

VETERINARY SURGEON—QUALIFIED PERSON—USE OF DESCRIPTION BY UNQUALIFIED PERSON—"CANINE SPECIALIST"—VETERINARY SURGEONS' ACT (44-45 VICT. C. 62) S. 17(1)—(R.S.O. C. 184, s. 3).

In *Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons v. Collinson* (1908) 2 K.B. 248 it is held by a Divisional Court (Lord Alverstone, C.J. and Ridley and Darling, JJ.) that for a person who is not a registered veterinary surgeon to exhibit a notice board on his residence with the words "Canine Specialist—dogs and cats treated for all diseases," is an offence against the Veterinary Surgeons' Act (44-45 Vict. c. 62) s. 17; (see R.S.O. c. 184, s. 3).

NEGLIGENCE—DANGEROUS PREMISES—BUILDING LET OUT IN FLATS—STAIRCASE IN POSSESSION OF LANDLORD—STAIRCASE NOT LIGHTED—LIABILITY OF LANDLORD TO PERSONS OTHER THAN TENANTS.

*Huggett v. Miers* (1908) 2 K.B. 278. This was an action to recover damages for injury sustained by the plaintiff by reason of the alleged negligence of the defendant in omitting to light a staircase in his building. The building in question was owned by the defendant and let out in flats. The agreements for letting contained no provision for keeping the staircase, which led to the flats, lighted. The tenants had gas lights on the landings outside their respective offices which were supplied with gas from their own meters, and their practice was to turn them off at night. The plaintiff while in the employ of one of the tenants, on coming down the staircase from his employer's offices, in the evening at 8.15, when all the lights had been put out, failed to find his way out to the street and on going down to the basement fell through a door opening into a flagged courtyard some distance below, and suffered injury for which the action was brought. Channell, J., who tried the action was of the opinion that there was no duty on the defendant to keep the staircase lighted, but left the case to the jury to avoid the necessity for a new trial, and the jury found a verdict for the defendant. The Court of Appeal (Barnes, P.P.D. and Moulton, and Farwell, L.JJ.) agreed with Channell, J., that the defendant was not liable, and dismissed the action.