of the product, whether manufactured according to the plaintiff's specifications or according to other specifications; but he afterwards qualified this; and on the 11th May, 1911, a demand was made that the plaintiff should state definitely, by particulars, whether he intended to prove both of these allegations or only the second. In answer, a statement was delivered to the effect that the plaintiff was not aware of how the defendant made the lenses he sold, but that they infringed the plaintiff's patent. On the argument, the plaintiff's counsel declined to give any more definite information as to the course to be taken at the trial. The Master said that it seemed probable that, if the second ground only were relied on, it would be unnecessary to prepare any evidence to meet the question of the defendant having used the process, and that a great deal of expense would be saved in that way; and the defendant should not be left in doubt on this point, and obliged to procure the evidence of patent experts at a large cost, which might in the end prove to be unnecessary, yet which he must be prepared to adduce if the question of the process were gone into at the trial. The motion was entitled to succeed, and the plaintiff should give the information asked for in ten days. Costs of the motion to be in the cause. W. A. Logie, for the defendant. M. H. Ludwig, K.C., for the plaintiff.