

all his interest in a sum of \$10,000. The executors asked the opinion of the Court as to whether they were justified in paying over now to the widow three-quarters of this \$10,000, or whether they must wait until her death before making a distribution of it. The revenue derived from this \$10,000 was to be paid to the widow from the date when his son W. H. Earl Hunter should attain the age of 18 until her death; and, subject to this provision in her favour, the corpus was to vest equally in the testator's children by his said wife; the receipt and enjoyment of their shares thereof being merely postponed to permit of her receiving the income for the time specified. The case came within *Re Douglas* (1892), 22 O.R. 553. Assuming that the three adult children had assigned their shares to their mother, there was no reason why those shares should not now be paid over to her. Order declaring accordingly; costs out of this fund—those of the executors as between solicitor and client. C. R. McKeown, K.C., for the executors. F. W. Harcourt, K.C., Official Guardian, for the infant.

CORRECTION.

IN *BEST v. BEATTY*, *CALVERT v. BEATTY*, ante 327, at p. 328, insert after the word "assignment," in line 7 from the top, the words "in a case of this kind."