

statement of claim as embarrassing and for improper joinder of causes of action, or for particulars. Action against several defendants for libel, slander, and conspiracy. The Master held, that the causes of action for conspiracy and slander could not be joined: *Pope v. Hawtrey*, 85 L. T. R. 263; nor can there be a joint action for oral slander against several defendants, though uttered at the same time: *Carrier v. Garrant*, 23 C. P. 276; they can only be joined in an action for conspiracy to defame. Order that the plaintiff amend or deliver a new statement of claim within a week; costs to the applicant in any event. H. E. Rose, K.C., for the applicant. J. T. White, for the plaintiff.

WOODS v. ALFORD—MEREDITH, C.J.C.P., IN CHAMBERS—FEB. 11.

*Mortgage—Covenant—Judgment — Amendment — Costs.*]—An appeal by the plaintiff from the order of the Master in Chambers, ante 434, was allowed with costs; no costs of the original motion. F. E. Hodgins, K.C., for the plaintiff. A. R. Hassard, for the defendant Brennand.

REX EX REL. MOONEY v. ROBERTSON—MASTER IN CHAMBERS—  
FEB. 15.

*Municipal Election — Proceeding to Avoid — Disclaimer — Costs.*]—Upon a summary application in the nature of a *quo warranto* to void the election (by acclamation) of the respondents as mayor and councillors of a town, the respondents disclaimed, and asked to be relieved of costs. The Master held that, the respondents having acted after notice of their disqualification, the relator was entitled to his costs: *Regina ex rel. Mitchell v. Davidson*, 8 P. R. 434; *Rex ex rel. Jamieson v. Cook*, 9 O. L. R. 466; *Rex ex rel. O'Shea v. Letherby*, 16 O. L. R. 581. J. A. Macintosh, for the relator. H. S. White, for the respondents

TITCHMARSH v. WORLD NEWSPAPER Co—MASTER IN CHAMBERS  
—FEB. 17.

*Security for Costs—Libel—Criminal Charge.*]—Motion by the defendants in an action for libel for security for costs. The Master held that the newspaper article complained of did not involve a criminal charge within the decision of *Smyth v. Stephenson*, 17 P. R. 374; that the statements complained of were not such as are found in any of the following cases, where security was refused: *Harman v. Windsor World Co.*, 2 O. W. R. 442; *Gordon v. Star Printing and Publishing Co.*, 6 O. W. R. 887;