powers conferred by R. S. O. ch. 307. It seems to me not desirable to extend non-liability to an association such as the Salvation Army, if it so happens that some one acting entirely within the rules of and for the Army, does a wrong for which he himself would be liable. Of course, in determining the question of holding the Army by name as a party to the action, I am expressing no opinion on the merits.....

The general question is an important one; but I cannot think the Salvation Army would care to allow the brunt of the liability to be borne by McQuarrie and Austin alone, if in what they were doing they were merely acting as officers and in the interests of the Army.

Appeal dismissed. Costs in cause to plaintiffs.

BRITTON, J. MAY 4TH, 1903.

CHAMBERS.

CHANDLER AND MASSEY (LIMITED) v. GRAND TRUNK R. W. CO.

Parties—Joinder of—Two Defendants—Different Causes of Action—Sale of Goods—Claim against Vendee for Price—Claim against Carrier for Loss in Transit.

Appeal by plaintiffs from order of Master in Chambers (ante 286) staying proceedings until plaintiffs elect which of the two defendants the plaintiffs will proceed against, and dismissing the action against the other.

W. A. Sadler, for plaintiffs.

D. L. McCarthy, for defendant company.

C. A. Moss, for defendant Kerr.

BRITTON, J.— . . . I have no doubt that as a matter of convenience and saving of expense to all parties, this is a case where plaintiffs should be at liberty to join defendants.

There is, however, the question of law. It is contended that Rule 186 applies only to cases of joinder of defendants in reference to one cause of action, and that it has no application to any case where there are two distinct and different causes of action, one against one defendant, or, in the alternative, the other cause of action against the other defendant, even if the action arises about the same subject matter. It is argued that Rule 192 is limited to cases where the right to relief is founded strictly and technically upon the same cause of action. A careful perusal of the cases cited will not warrant the conclusion that the Rule is absolutely so limited and restricted. . . . [Quigley v. Waterloo Mfg. Co., 1