

by the Division Court Judge. His findings, even if erroneous, could not be reviewed. Upon the argument it was apparently thought that the action was with respect to wages prior to the date of the liquidation; and there was much confusion in the affidavits made by the plaintiff. Apparently there was \$110 due before the liquidation, and this was the amount claimed for wages subsequent to the liquidation. This amount was evidently erroneous, for the wages after liquidation began on the 11th November and ended on the 23rd November, and would amount to \$53.43 only, instead of \$110. The plaintiff now consented to reduce his claim to this amount, with costs in the Division Court; and this consent might be recited in the order. The motion failed; but costs should not be awarded, as the motion was provoked by the fact that the judgment was apparently for wages prior to the date of the liquidation. D. C. Ross, for the defendants. C. B. Jackes, for the plaintiff.