

the subsequent acts taken with those condoned justified the wife in a reasonable apprehension of bodily harm had the effect of displacing the condonation. In delivering the judgment of the Court of Appeal, Phillimore, L.J., discusses the difference between condonation of adultery and like offences which entitle a party to a divorce, and the condonation of offences which only entitle the injured party to a separation.

VENDOR AND PURCHASER—OBJECTION TO TITLE—NOTICE OF TRUST—RECITAL OF TRUST—PRACTICE OF CONVEYANCERS.

*In re Chafer & Randall* (1916) 2 Ch. 8. This was an application under the Vendors and Purchasers Act. By the deed under which the vendor acquired the property in question it was recited that Forbes, the grantor, held the property in question as trustee partly for himself and partly for the grantee and that they had agreed to a partition of the lands whereby the lands in question were to be conveyed to the grantee. The purchaser delivered a requisition asking how Forbes became trustee and if by deed calling for an abstract and production thereof. The vendor refused to comply with the requisition, relying on the practice of conveyancers. Younger, J., upheld the vendor's contention and the Court of Appeal (Lord Cozens-Hardy, M.R., and Phillimore, L.J., and Sargant, J.) affirmed his decision, being of the opinion that as the recital as to the nature of the trust was clear and unambiguous the purchaser was not entitled to call for any further information about it.

WILL—BEQUEST TO CHILDREN WHEN THE YOUNGEST ATTAINS THIRTY—CHILDREN DYING UNDER THIRTY NOT EXCLUDED—CONTINGENCY NOT IMPLIED—REMOTENESS.

*In re Ludwig, Ludwig v. Evans* (1916) 2 Ch. 26. The question in this case related to a will whereby the testator gave his residuary estate to trustees upon trust to sell and convert and out of the proceeds pay a weekly sum to her daughter-in-law Katie until her youngest child attained the age of thirty years, and then to divide the trust funds between Katie and her children in equal shares, and in the event of any grandchildren dying leaving lawful issue surviving, the share of the parent so dying was to be divided between his or her children. The heir and sole next of kin of the testator claimed that the trusts of the residue except as regards the payment of the weekly