

merchant in this sense may be identified with the manufacturer. As to the manufacturer, however, in their recent judgment¹ the Privy Council expresses the opinion (for they carefully state that answering as they are questions "in their nature academic rather than judicial," their answers are "not meant to have and cannot have the weight of a judicial determination") that power to control his business is not exclusively in the Dominion Parliament or in the Provincial Legislature, that what they state as to the two aspects in which the regulation of the retail trade may be treated by legislation, applies also to wholesale manufacturers, for in answer to the question submitted: "Has a Provincial Legislature jurisdiction to prohibit the manufacture of such liquors within the province?" they reply: "In the absence of conflicting legislation by the Parliament of Canada, their lordships are of opinion that the Provincial Legislatures would have jurisdiction to that effect, if it were shown that the manufacture was carried on under such circumstances and conditions as to make its prohibition a merely local matter in the province."

A. H. F. LEFROY.

ENGLISH CASES.

EDITORIAL REVIEW OF CURRENT ENGLISH DECISIONS.

(Registered in accordance with the Copyright Act.)

The Law Reports for May comprise, (1896) 1 Q.B., pp. 461-567; (1896) P. pp. 129-148; and (1896) 1 Ch. pp. 573-684.

RESTRAINT OF TRADE, VALIDITY OF—REASONABLENESS.

Dubowski v. Goldstein, (1896) 1 Q.B. 478, was an action to recover damages for, and also to restrain the breach of, an agreement in restraint of trade. The defendant had been an employee of the plaintiffs in their business as dairymen, and had agreed as a condition of employment that he would not,

¹ 11 T.L.R. at p. 393.