

arranged with Lloyds to print it, they undertaking also to procure certain information for the purpose of the publication. Owing to pressure of time Gavin procured part of the book to be printed by another printer, but the whole work when published appeared on title page to have been printed by Lloyds. The part printed by the other printer turned out to be an infringement of the plaintiff's copyright and the question was whether Lloyds had printed it or caused it to be printed within the meaning of the Act. Byrne, J., held that they had not, that there was no partnership between Gavin and Lloyds and therefore the latter were not responsible for the alleged infringement; as, however, they had permitted their name to appear as the printers, he refused them costs.

WILL—GIFT TO ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN—PRESUMPTION—EVIDENCE OF INTENTION.

In re Mayo, Chester v. Keirl (1901) 1 Ch. 404, a testator by his will gave a part of his estate to "the *three* children of one, Caroline Lewis, born prior to her marriage." The evidence shewed that Caroline Lewis had actually had four children prior to her marriage, but that the testator only knew of three, of whom he had acknowledged being the father. The fourth child claimed to be entitled to share in the bequest, but Farwell, J., held that she was not so entitled.

WILL—ANNUITY TO WIFE "SO LONG AS SHE REMAINS UNMARRIED."

In re Howard, Taylor v. Howard (1901) 1 Ch. 412, Farwell, J., held that where a testator by his will bequeathed a sum of £200 to be set apart and thereout £3 per month paid to his widow so long as she remained unmarried, that on the death of the widow unmarried, before the fund was exhausted, her personal representative was entitled to the balance of the fund.

PATENT—INFRINGEMENT—MANUFACTURED ARTICLE IMPORTED FROM ABROAD, IN WHICH PATENTED PROCESS USED.

In Saccharin Co. v. Anglo Continental Chemical Works (1901) 1 Ch. 414, the defendants had imported from abroad a manufactured article in which a material made by a process similar to that protected by the plaintiff's patent was used. The nature of this material was, however, chemically changed in the course of the manufacture, but notwithstanding that, Buckley, J., held that the