

ality of the words, "or other persons whatsoever," it was held that they were confined to persons pursuing callings like those specified in the preceding words, and did not include others, e.g., a coach proprietor: *Sandiman v. Breach*, 7 B. & C. 96; or a farmer: *Reg. v. Cleworth*, 4 B. & S. 927; or an attorney: *Peate v. Dicken*, 1 C. M. & R. 422; or persons in the public service of the sovereign: *Reg. v. Berriman*, 4 O.R. 282.

It was also applied in the construction of an Act which made it felony to break into "a dwelling, shop, warehouse, or counting house," which words were held not to include a "workshop": *Reg. v. Sanders*, 9 C. & P. 79; so also in the construction of 11 Geo. II., c. 19, which authorizes "corn, grass, or other product," growing on the demised lands, to be distrained for rent; and it was held that only similar products to corn and grass come within the general words "or other product," and, therefore, they did not include young trees: *Clark v. Gaskarth*, 8 Taunt. 431; and for the like reason it was held that young trees were not within an Act which made it penal to steal "any plant, root, fruit, or vegetable production growing in a garden, orchard, nursery-ground, hothouse, or conservatory": *Rex. v. Hodges*, 1 Moo. & M. 341, because a tree was not *ejusdem generis* with a "plant, fruit, or root."

So an Act which authorized the police to enter any "house or room" used for stage plays, and imposed a penalty for keeping any house "or other tenement" as an unlicensed theatre, was held not to extend to a portable booth consisting of two wagons joined together, and used as a theatre by strolling players: *Fredericks v. Howie*, 1 H. & C. 381.

A similar principle of construction was applied to the English Companies Act, 1862, s. 79 (see 52 Vict., c. 32, s. 4, s-s. (e) (D.)), which authorizes the Court of Chancery to wind up companies—where the company passes a resolution in favour of that course,—or does not begin business within a year,—or its members are reduced to seven, *-or where the court thinks a winding up "just and equitable,"*—and it has been held that these general words only apply to cases where for causes *ejusdem generis* with those previously mentioned the court thinks it just and equitable: *Spackman's Case*, 1 McN. & G. 170; *Re Anglo-Greek Steam Co.*, 2 Eq. 1; and see per Lord Macnaghten, 12 App. Cas. 502.

The doctrine was also applied in the interpretation of 20 Geo.