

children, while the contrary is in truth the case. By the settlements only a life interest is reserved to the Testator's children, and the *corpus* or principal is to go to the grand-children; while under the Will, as mentioned, the children share equally in the residue, subject to Mrs. Goodhue's life annuity.

This statement of our position shows that the aid sought from the Legislature was not in conflict with the Will, but was one of those remedial measures which was consistent with, and not in contravention of any proper principles of Legislation, and for which, moreover, there were many precedents in the Parliament of the late Province of Canada.

II. *Proceedings in support of Bill.*

Besides the Will and the Indenture, we offered only the opinions of Counsel, one of these having been given to the opposing Trustee, Mr. Becher, himself.

In answer Mr. Becher endeavoured to introduce his own evidence to prove what the Testator intended by his Will, and this we objected to, and the Committee properly rejected it.

MR. CAMERON'S *opinion, as expressed before the Committee, was as follows:—*

"My view of the Will is, that the shares of the children of the Testator are all vested in interest, but none of them in possession, "wherefore the effect of the will is, that if one child dies, leaving "no child, the share of that child will be distributable amongst "those who have children. This opinion is not shared in by "others; but it was originally given by me to the Trustees, on the "application of one of those interested under the Will applying to "have the benefit in possession of one of the shares."

And again Mr. CAMERON said:—

"I was not aware till I heard Mr. Anderson's argument, that "there was any difference of opinion amongst legal gentlemen as to "the shares of the children being vested. *I am satisfied that the "correct interpretation of the Will is that they are vested. I have*