
 REPORTS AND NOTES OF CASES.

 Province of Ontario.

 HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

Divisional Court.]

[Oct. 21.

CITY OF TORONTO v. FOSS.

Building restrictions—Store or manufactory—Ladies' tailoring business.

Appeal by the defendants from the judgment of Middleton, J., 3 O.W.N. 1426. This case raised the question as to whether or not a ladies' tailoring business, carried on in a private dwelling, came within the words a "store." The defendant kept no general assortment of goods or commodities nor were his premises fitted with counters or shelving, nor had he any visible sign.

Held, that the premises did not constitute a "store" in the well-understood meaning of that expression as being a place where merchandise was kept for sale. Nor was it a "manufactory" which presumes the employment of a number of operators.

Chisholm, K.C., for defendant. *C. M. Colquhoun*, for plaintiff.

Divisional Court, K.B.]

[Oct. 21.

EADIE-DOUGLAS v. HITCH & CO.

Mechanics' lien—Registration after proceedings taken by another lienor—Meaning of "in the meantime."

Appeal by the plaintiff from an order of the Local Master at Ottawa, allowing claimant, G. W. King, to prove his claim to a lien under this Mechanics' Lien Act. Reference was made to the expression "in the meantime," in s. 24, of 10 Edw. VII. c. 69.

Held, that "in the meantime" has the primary signification of during or within the time which intervenes between one specified period or event and another. In strictness there is in contemplation a *terminus a quo*, as well as a *terminus ad quem*—