

his part. The husband having become bankrupt, his trustees in bankruptcy brought the present action to set aside the settlement. Stirling, J., held that to the extent of the wife's property received by the husband the settlement was valid, and that the Married Woman's Property Act, 1882 (45 & 46 Vict., c. 75), s. 3, which makes property received by the husband from his wife for the purpose of his trade or business assets of the husband's estate in favour of his creditors in bankruptcy did not apply to the moneys in question.

WILL—LEGACY IN SATISFACTION OF DEBT—DEBT DUE BY TESTATOR TO LEGATEE.

*In re Horlock, Calham v. Smith*, (1895) 1 Ch. 516; 13 R. Apl. 227, a testator who was indebted to the plaintiff in £300, payable within three months next after his death, by his will bequeathed a legacy to the plaintiff of £400, as to which no time of payment was fixed. The question was whether the legacy was a satisfaction of the debt. Following *Re Dowse*, 50 L.J.Ch. 585, Stirling, J., was of opinion that the legacy was not a satisfaction, because, while the debt was payable in three months from the death of the testator, no time was fixed for payment of the legacy. He, however, expressed disapproval of the rule laid down, though holding himself bound by it.

RAILWAY—TUNNEL—EXPROPRIATION—COMPENSATION.

*In Farmer v. Waterloo & C. Ry Co.*, (1895) 1 Ch. 527; 13 R. April 177, a railway empowered by charter to construct an underground railway, and for that purpose to appropriate "the subsoil and under-surface," subject, however, to the liability to make compensation, proceeded to bore through the subsoil of the plaintiff's land without giving him any notice to treat under the compensation clauses. This action was accordingly brought to restrain the company from proceeding with the work, and Kekewich, J., granted an injunction, holding that the company were taking not merely an easement, but land, and that they could not appropriate it except by way of purchase.

TRUSTEE AND CESTUI QUE TRUST—BREACH OF TRUST—EQUITY OF TRUSTEE TO HAVE BENEFICIARY'S INTEREST IMPOUNDED—MARRIED WOMAN—RESTRAINT ON ANTICIPATION—TRUSTEE ACT, 1893 (56 & 57 VICT., c. 53), s. 45—(54 VICT., c. 19, s. 11 (O.)).

*Bolton v. Curre*, (1895) 1 Ch. 544; 13 R. Feb. 186, was an action to compel the replacement of a certain trust fund, which