known to belong, if those who look on know well who is aimed at, the very same injury is inflicted, the very same thing is in fact done as would be done if his name and Christian name were ten times repeated." Albrecht v. Burkholder is to the same effect.

The defendants' second ground is that there is misjoinder of parties. Holding as I have held above, and it not appearing that the joinder of the plaintiffs will embarrass or delay the trial of the action, I am of opinion that under Rule 66 (Con. Rules of 1913) the plaintiffs are not improperly joined.

The defendants ask, in the alternative, that portions of paragraph 3 of the statement of claim be struck out as irrelevant and embarrassing. The portions objected to are sufficiently connected with the other published statements in respect of which the action is brought, and they should remain as part of the record. It is difficult to see how they can cause embarrassment or interfere with the proper trial of the action.

The application for particulars of the name of the Controller referred to in paragraph 3 of the statement of claim is also refused. Disclosure of the name of the person whom the author and the publisher of the article complained of, or one or other of them, had in mind, is, or should be, within the power of the defendants or some one of them. The defendants are not, therefore, in that respect, prejudicially affected in making their defence.

The motion is dismissed with costs.

MIDDLETON, J.   OCTOBER 1ST, 1913.

Re BLACK AND TOWN OF ORILLIA.

Municipal Corporations—Bonus for Promotion of Manufactures —Municipal Act, 1903, sec. 591(12)(e)—"Industry already Established elsewhere in the Province"—Meaning of "Established"—Business Carried on for Ten Months in Rented Premises.

Motion by a ratepayer of the Town of Orillia to quash by-law No. 569, being a by-law to raise by way of debentures the sum of $25,000, to be lent to the C. N. W. Shoe Company Limited, as a bonus to assist them in establishing and operating a boot and shoe factory at Orillia.