

from Matthew, J. The defendant had employed a broker to purchase shares for him on the stock exchange; the broker bought the shares from the plaintiffs in his own name; they were not paid for, and the defendant directed his broker to carry them over to the next account, which he did. The defendant's name was not disclosed. Before the next settling day the defendant's broker was declared a defaulter, and in accordance with the rules of the stock exchange, his contract with the plaintiffs was closed at a fixed price by the official assignee of the stock exchange. The plaintiffs, having discovered that the broker was acting for the defendant, called upon him to take up the shares, which he refused to do, disclaiming all responsibility for them, and the plaintiffs, on the settling day, tendered the shares to the defendant, and on his refusing to accept them then, sold them for the best price then obtainable, and now sued the defendant for the difference between the price at which they had been carried over and the amount realized therefor. The Court of Appeal affirmed Matthew, J., in holding that the defendant was liable.

Becklison v. Hamblet (1901) 2 K.B. 73, is another case on a similar point, but in this case the broker had lumped together several orders in one contract, and in that case Kennedy, J., held that one of the principals could not be sued by the person with whom the broker had made the contract (1900) 2 Q.B. 18, (noted ante vol. 36, p. 441) and this judgment the Court of Appeal (Smith, M.R., and Collins and Romer, L.JJ.) have affirmed.

EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS—COMPENSATION—INTEREST IN LAND EXPROPRIATED—RIGHT TO SINK SHAFT.

In re Masters & Great Western Ry. Co. (1901) 2 K.B. 84, the Court of Appeal (Smith, M.R., and Collins and Romer, L.JJ.) have affirmed the judgment of Darling and Bucknill, JJ. (1900) 2 Q.B. 677, (noted ante p. 94).

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS—REAL PROPERTY—MORTGAGE—REAL PROPERTY LIMITATION ACT 1837 (7 WM. 4 & 1 VICT. C. 28)—(R.S.O. C. 133, s. 22).

Ludbrook v. Ludbrook (1901) 2 Q.B. 96, is an important decision under the Real Property Limitation Act, 1837, (see R.S.O. c. 133, s. 22). The reporter notes that the case is only reported for the purpose of shewing that the case of *Doe v. Eyre* (1851) 17 Q.B. 366 is now settled law. The result of the decision of the Court of