tiffs' representative not inquiring into or complaining of the conditions of that test, but only professing ignorance of their fairness. We find no reason to suspect that defendants are not acting in good faith.

In my opinion, the decision of the learned Judge appealed from should be affirmed with costs.

CORRECTIONS.

RE REID.

In the report of this case, ante 915, the judgment of RIDDELL, J., is not given in full, and the short report is inaccurate.

After setting out the facts, practically as on p. 915, the learned Judge says:—

The motion purports to be made under the provisions of Con. Rule 938. Assuming that the present is a case within that Rule, it could be under (a), (c), or (h) only. Applications under these clauses are to be made before a Judge of the High Court sitting in Weekly Court, and not before a Judge in Chambers. I have no jurisdiction in Chambers to dispose of this application. Nor should I remove it into Court—the insolvent not appearing. Had all parties been represented, I should probably have so removed the application, but, as things are, I shall not do so in his absence.

The motion will be refused.

In KINNEAR v. CLYNE, ante 777, 15th line from bottom, for "[1893] 2 Ch." read "[1903] 2 Ch.," and 16th line from bottom, for "[1897] 2 Ch." read "[1907] 2 Ch."

In RICHARDSON v. SHENK, ante 913, 4th line from bottom, insert "not" before "shewn."