

is not the case here, according to the evidence and finding of the judge. These claims, while similar in character, are yet for moneys lent as distinct loans at different times and places, but pursuant to a course of dealing, and not necessarily to be massed en bloc for the purpose of litigation.

The present case is within the authority of *Rex v. Herefordshire*, 1 B. & Ad. 672. See *Harvey v. McPherson*, 6 O.L.R. 60.

Application refused with costs.

*Frank McCarthy*, for the defendant. *J. T. White*, for the plaintiff.

---

Master in Chambers.]

[Feb. 7.

CANADA CARRIAGE CO. v. DOWN.

*Venue—Change—County Court.*

Upon motion of the defendants, an order was made transferring the action from the County Court of York to the County Court of Perth. The action was for the price of a waggon made by the plaintiffs, who carried on business at Brockville, and sent to the defendants at Stratford. The Master thought it would be reasonable to have the trial at Stratford, where the waggon could be inspected by the judge and witnesses. Costs in the cause.

*H. E. Rose*, K.C., for the defendants. *Mervil Macdonald*, for the plaintiffs.

---

Master in Chambers.]

[Feb. 9.

STIDWELL v. TOWNSHIP OF NORTH DORCHESTER.

*Venue—Change—Expense.*

Motion by defendants to change the venue from St. Thomas to London. The Master held that, with an hourly electric service between the two cities, there would scarcely be any substantial difference in cost; and pointed out that a successful defendant can always apply to the trial judge for a direction as to the taxation of the costs of the witnesses if it appears that the costs have been materially increased by the trial being at the place chosen by the plaintiff. Motion refused; costs in the cause.

*H. S. White*, for the defendant. *J. F. Lash*, for the plaintiff.