

provisions of the will. This document was not shewn to her. The Master dismissed the motion, holding that what the defendant was requested to do was not relevant to the issues. N. G. Heyd, for the plaintiff. M. F. Muir, for the defendant.

HOLMES v. CITY OF ST. CATHARINES—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—OCT. 21.

*Parties.*—Action for injuries caused by the faulty condition of a street and walk and the faulty condition of the lights thereon. The defendants moved, after the action had come on for trial and the trial had been postponed, to add as defendants the gas company who supplied the lighting of the streets under a contract with the defendants. The plaintiff not objecting, the Master made an order adding the company, saying that the statement of claim would have to be amended so as to make a claim against the company, and suggesting that the defendants should serve the company with a notice under Rule 215. Reference to *Hewitt v. Heise*, 11 P. R. 47; *Erdman v. Town of Walkerton*, 15 P. R. 12; *Leid v. Gould*, 13 O. L. R. 41; *Bullock v. London General Omnibus Co.*, [1907] 1 K. B. 204; *Tracey v. Toronto R. W. Co.*, 13 O. W. R. 15. *Featherston Aylesworth*, for the defendants. R. H. Parmenter, for the company. J. A. Keyes, for the plaintiff.

---