The Legal News.

Vol. XII. DECEMBER 14, 1889. No. 50.

The manufacturers of patent medicines seem to have been extremely lucky in escaping actions for the deleterious effects of their compounds, for in a recent case, *Blood Balm Co.* v. *Cooper*, Supreme Court of Georgia, Oct. 14, 1889, the Court said it had searched carefully without finding any case in which the question had been decided. Perhaps much research was needless when the principle which must govern the case was clear. The decision was to the effect that where the proprietor of a patent medicine places on the bottle containing it a label recommending it for certain diseases, and directing the size of the dose to be taken, and it is shown that the dose contained such a quantity of a certain poison as to injure plaintiff when he took it, the proprietor is liable for the damage, whether he sold the medicine to plaintiff directly or to a druggist to be resold, from whom plaintiff purchased it. The Court said: "In the case of *Thomas* v. *Winchester*, 6 N. Y. 397; 57 Am. Dec. 455; 1 Thomp. Neg. 224, referred to by counsel in this case, the question decided was that a dealer in drugs and medicines, who carelessly labels a deadly poison as a harmless medicine, and sends it so labelled into market, is liable to all persons who, without fault on their part, are injured by using it as such medicine in consequence of the false label. It is not denied by counsel in this case that the doctrine cited is sound and correct law, but the present case differs from that case, and mainly in this: There the drug sold was a deadly poison, and the wrong consisted in putting a label upon the same which indicated that it was a harmless medicine; whereas in this case the medicine sold was not a deadly poison, and no label was put upon it which was calculated to deceive any one in this respect. But accompanying the medicine was a prescription of the proprietor, stating the quantity to be taken; and the evidence tended to show that the quantity thus prescribed contained iodide of potash to such an extent as, when taken by the plaintiff, produced the injury and damage complained of. The liability of the plaintiff in error to the person injured arises, not by contract, but for a wrong committed by the proprietor in the prescription and direction as to the dose that should be taken. We can see no difference whether the medicine was directly sold to the defendant in error by the proprietor or by an intermediate party to whom the proprietor had sold it in the first instance for the purpose of being sold again. It was put upon the market by the proprietor, not alone for the use of druggists to whom they might sell it, but to be used by the public in general, who might need the same for the cure of certain diseases, for which the proprietor set forth in his label the same was adapted. This was the same thing as if the proprietor himself had sold this medicine to the defendant in error, with his instructions and directions as to how the same should be taken."

ESTATES OF COLONIAL SHAREHOLDERS.

The following despatch is published in the *Canada Gazette*:—

Downing Street,
13th September, 1889.

My Lord,—I have the honor to transmit to you a copy of the Imperial Revenue Act of 1889, and to request that you will cause Sections 18 and 19 to be published for information in the Colony under your Government.

During the sittings of the Colonial Conference in 1887, the attention of Her Majesty's Government was called to the Companies (Colonial Registers) Act, 1883, which had the effect of requiring probate or letters of administration to be taken out both in the Colony and in this country in respect of the wills or estates of Colonial Shareholders holding shares on the Colonial Registers of Banks and other Companies. The proceedings on the subject at pages 76 and 107 of Parliamentary Paper C. 5091, Volume I, and the papers then laid before the Conference, are printed at pages 47, 48, 49 of the Parliamentary Paper C. 5091, Volume II. The promise given in the