In Twyford v. Trail, 3 My. & Cr. 645, where specified exceptions as to certain amounts on a Master's report were allowed, and the report was thereupon referred back to the Master for review, the Court held that the Master was precluded from making any other inquiry than whether anything or a certain sum was due.

And in Re Corkers, 3 Jo. & L. 377, where on a reference to report as to the fortune of a minor, the Master gave his construction of the testator's will, the Court declined to confirm his report.

The decisions of our own Courts are in harmony with the principle of Lord Bacon's Order, and the cases under it. In Williams v. Haun, 10 Gr. 553, where, owing to the Master not having ascertained a particular fact, there was a reference back, and the Master on further evidence altered some of the findings on his original report, VanKoughnet, C., held that he should not have done so, as the report had not been sent back to him for such alterations.

In Morley v. Matthews, 12 Gr. 453, Mowat, V.-C., said: "I apprehend that where the Court does not mean that the Master should take further evidence, the order must contain a direction to that effect,—unless the reference back is expressed to be for a purpose on which further evidence could not be material."

In this case no further evidence is material or necessary; all that the order directs is a readjustment of the accounts by striking out the computations of compound interest.

And Gordon v. Gordon, 12 O. R. 593, shews that a Judge's jurisdiction to alter the findings in a Master's report is limited. In that case Proudfoot, J. (11 O. R. 611), had altered the amount found by the Master, although not appealed from. Boyd, C., said: "I do not think he should have gone further and reduced the amount of their claim as proved before the Master, and not appealed from. That appears to me to be an irregular proceeding, and a manner of giving redress not warranted by the practice. To this extent his order should be modified, and the Master's report in this respect will remain as if not appealed from." Ferguson, J., concurred.

I find therefore that the order in this case limits my jurisdiction to a readjustment of the accounts by disallowing