

motion was not entitled to prevail at this stage. The order should, therefore, be, that no further particulars be ordered at this stage; but that, after examination of both parties for discovery, the defendants may apply for further particulars, if so advised, or the plaintiff may furnish the same if he desires so to do. The Master drew attention to what was said by Stirling, J., in the Mandleberg case, where the defendants were only sellers: "If a manufacturer is attacked for infringing a patent by a particular process, he does not want to be told in the shape of particulars or otherwise what the process is he is using. But it is a very different thing with respect to a vendor." In *Kleinert Rubber Co. v. Eisman Rubber Co.*, 12 O.W.R. 60, where an order for particulars of breach was made, the facts were not set out, nor was it said at what stage the motion was made, nor what particulars, if any, had already been given. It, therefore, seemed better to follow the authorities, which, if cited in the *Kleinert* case, were not referred to in the judgment. Costs of the motion to be in the cause. E. G. Long, for the defendants. A. C. McMaster, for the plaintiffs.

CORRECTIONS.

In *Adams v. Gourlay*, ante 909, the counsel for the plaintiff was R. S. Robertson. On p. 911, 12th line from the bottom, "plaintiff's counsel" should be "defendants' counsel."

In *Huegli v. Pauli*, ante 915, on p. 918, 2nd line from the bottom, "19" should be 23.