after his death, and not as a present deed of gift.—*Cock* v. *Cooke*, Law Rep. 1 P. & D. 241.

6. Bequest of "my personal estate to my grandson, subject to the payment of debts, legacies, and to the trusts hereinafter contained, on trust to convert and to stand possessed of the said trust moneys," on trusts which did not exhaust the funds. The testator then appointed the grandson, with three other persons, executors. *Held*, that the grandson took the residue beneficially. — *Clarke* v. *Hilton*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 810.

7. Gift by will to all the testator's nephews and nieces, the sons and daughters of his sister R., including who the illegitimate of the said R., equally. *Held*, a valid gift to the legitimate sons and daughters of R., exclusive of R.'s illegitimate children.—*Gill* v. *Bagshaw*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 746.

8. Gift by will of real and personal estate to A., but if A. should die in B.'s lifetime, without leaving issue, then over. A. died in B.'s lifetime, leaving issue, who all died in B.'s lifetime. *Held*, that the gift over took effect.—*Jarman* v. *Vye*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 784.

9. A. gave his estate to trustees in trust for his wife for life, and, "after her decease, to distribute and divide the whole amongst such of my four nephews and two nieces (naming them) as shall be living at the time of her decease; but if any or either of them should then be dead, leaving issue, such issue shall be entitled to their father's or mother's share." A nephew died in the lifetime of A.'s widow, leaving a daughter, who also died before the widow. *Held*, that this daughter, on her father's death, took a vested interest in the share which, if he had survived, he would have taken, and that her representative was entitled.—*Martin* v. *Holgate*, Law Rep. 1 H. L. 175.

10. Testator declared that his property should be inherited by his nephews A. and B. during their lives, and, after their death, that their eldest sons should inherit the same during their lives, and so on; the eldest son of each of the two families to inherit the same for ever. *Held*, that A. and B. took estates for life, remainder to their eldest son in tail.—*Forsbrook* v. *Forsbrook*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 799.

11. A gift of the income of a fund during the life of A. to B., for his maintenance, is an absolute gift to B., his executors and administrators, during the life of A.—*Attwood* v. *Alford*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 479.

12. A gift to the testator's sisters living at a particular time, or the issue of any or either then dead, is not a substitutionary but a substantive gift to the issue.—*Attwood* v. *Alford*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 479.

13. A testator directed his personal estate to be invested, "and the interest divided half yearly between his four sons, and, at the decease of either without issue, such share to revert to the remainder then living, or their child or children." *Held*, that each son took an absolute interest in his share, subject to be divested if he died without leaving issue.—*Dowling* v. *Dowling*, Law Rep. 1 Ch. 612.

14. Devise of freehold estate to A., B., and C., in equal shares, during only their natural lives, "and, after their decease, I give the said freehold estate to the next lawful heir of A., all the said freehold estate for ever." *Held*, that the rule in Shelley's case applied, and that A. took a fee.—*Fuller* v. *Chamier*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 682.

15. Testator purchased an estate called A. farm, in the parish of R., in the county of H. Afterwards, he acquired adjoining land in the parishes of S. and B., in the same county, which was thrown into and occupied with A. farm, and the whole thenceforth called A. farm. Later, by will, he devised his estate, consisting of A. farm, in the parish of R., in the county of H. *Held*, that the land in the parishes of S. & B. did not pass by the devise.—*Pedley* v. *Dodds*, Law Rep. 2 Eq. 819.

16. A testator made a will in 1864, revoking all former wills. This, in 1865, he destroyed, expressing at the time an intention to substitute for it an earlier will, which he held in his hand. The 1 Vic. c. 26, sec. 22, provides that a will once revoked shall not be republished by parol acts or declarations. *Held*, that the act of destruction was referable solely to the testator's intention to validate the earlier will; and that, the act being conditional and the condition unfulfilled, the destroyed will was not revoked. — *Powell* v. *Powell*, Law Rep. 1 P. & D. 209.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE LAW JOURNAL.

Sale of interest in Crown Lands under fi. fa. —Tariff for guardians under Insolvent Act.

GENTLEMEN,—In your number of July, a barrister—Prescott," asks whether "the interest of a person in Crown Lands before patent issues, is saleable under *fi. fa.*? By reference to Chancery Reports, vol. xiii. page 802—1867—"*Yale* v. *Tollerton*," he will see that the Chancellor has decided that it is.