

General Life Assurance Co., 16 P.R. 536, and Dickerson v. Radcliffe, 17 P.R. 586. On the other hand, Stow v. Currie, 14 O.W. R. 62, 154, 248, shewed that the Courts lean "very decidedly against separating issues." Without further discovery, the plaintiff could not satisfy the demand for particulars of paragraphs 9 and 10 of the statement of claim. But, apart from this, it was essential to the plaintiff's case to shew, if he could, that all the persons said by him to have been his sub-agents were really so and to the full extent alleged. Entries might or might not be found in the company's books which would assist him in so doing. These men were all admittedly acting for the company; and it seemed, from the course of dealing between the plaintiff and the company, that accounts of the company with the fifteen persons named in the notice of motion might assist the plaintiff in establishing his right to commission in respect of the whole or part of the business they did. This would not extend to such a minute investigation of the accounts as would be proper after the right to an account had been established, unless the defendants' demand for particulars of paragraph 10 of the statement of claim was pressed. Whether the discovery to which the plaintiff was entitled could in fact be separated from the fuller consequential discovery to which the plaintiff would be entitled after a judgment in his favour, might present some difficulty. But, no doubt, this could be arranged so as to give the plaintiff all he was entitled to now, and yet limit him to that. If any more precise directions were required by either side, they could be considered on the settlement of the order. Costs of the motion to the plaintiff in the cause. F. Arnoldi, K.C., for the plaintiff. C. Evans-Lewis, for the defendants.

BROWNE v. TIMMINS—FALCONBRIDGE, C.J.K.B., IN CHAMBERS—
MARCH 19.

Practice—Addition of Party Plaintiff—Leave to Amend—Late Delivery of Amended Statement of Claim—Validation—Terms—Interest—Costs.]—Appeal by the defendant from the order of the Master in Chambers, ante 897. The Chief Justice said that the Master had taken the correct view. The United Cobalt Exploration Company were added as plaintiffs by the Divisional Court; and the only question before the Master was as to the extension of time. The attention of the Judge at the trial was pointedly and properly drawn to the question of interest. Appeal dismissed with costs to the plaintiffs in any event. Grayson Smith, for the defendant. R. McKay, K.C., for the plaintiffs.