the law relating to the Statute of Limitations) in such case, to hold the greater part of a township to be irretrievably lost to the proprietor, by reason of adverse possession, when in law he is not barred at all, and in consequence award him only $5,000 compensation, when but for this mistake in law they would have given him $20,000. Surely it would be very important in such a case that the proprietor should be at once informed of this, so that he might come to this Court and ask to have it remitted for re-construction and correction, before the thirty days expire. The Plaintiff's Counsel, in showing cause, offered an affidavit with the short-hand writer's notes of the trial before the Commissioners attached; it was objected to, but we admitted it; I am not quite sure we were correct in doing so. But there is a part of Mr. Davies' speech which shows so clearly what the contention about squatters was, and how materially it must, if sustained, have affected the amount of compensation, that I extract it. He says, page 185, that the question about conditions will be spoken to in closing, and that Stewart has no title to Lot 47. "We will show that the Lot is held adversely, and that his Schedule of tenants and "arrears is merely fictitious. We will show that the persons against whom he claims "these large arrears he has never been able to put in possession of the farms. They "are not legally bound to pay, and Mr. Stewart has added these fictitious sums to "increase his claims. We will submit that these farms were, at the time he leased "them, held adversely by other parties. We contend, therefore, that the Court cannot "allow him for these arrears, and we contend also that if he is allowed anything for that "part of the Lot upon which he has obtained a foothold, the allowance should be but a "very small sum indeed, as against the Crown he has no title, and he has already drawn "from the Township much more than the value of any precarious possessory interest of which he may be supposed to be the owner. On Lot 30 we will show that a large "quantity of land has been held adversely for many years by those who came there "before Mr. Stewart himself got possession of the Lot. We will show that, with one "or two exceptions, they have remained in possession, that in some instances he has "brought actions against them, but has not succeeded in ousting them. The contention that their possession is to be confined to land which they have had actually under "cultivation for twenty years has never been sustained in any Court of Law in which "the whole question has been brought up. We will show that those persons have held "the rear of their farms by open notorious possession, that their lines have been run "out, and that they have openly exercised over the land the rights of ownership, and in "every way have treated it as their own. It is not necessary that people should have "land under crop for twenty years to acquire possession of it. That is not the law. "It is quite sufficient if the possession is open, and marked by clear boundaries, that "give notice to the world. On Lot 40 we can show that the holders had a possession "of that kind. Mr. Stewart might as well claim the land at the bottom of the sea, as "the land which has been thus held for twenty years." And the Attorney-General, in his closing speech, insists on the breach of conditions in the original grants, quit rents, as matters which should diminish the compensation. At page 186 the Court says, "We "do not wish you to argue the question of forfeiture now, if you will do so at the close, "but we will be glad to know from you then what you consider to be the distinct effect "of your argument; we would like to know whether, if we think your argument sound, "you consider that we should give Mr. Stewart nothing for his land, or should make a "deduction, and if so, what deduction." Mr. Brecken, in his reply to this question, page 233, says Mr. Stewart is not in a position to take advantage of any concessions. Your Honours are sitting here under a special Act of the Legislature, and *part of your instructions is that you shall consider the performance or non-performance of the original grants.* A great many squatters appear to have been examined. Some say they hold 100, some 50 acres; one says he had 12 acres cleared or fenced 20 years ago; some, they cannot say how much, perhaps 15 or 20. This seems to have been the contention and the nature of the inquiry. Now, what is the law as to acquiring title by adverse possession? Briefly this, that a squatter is not considered in possession of anything, except what he has fenced, cleared, or cultivated, or appears to occupy in some way as open and notorious as if he had fenced, cleared, or cultivated it; he is said to acquire title inch by inch, *i.e.*, it must appear that each acre claimed has been so held for 20 years, and if it appears that he held 5 acres in that way for 20 years, and the next 5 only for 18 or 19 years, he can only hold the first, and the proprietor (if he make out a *primâ facie* title) will recover the other. How did the Commissioners decide this contention? Who can answer the question? The reference made by section 28, subsection (e), obviously might bring two classes of squatters' claims before the Commissioners; one where the occupants had not held for 20 years, another where they had, and thus raise two distinct questions; admitting that as regards the first, they had a