manifest intention of the law-makers as set forth in this Winding-up Act.

All I now decide is, that it is competent for the petitioners to examine the directors, and the procedure taken is right.

The application must be dismissed with costs.

[See Re McLean Stinson and Brodie Limited, 2 O.W.N. 294, 435.]

BOYD, C., IN CHAMBERS. SEPTEMBER 20TH, 1912.

RE HOBBS AND CITY OF TORONTO.

Municipal Corporations—Buildings "on Residential Streets" of Cities—Consolidated Municipal Act, 1903, *sec.* 541*a—By-law—Permit for Erection of Building for the "Purpose of Storage"—"Stores"—"Shops."*

Motion by Hobbs for a peremptory order in the nature of a mandamus requiring the city corporation and the city architect to issue to the applicant a permit for the erection of a building.

W. C. Chisholm, K.C., for the applicant.
C. M. Colquhoun, for the respondents.

BOYD, C.:—In the application for a permit to build, it is stated that the building to be erected is for the "purpose of storage." It is proposed to store therein such things as (second-hand) machinery, furniture, or printing presses, for safe-keeping until removed. If the use of the bulding is thus defined and limited as a mere place of deposit, I do not think it falls within the classes of buildings prohibited by the by-law. The by-law is based on the Municipal Act, 1903, sec. 541a, as added in 1904 by 4 Edw. VII. ch. 22, sec. 19, relating to the regulation and control in cities of the location, erection, and use of buildings for "laundries, butcher-shops, stores, and manufacturies." The one pertinent word in this connection is "stores." In City of Toronto v. Foss, 3 O.W.N. 1426, it was conceded by counsel that the word "stores" in this context meant "shops." I think that is so. Probably, for the sake of euphony, after saying "butcher-shops," the further idea as to "shops" generally was carried out by using its equivalent, "stores." The dictionaries tell us that, in the United States and the British colonies adjoining,