

fatal result at a trespassing aviator, without warning and without taking precaution, would be manslaughter (assuming always that 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, does not apply), because owner intended to commit and did in fact commit an act which was wrong. Neither would the taking of precautions, as suggested above, absolve the owner from liability since every sane adult is presumed to intend the natural consequences of his conduct, and is assumed by law to have the power of foreseeing these consequences. From whatever point the question is approached; it seems clear that the owner would not be able to enforce his right of ejectment, but would be obliged to rest content with his right of action for damages or for a declaration, or for an injunction to restrain further acts of trespass.

In view of the present stage of development arrived at by the science of aviation, the writer ventures to suggest that the landowner has at his command all the remedies he requires, and to express the hope that no landlord will be tempted, should he read this article, to institute proceedings for trespass against an aviator merely for flying over the owner's land.—*Law Magazine*.

---

VERBUM SAP.—On the door of the old Court-room of the Court of Appeal at Osgoode Hall is affixed the notice: "Dangerous, keep out."

---

NE SUTOR ULTRA CREPIDAM :—Motion before Court of Appeal for stated case by way of appeal from the conviction of a cobbler, aged 73, for non-support of his second wife aged 63. Mr. Justice Magee: "She was probably his last, and he did not stick to her."