

"Sovereign" Radiators never leak and never choke up—and they cost no more than the radiators that do.

Makers of the
"Sovereign"
How Water Boiler

NOTICE OF DIVIDEND

Notice is hereby given that a Dividend at the rate of SIX PER CENT. per annum upon the Paid-Up Capital Stock of The Home Bank of Canada has been declared for the THREE MONTHS ending the 30th November, 1908, and the same will be payable at the Head Office and Branches of the Bank on and after Tuesday, the First Day of December next.

The transfer books will be closed from the 15th to 30th of November, both days inclusive.

By Order of the Board,

JAMES MASON, General Manager.

Toronto, Oct. 21, 1908.

Original Charter 1854
THE HOME BANK OF CANADA

Head Office—8 King St. West.
Branch Offices, open 7 to 9 o'clock every Saturday night:
78 Church Street
Cor. Queen West and Bathurst Streets
Cor. Bloor West and Bathurst Streets
Cor. Queen East and Ontario Streets
20 Dundas Street, West Toronto

IN THE LAW COURTS

IN THE HIGH COURT.

Announcements.
Osgoode Hall, Nov. 6, 1908.
Monday, Nov. 9, being Thanksgiving Day, the offices at Osgoode Hall will be closed and no courts will be sitting.

Judges' chambers will be held on Tuesday, 10th, at 10 a.m.

Peremptory list for divisional court on Tuesday, 10th inst.:

1. Re Burk Estate.
2. Pinn Estate, Dunn v. Finn.
3. Dunn v. Finn.
4. Re McNaughton and Taylor.
5. Re Hill and Telford.

List of motions set down for the sittings of the court of appeal, commencing Tuesday, 10th inst.:

1. Jewell v. Jacobs.
2. Rudd v. Armprior.
3. Bagnall v. Durham.
4. Canadian Fairbanks v. London M. F. Co.
5. Carroll v. Erie Co. and Prov. Nat. Gas Company.
6. University of Toronto v. Conservatory of Music.
7. C. P. R. v. Brown.
8. Rex v. Cook.
9. Coburn v. Clarkson.
10. Toronto v. Ward.
11. Rex v. Lamotte.
12. Sutherland v. G.T.R.
13. McGraw v. Toronto Railway.
14. Gray v. Wabash and G.T.R.
15. Dickson v. Leroy.
16. Petrie v. Knott & McLean (Winding-up Act).
17. Brill v. Toronto Railway.
18. Hotley v. G.T.R.
19. Paget v. Toronto Railway.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

Before Cartwright, master.
City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

City of Toronto v. Laing—W. A. Proudfoot for defendant, F. R. MacKeehan for plaintiff. Judgment (H.). Motion to set aside statement of claim as improperly joining distinct causes of action, etc. The alleged wrongs do not arise out of the same transaction or series of transactions, nor do they involve a common question of law or fact. The only thing in common is that the defendant is the alleged wrongdoer in each case. I cannot find here either of the two conditions, both of which must concur before recourse can be had to C.R. 185. If the plaintiffs still think they can bring themselves within rule 185, they must elect. If not, they must elect. As in Mason v. G. T. R. The amendments (whichever is finally decided on) should be made in a fortnight. The order will therefore be made.

that the writ and statement of claim be amended in any way or the other, and the costs of this motion must be to defendant in any event.
Smith v. Henderson—R. G. Agnew (West Toronto), for plaintiff, moved for payment out of court of money paid in by defendant, Henderson. G. C. Campbell, for Norton, a judgment creditor of the contractors, defendants, contra. Motion dismissed. Costs to be in the mechanics' lien action.

Kelly v. London and Western Trust Co. E. G. Morris, for defendants, moved for security for costs, on ground that plaintiff resides out of jurisdiction. W. H. Garvey, for plaintiff, asked enlargement. Enlarged until 11th inst, stay meantime.

Re Distributors' Company (Stephen's case)—W. H. McFadden, K.C., for the plaintiff, moved for judgment. A. J. R. Snow, K.C., contra. Motion enlarged for one week, to see if plaintiff can be examined in meantime. Leave to deliver claim without prejudice.

Bowman v. City of Toronto—F. R. MacKeehan, for defendants, moved to strike out certain paragraphs of statement of claim. W. G. Thurston, K.C., for plaintiff, contra. Reserved.

