefore a mere question of expenditure and care. The provision might seem to them analogous to that contained in the General Tramways Act, and I believe in the Railways Act also, prohibiting the line being opened until it had been inspected by the Board of Trade and certified fit for traffic, which no one would regard as a condition practically limiting the right to use the line for the purpose of a tramway or railway. I do not say that the two cases are strictly analogous in point of law, but they may well have been thought so by business men.

I turn now to the evidence of the defendants. I will take first that of Mr. Wilde, whose conduct in relation to the promotion of the company is free from suspicion. He is a member of the Bar and a director of one of the London tramway companies. He states that he was aware that the consent of the Board of Trade was necessary, but that he thought that such consent had been practically given, inasmuch as, pursuant to the Standing Orders, the plans had been laid before the Board of Trade with the statement that it was intended to use mechanical as well as horse-power, and no objection having been raised by the Board of Trade, and the Bill obtained, he took it for granted that no objection would be raised afterwards, provided the works were properly carried out. He considered, therefore, that, practically and substantially they had the right to use steam, and that the statement was perfectly true.

Mr. Pethick's evidence is to much the same effect. He thought the Board of Trade had no more right to refuse their consent than they would in the case of a railway; that they might have required additions or alterations, but that on any reasonable requirements being complied with they could not refuse their consent. It never entered his thoughts that after the Board had passed their plans, with the knowledge that it was proposed to use steam, they would refuse their consent.

Mr. Moore states that he was under the impression that the passage in the prospectus represented the effect of sect. 35 of the Act, inasmuch as he understood that the consent was obtained. He so understood from the statements made at the board by the solicitors to the company, to the general effect that everything was in order for the use of steam, that the Act had been obtained subject to the usual restrictions, and that they were starting as a tramway company, with full power to use steam as other companies were doing.

Mr. Wakefield, according to his evidence, believed that the statement in the prospectus was fair; he never had a doubt about it. It never occurred to him to say anything about the consent of the Board of Trade, because as they had got the Act of Parliament for steam he presumed at once that they would get it.

Mr. Derry's evidence is somewhat confused, but I think the fair effect of it is that though he was aware that under the Act the consent of the Board of Trade was necessary, he thought that the company having obtained their Act the Board's consent would follow as a matter of course, and that the question of such consent being necessary never crossed his mind at the time the prospectus was issued. He believed at that time that it was correct to say they had the right to use steam.

As I have said, Stirling J. gave credit to these witnesses, and I see no reason to differ from him. What conclusion ought to be drawn from their evidence? I think they were mistaken in supposing that the consent of the Board of Trade would follow as a matter of course because they had obtained their Act. It was absolutely in the discretion of the Board whether such consent should be given. The prospectus was therefore inaccurate. But that is not the question. If they believed that the consent of the Board of Trade was practically concluded by the passing of the Act, has the plaintiff made out, which it was for him to do, that they have been guilty of a fraudulent misrepresentation? I think not. I cannot hold it proved as to any one of them that he knowingly made a false statement, or one which he did not believe to be true, or was careless whether what he stated was true or false. In short, I think they honestly believed that what they asserted was true, and I am of opinion that the charge of fraud made against them has not been established.

H. L. (E.) 1889 DERRY v. PEEK. Lord Herschell.

It is not unworthy of note that in his report to the Board of Trade, General Hutchinson, who was obviously aware of the provisions of the special Act, falls into the very same inaccuracy of language as is complained of in the defendants, for he says: "The Act of 1882 gives the company authority to use mechanical power over all their system."

I quite admit that the statements of witnesses as to their belief are by no means to be accepted blindfold. The probabilities must be considered. Whenever it is necessary to arrive at a conclusion as to the state of mind of another person, and to determine whether his belief under given circumstances was such as he alleges, we can only do so by applying the standard of conduct which our own experience of the ways of men has enabled us to form; by asking ourselves whether a reasonable man would be likely under the circumstances so to believe. I have applied this test, with the result that I have a strong conviction that a reasonable man situated as the defendants were, with their knowledge and means of knowledge, might well believe what they state they did believe, and consider that the representation made was substantially true.

Adopting the language of Jessel M.R. in *Smith* v. *Chadwick* (1), I conclude by saying that on the whole I have come to the conclusion that the statement, "though in some respects inaccurate and not altogether free from imputation of carelessness, was a fair, honest and bonâ fide statement on the part of the defendants, and by no means exposes them to an action for deceit."

I think the judgment of the Court of Appeal should be reversed.

Order of the Court of Appeal reversed; order of Stirling J. restored; the respondent to pay to the appellants their costs below and in this House: cause remitted to the Chancery Division.

Lords Journals 1st July 1889.

Solicitors for appellants: *Linklater, Hackwood, Addison & Brown.*

Solicitors for respondent: *Tamplin, Tayler & Joseph.*

(1) 20 Ch. D. at p. 67.