But the goods were supplied ; and a suit next we see,
Testing rights of a wife in such cases.
Per Cur : "The defendant is surely Scot't)-free,
"For where is the agency basis ?
"The wife can't have credit
"Where husband says not—
"And he's said it !
"So Scott,
"Bid ye wot,
"Takes no scath from this plot."

—CHARLES MORSE.

ENGLISH CASES.

EDITORIAL REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

PRACTICE—NEW TRIAL—VERDICT.

Kerry v. *England* (1898) A.C. 742, was an appeal from the order of the Queen's Bench for Quebec, or Lower Canada, as it is still styled, granting a new trial. The action was brought by the plaintiff personally, and also as tutor for his minor son, to recover damages for the defendant having negligently caused or accelerated the death of the plaintiff's wife. The jury found that the death of the wife had been accelerated, but not to any appreciable extent, by her taking a dose of tartar emetic negligently supplied by the defendant, and also that the plaintiff had incurred no damage thereby, but that his minor child had incurred damage to the extent of $1,000. The Court below granted a new trial on the assumption that the findings were illogical and contradictory ; but the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Herschell, Watson, Hobhouse, Davey and Sir H. Strong) held that this order was erroneous, and that on the findings the action must be dismissed, on the ground that the damages attributable to the defendants were on these findings inappreciable and irrecoverable. Their Lordships disagreed with the Court below as to the finding in favour of the son. They were of opinion that it merely amounted to a finding that he had sustained damage to the extent of $1,000 by the death of his mother, but not that the