

LIDLAW LUMBER CO. v. CAWSON—LENNOX, J., IN CHAMBERS—  
JULY 17.

*Interpleader—Order Directing Issue—Parties—Who should be Plaintiff.*—Appeal by the claimant from an order of the Master in Chambers directing that she should be plaintiff in an interpleader issue. LENNOX, J., said that it would, perhaps, prejudice the trial of the interpleader issue were he to go minutely into his reasons for thinking that the learned Master in Chambers was not wrong in making the claimant plaintiff in the proceedings. The way in which the property was acquired, was dealt with, and was found, to say nothing of the circumstances of a lady, in the claimant's position, investing in two automobiles, quite justified the order made. C. M. Hertzlich, for the claimant. G. F. McFarland, for the execution creditors. R. J. Maclellan, for the Sheriff of Toronto.

## RE McCOUBREY AND CITY OF TORONTO—LENNOX, J.—JULY 17.

*Municipal Corporation—Regulation of Barber Shops—Early Closing By-law—Validity—Statutes.*—Motion by Charles McCoubrey for an order quashing by-law No. 6513 of the City of Toronto, passed on the 16th June, 1913, and known as the barbers' early closing by-law. LENNOX, J., said that he saw no reason to change the opinion he expressed at the argument, namely, that the by-law substantially complied with the Act. The legislative meaning was not at all clearly expressed, either in 4 Edw. VII. ch. 10, or in the Act of last session; but the exceptions of sec. 84, as applying to barber shops, would lead to manifest absurdity. The by-law should be amended by striking out the words "owner complained of," and in all other respects the application should be dismissed and the by-law confirmed. Owing to the unsatisfactory wording of the statute, there should be no costs. T. J. W. O'Connor, for the applicant. Irving S. Fairty, for the city corporation.

## CORRECTION.

In *Blaisdell v. Raycroft*, ante 1569, 15th line from the bottom, the figures 4,800 should be 4,000.