error or omission whereby the true intention of the testator has been purposely violated, or by the mistake of some other person has not been carried out.

According to the most recent authorities the power of the Probate Court is limited to striking out from the will any words improperly inserted contrary to the true intention of the testator, but it has no power to supply matters alleged to have been improperly omitted.

Defects corrected by Probate Court.—The Probate Court has struck out from a will propounded for probate a gift of a residue in favour of the writer of the will, the testatrix being almost blind and there being no independent proof of any instruction for such bequest: *Barton* v. *Robins*, 3 Phill. 455 n.; also a bequest in the legatee's own writing, the earlier part of the will being in the testator's own writing, and his capacity being doubtful, and there being no independent evidence of instruction for the legacy in question: *Billinghurst* v. *Vickers*, 1 Phill. 187; *Wood* v. *Wood*, Ib. 357, and see per Lord Cairns, *Fulton* v. *Andrew*, L.R. 7 H.L. at 461; *Baker* v. *Butt*, 2 Moore P.C. 317; *Barry* v. *Butlin*, Ib. 480. Also a bequest introduced after the death of a testator though pursuant to his expressed wish before death: *Nathau* v. *Morse*, 3 Phill. 529; *Rockell* v. *Youde*, Ib. 141. So also a portion of the will obtained by coercion: *Piercy* v. *Westropp*, Milward 495; and a bequest which the legatee by noise and clamour had prevented the testator from altering: *Maguire* v. *Marshall*, Milward 307, and a clause fraudulently introduced has been struck out: *Harrison* v. *Stone*, 2 Hagg. 549. Where the testator himself is responsible for a mistake or omission it would seem it cannot be corrected. Thus where a testator executed a will in which he gave to each of his servants two years' wages, and afterwards desired another person to transcribe it, which he did, the testator himself dictating and transposing some of the legacies, and after this latter paper was executed it was pointed out to the testator that the legacies to the servants had been omitted, and he then said it was of no consequence as they could be inserted in another will which he intended to make, but having died without executing any other will, it was held that the Probate Court could not include the legacies to servants as having been omitted by mistake: *Sandford* v. *Vaughan*, 1 Phill. 128.