where the claim is founded on the performance of work in relation to a specific kind of business, and the only employés connected with that business who are designated by the statute in question are those in the service of corporations[11].

*(f) ——— to the exhaustive character of the enumeration of the preferred classes of employés.* An application of the rule of statutory construction, ***Expressio unius est exclusio alterius,*** requires the conclusion that, if the statute in question enumerates a considerable number of classes of employés, the legislature did not intend that any other classes should be benefited[12].

*(g) Preference of employés of corporations who are also stockholders.* It has been laid down that an employé of a corporation, if he is otherwise within the purview of a statute of

---

the Act); *Llewellyn's Appeal* (1883) 103 Pa. 458 (mechanics and labourers, whose services were rendered in the repair and equipment of a plant preparatory to the production of pig iron,—held not to be entitled to a preference out of the property of the manufacturer); *Wolf* v. *Krick*, 17 Pa. Co. Ct. 118 (person who performed labour in the equipment of a manufactory under the employment of the persons who proposed to carry on the manufacturing business, held not to be entitled to a preference out of the assets of such persons); *Pacific Guano Co.* v. *Kuhns*, 7 Pa. Dist. R. (preference not available to the employés of a log jobber, or of a railroad or building contractor).

In *Gibbs & S. Mfg. Co.'s Appeal* (1880) 100 Pa. 528, it was held that the employés of a man who undertook the drilling of oil-wells were not working for a "contractor" as that word is used in the original Act. The position of the court was that this word applicable only to persons employed by the owner or lessee of the mine or works to produce the mineral or the article manufactured, as the case may be, and "does not embrace those who undertake to perform some special service in the construction of works, or the opening of mines preparatory to their being operated."

But it is perhaps open to doubt whether a similar construction would be placed upon a provision in which phraseology of a less special character was employed.

[11] That a bookkeeper employed by an individual engaged in the saw mill business is not within a statute which allows a lien to bookkeepers and other employees of "merchants, transportation companies and corporations," was held in *Warburton* v. *Coumbe* (1894) 34 Fla. 212.

[12] In *Thomas* v. *Washbrough* (1900) 24 Pa. Co. Ct. 419, the court refused to allow a preference to a man performing services as the janitor and trainer of an athletic association, the *ratio decidendi* being that in the Pennsylvania Act of May 12, 1891, there was no mention of persons performing such services, and that the claimant could not be placed [illegible] any of the classes of employés which were specified.