Milton Pressed Brick Co. v. Marsh—W. J. Themear, for plaintiffs, moved for judgment. No one contra. Judgment as asked.

Elliott v. Buchanan—D. T. Symonds, K.C., for defendants, moved for particulars. G. Grant, for plaintiff, contra. Order to go stating that particulars demanded are those given in plaintiffs' cross-examination. Defendants to plead in ten days. Costs in the cause.

McBride v. McCutcheon—W. E. Middleton, K.C., for defendant, moved to postpone trial, on ground of absence of a material witness. G. Vance, K.C., contra. Order made. Plaintiff to be at liberty to move to change place of trial to Toronto if so advised. Costs in the cause.

Green v. Needham—J. H. Spence moved for leave to serve notice of motion on Fanny Needham, who is out of jurisdiction. Order made.

Booth v. Johnston—A. J. R. Snow, K.C., for plaintiff, moved for particulars. H. W. Page, for defendants, also moved for particulars. Particulars having been given, both motions dismissed, one order to be taken out by defendant. Costs in the cause.

Lewis Bros. v. Gillman—D. G. Galbraith, for plaintiff, moved for judgment against defendant Brooks. No one contra. Judgment as asked, but not to issue until 11th inst.

Before Teetzel, J.
The King v. Nelson. J. B. MacKenzie, for defendant, moved for a writ of habeas corpus. Order made.

Re Pow-Pew v. Pew. A. E. H. Creswick (Barrie), moved on consent for an order transferring money to this account, for confirmation of report and for payment out. Order made.

Hopper v. Hall. J. Agnew, for plaintiff, moved for an order to permit continuance of reference before another referee, the one to whom reference had been directed having died.

Re Dewey and O'Heir, Limited. A. M. Lewis (Hamilton), moved to wind up company. G. Lynch Staunton, K.C., for the company, contra. Enlarged until 10th inst. for payment out of court of \$350. Order made.

Re McLaren estate. W. E. Raney, K.C., for the mother of four infants, asked for payment out of court of certain sums half yearly for maintenance. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., for infants. Order made.

Re Clark estate. H. E. Rose, K.C., for executor of Philip O. Clark estate, moved for amendment and confirmation of report, and for payment out of money pursuant thereto. Philip O. Clark and Jane Rowe in person. Order granted.

Re Peel, a supposed lunatic. G. H. Sedgewick, for petitioner, moved for an order declaring lunacy. No one contra. Order made, declaring lunacy, and referring to the master-in-ordinations committee.

Proctor v. Carscallen. J. G. Smith, for plaintiff, moved for an order adding parties, the part of kin, as defendants. A. O'Heir (Hamilton), for defendants. E. C. Spreeman, for Jesse A. Carscallen. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., for infant. Order made. Four weeks after service of claim allowed for defence by those in Scotland and Ireland and three weeks for the others. Dixon Woodstock appointed to represent those in same interest.

Re Hamilton and Canadian Order of Foresters. L. Lee (Hamilton), for order, moved for leave to pay insurance money into court. S. H. Bradford, K.C., for the Trust Corporation. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., for infants. Order allowing payment into court, and the question of who is entitled to the fund on the law referred to a divisional court. S. H. Bradford argued interests may be in conflict with those represented by the official guardian. Costs of all parties out of fund.

Re mother v. Chute. P. D. Byers, for mother, moved for payment out of court of \$100 for maintenance of infant. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., for infant. Order as asked.

Re Cottingham and Lunatic. H. A. Chadwick, for the inspector of prisons, and public charities, moved for an order for payment of moneys in the hands of the official guardian for the maintenance of a patient. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., does not oppose. Order made.

Re Muir. Balfour Smith, R. and G., moved for an order dispensing with payment in and for discharge of mortgage. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., for infant. Order granted.

Re Keegan. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., for infants moved for the allowance of \$1000 a year for maintenance. Order made for payment of that sum for five years.

Re McGrady. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., for Margaret McGrady, moved for an order for payment out of court of certain moneys for education of his client. Order made.

Colchester v. Halsted. J. G. O'Donoghue, for plaintiff, moved for payment out to his client of moneys to which he is entitled. Order as asked.

Re Gibbs and Walkerton and Lucknow Railway. R. J. W. McGowan, for railway, moved for an order for advertisement. Order for publication in a paper in the county, and for sending a copy of the advertisement in a letter to the owner.