

The only other case in which there could be a suspicion of plagiarism, is the case of *Caston v. Scott*, 1 M. L. R. 117; 4 C. L. T. 151. The grossest reprobate, hugging his newborn innocent to his bosom and swearing to the faithfulness of the reproduction, could not be more astray than is our suspicious friend in this instance. The question for decision in the case was, whether the ownership of unincumbered real estate in the Province was a sufficient answer to an application for security for costs. *The Manitoba Law Reports* gives the conclusion of the judge as follows: "it would not be *unreasonable* to say, that where the plaintiff owns real property, a mortgage, given to an officer of the court, conditioned to be void upon payment of a certain sum should costs be awarded against him, should be accepted." *The Canadian Law Times*, on the contrary, makes the learned judge say that "it would not be *reasonable* to say that where the plaintiff owns real property, a mortgage given to an officer," &c.

We need hardly add that *The Manitoba Law Reports* are correct, and that our inter-provincial friend is not more free from criticism in his reporting than in his advertising columns. If the reason of his errors really is attributable to lack of financial support (as our unfortunate friend seems to suggest), we will be glad to undertake, without charge, for a reasonable time, not only the inspectorship of his advertisements (a position he seems to be desirous we should assume), but also the supervision of his whole publication. We think that an impecunious friend ought always to be assisted—that is, of course, with advice. Perhaps, in advance of our installation in office, he will allow us to suggest the adoption of the somewhat useful page usually headed—"*Addenda et Corrigenda*." It would be an evidence of the editor's honesty and of our industry. Let it be in this form:—

Page 152, line 7 from foot—for "it would not be reasonable to say," read "it would not be unreasonable to say."