

dor's, and no one else's; that the company was the vendor's agent, and that the vendor was bound to indemnify that agent (the company) in respect of claims made upon it.

*

Is malicious interference resulting in the dismissal of workmen actionable?

Flood and others *vs.* Jackson and others (Times L.R. 276). Mr. Justice Kennedy, H.C.J., held that any malicious disturbance of another in his calling or business causing him damage is actionable, whether it induces a breach of contract or whether, without inducing a breach of contract, it tends to deprive the other of employment, present or future.

*

If property is given trustees to pay the income to A. for life for her separate use, and the property is to be handed over to A.'s appointees by will, and in default of appointment the property is given to A.'s executors, administrators and assigns, is A. absolutely entitled to the property?

Re Turner v. King. Yes, said Kekewich, H.C.J., and on releasing the power A. is entitled to have the property handed over to her, since in such a case, owing to the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, the life interest coalesces with the reversionary interest directly the power is released. (64 L.J. Chy. 252.)

*

If A. has the sole right of performing a drama in the United Kingdom and all other countries, will the court, by injunction, restrain B. from performing the drama in public in Germany?

"Morocco Bound" Syndicate *v.* Harris and Chamberlain (Times L.R. 254). No, said Kekewich, J.; the injunction must be obtained in Germany. He had no jurisdiction to enforce German law.

*

LIBEL. — Corporation — Privileged occasion—Statement exceeding privilege. *Nevill v. The Fine Arts Insurance Company (Lim.)*.

The defendants (a corporation), for their own benefit, published in a circular letter a statement which was false and calculated to injure the plaintiff, upon an occasion which was privileged for the making of a necessary and proper statement; but the occasion did not justify the corporation in making a portion of the statement.

Pollock, B., Q.B.D., March 4th, held that the libel was, apart from any question of malice, a wrongful act in furtherance of the defendants' interest, for which, as for other wrongful acts, the defendants were liable, although a corporate body.

INSURANCE NOTES.

THE bill respecting the Insurance Law introduced into the Legislature at the session just brought to a close, is now to be known as 58 V., c. 34.

*

The first feature worthy of notice is the further authority claimed by the province over Insurance contracts. Heretofore it was a matter of course to let loose any concern to do business in Ontario, upon proof that the Dominion Insurance department had authorized it under the Insurance Act of Canada. Now, however, the On-