

solidating the four actions, similar to the order made in Campbell v. Sovereign Bank of Canada, ante 334, which was affirmed by Falconbridge, C.J.K.B., on the 22nd December, 1911. The plaintiff contended that the cases were quite different, and that the proper and only order to be made—an order to which he was willing to consent—was that made by the Master in Clarkson v. Allen, on the 8th January, 1912, which, on appeal by the defendants, was not interfered with by the Chancellor, but simply referred to the trial Judge. The Master said that in the present actions the object was to recover one sum of \$60,000 for which the four defendants were *primâ facie* liable and for which notes had been given as security, amounting in all to nearly \$120,000; and these facts made it desirable that the whole matter should be investigated at one and the same time. The only question for decision was, how that was to be done. These cases were more like Clarkson v. Allen than Campbell v. Sovereign Bank of Canada. It was not clear how the four actions could be consolidated, as the liabilities of the defendants were not identical, and the results of the trial might be different in each case—some might be held to be liable and some not. An order should, therefore, be made as in Clarkson v. Allen, counsel for the plaintiff consenting that (subject to the direction of the trial Judge) the four actions be tried together, and counsel for all parties consenting that only one set of costs shall, in that event, be taxable in respect of the trial of the four actions. Upon these terms, motion dismissed; costs in the cause. F. Arnoldi, K.C., for the defendants. F. R. MacKelian, for the plaintiff.

BARBER V. SANDWICH WINDSOR AND AMHERSTBURG R.W. CO.—
MASTER IN CHAMBERS—MARCH 7.

Trial—Postponement—Action for Damages for Personal Injuries—Surgical Examination of Plaintiff.]—Motion by the defendants to postpone the trial, for the surgical examination of the plaintiff, and for further examination of the plaintiff for discovery. The action was for damages for injuries sustained by the plaintiff by reason of a collision of two of the defendants' cars, in one of which he was being carried. Notice of trial had been given by the plaintiff for the Sandwich jury sittings beginning on the 11th March. The Master said that liability was admitted, and it was only a question of what damages, if any, the plaintiff was entitled to recover. The plaintiff did not object