

defendants to break up her home and deprive her of the custody of her two infant children. She claimed damages "by reason of the misconduct of the defendants and for breaking up the domestic relations existing between the plaintiff and the defendant John Ney," her husband. The defendants the Neys moved to strike out pars. 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of the statement of claim as embarrassing. The motion was supported by reference to the judgment of the Court of Appeal in *Weston v. Perry*, 1 O.W.N. 155, following their previous judgment in *Lellis v. Lambert*, 24 A.R. 653. The Master said that these judgments seemed to support the contention that no action would lie by a married woman for the loss of the consortium of her husband. Her right to support from him in such an event is not taken away. The Master, however, felt the difficulty that to give effect to the motion would be equivalent to a judgment under Con. Rule 261, as the paragraphs attacked were the whole substance of the plaintiff's claim; and he thought it would be best, in the interests of all parties, either to strike out the paragraphs in question and give the plaintiff leave to amend as advised or else refer the motion to a Judge in Chambers, who could enlarge it into Court and deal with it under Con. Rule 261. The defendants to elect within a week which course they prefer. T. N. Phelan, for the applicants. W. J. McLarty, for the plaintiff.