

action had been validly transferred to the assignee of the original plaintiff so as to entitle him to continue the proceedings, as was done in *Shepley v. Hurd*, 3 A.R. 549, and then the matter would be disposed of at the trial. What the defendants seek by the present motion is, to have it decided, on an interlocutory motion in Chambers, that the new plaintiff has no *locus standi*, which, if proved, would necessitate a dismissal of the actions and could only be done under Con. Rule 261. For these reasons, the Master thought that the only order to be made was, that the defendants should have eight days to amend their statements of defence as they might be advised and the plaintiff four days thereafter to reply. This would re-open the pleadings, and so invalidate the setting down—and it became unnecessary to consider the question of postponing the trial. Costs of the motion to be costs in the cause. G. H. Kilmer, K.C., for the defendants. F. R. MacKeehan, for the plaintiff.