

tion. It should have been, "Did the defendant take reasonable care to see that the place which was provided for the plaintiff to work in was a safe place in which to work?" And to that question the evidence warrants no answer but one in the affirmative.

Upon the whole case, and drawing the proper inferences from the evidence, I am of opinion that the case of the respondent failed, and that her action should have been dismissed; and I would, therefore, allow the appeal with costs, and substitute for the judgment which has been entered a judgment dismissing the action with costs.

*Appeal allowed.*

DECEMBER 10TH, 1914.

RE NELSON.

*Will—Construction—Devise and Bequest to Widow—Limitation to "Natural Life"—Application of, to Devise—Life Estate in Land Devised.*

Appeal by the executors of the widow of William Nelson, deceased, from the judgment of LATCHFORD, J., ante 250.

The appeal was heard by MEREDITH, C.J.O., GARROW, MACLAREN, MAGEE, and HODGINS, JJ.A.

G. H. Kilmer, K.C., for the appellants.

P. A. Malcolmson, for the executors of William Nelson, respondents.

THE COURT dismissed the appeal with costs.