and in fairness he is directed to pay occupation rent. This occupation rent will be based upon the real value of the thing occupied; and the foul condition of the land would also reduce the amount with which he was to be charged for rent; and if it be shewn that during his occupation he expended money resulting in the betterment of the condition of the land, an allowance might be made to him upon that head.

The Master has proceeded upon a totally different theory; he says the plaintiff was in prosperous circumstances in British Columbia, having investments of $30,000, yielding an income of 10 per cent. He gave up these and came here, realising upon his investments, and stayed upon the Ontario property, not only after he had discovered the misrepresentation within a few weeks after his arrival, but throughout the litigation, including the hearing of the appeals; and the Master has allowed $7,500 as representing this supposed loss of income, although claimed as "loss of time or salary for plaintiff for two and a half years at three thousand dollars, $7,500." The Master has, among other things, ignored the fact that the defendant has had to pay interest upon so much of this capital as was invested in the farm, also the fact that the balance of the capital was not shewn to have been idle in the meantime.

But quite apart from this, after the best consideration I can give to the case, I feel clear that this is not the kind of damage which can be recovered at all. *Chaplin* v. *Hicks*, [1911] 2 K. B. 786, does not at all determine that damages heretofore regarded as being too remote can now be recovered. All it determines is that damages may in proper cases be allowed notwithstanding that there may be difficulties in satisfactorily ascertaining the amount of damage. In this respect that decision is identical with the view given effect to in our own Courts in *Goodall* v. *Clarke*, 21 O. L. R. 614, 23 O. L. R. 57; 44 S. C. R. 284.

Among other items which have been allowed by the Master is $258.05 expenses moving from British Columbia to the property. I think this is properly allowable. The objection taken is that the plaintiff availed himself of the opportunity to go to Scotland and that he would have gone to Scotland at any rate. Notwithstanding this, I think the amount is properly allowable.