appears too large, it is true, but, as I think, not so large as to be unconscionable, or to shock one's ideas of right and wrong. It is not a case in which any legal measure of damages is afforded by which the Court can say that the jury was wrong.

*

HENDERSON v. Henderson.—Limitation of actions—R. S. O. c. 111, s. 5, s.s. 1; ss. 13, 14, 15 — Purchase of farm—Possession by son of purchaser—Payment of mortgage — Contribution by son — "Profits of the land" — "Rent." In March, 1881, the testator purchased a farm and had it conveyed to himself. In April, 1881, one of his sons, with the testator's assent, given after a conference with his other sons, went into possession of the farm, upon an understanding that he should contribute such sum as could be spared off the farm, after its yielding a living for him, towards payment of the mortgage thereon, until the mortgage should be paid, when he was to have the farm. He continued in actual possession and occupation from April, 1881, till his death in November, 1892. He contributed in all $1,900 towards payment of the mortgage, and with his contributions and payments made by his father, the mortgage was paid off, after which he asked his father for a conveyance. His father declined, but said he would leave him the farm by will. He died before his father, leaving all his property by will to his wife and child. After his death his father made a will leaving the farm to the plaintiffs, and died in 1894, the son's widow continuing in possession. In an action of ejectment brought against her by the plaintiffs: Held, Meredith, J., dissenting, that on the purchase by and conveyance to the father of the farm, the law put him into possession of it, there being no other person in possession in fact; that when the son went into possession, the father's possession ceased, and he was not thereafter in receipt of the "profits of the land," within the meaning of s. 5, s.-s. 1, of the Real Property Limitation Act, R. S. O. c. 111; that the son was not a tenant from year to year nor a lessee, and the money he contributed was not "rent," within the meaning of s. 14; nor was such money "rent" or "profits of the land," within the meaning of s. 5, s.-s 1, or in any way; and there being no acknowledgment by the son in writing within the meaning of s. 13, nor anything else which could stop the running of the statute, the title of the father was extinguished, under s. 15 of the Act, at least six months before the death of the son.

*

STEPHENS v. Beatty. — Will — Construction — "Who may then be the heirs-at-law" — Deed — Delivery — Operation — Trusts and trustees—Limitation of actions — Trustees Act, 1891, s. 13, s.-s. 1 (a), (b)—Commencement of statute — Balance in trustee's hands — Letter — Acknowledgement — Estoppel. The father of the plaintiff's deceased husband, by his will, left all his property to trustees, of whom the defendant was the survivor, in trust to convey and transfer it, after the death of his wife, unto all his surviving children, share and share alike, and their heirs forever; and by, a codicil, directed that the share of the plaintiff's husband should not be paid over or conveyed to him, but kept invested by the trustees, and the income paid to him during his life for his sole benefit, and after his death that such share should be paid over or conveyed to those "who may then be the heirs at law of my said son," share and share alike. The property in the hands of the defendant, as surviving trustee, at the time of the death of this son was all real estate. Held, *per* MacMahon, J., the Judge at the trial, that the words above quoted signified those who would take real estate as upon an intestacy. Coatsworth v. Carson, 24 O. R. 185, followed. The testator died in July, 1875, and his widow before the 1st August, 1876; the plaintiff's marriage to the son took place in July, 1885; and the son died in September, 1886, leaving no issue. By an ante-nuptial contract the son assigned and conveyed to the plaintiff all his interest in the estate of his father. By deed dated 1st August, 1885, the children of the testator made a