

enjoyed by a lunatic of having his property applied to his own maintenance in preference to the claims of his creditors is not, it appears, to be extended to the maintenance of his wife (*In re Winkle*). The Court of Appeal has decided that, in an action for interference with light, injunction is the proper remedy if a substantial interference is established, although it is of small pecuniary consequence. The Court expressed a doubt whether damages could be given at all in respect of damage which was only threatened. The case (*Martin v. Price*) is understood to be now before the House of Lords.

There have been several important trade-mark and trade-name cases. "Somatose" and "Eboline" have been refused registration as trade-marks (*Farbenfabriken* and *Salt's Trade-marks*); and the widest possible construction has been put upon the phrase "person aggrieved" in the section dealing with applications to remove marks from the register (*Powell v. The Birmingham Vinegar Company*). In another incident of the contest between the parties to the last-named case, the defendants were restrained till trial from using the name "Yorkshire Relish", for a sauce different in composition from the plaintiff's without sufficiently distinguishing their own goods, although the name had been treated by the House of Lords as mere descriptive words. The unexpected decision of the Court of Appeal in 1892 in the *Camel-hair Belting Case* has been substantially qualified by a recent determination of the other branch of the same Court that, as the words in question are descriptive of the article referred to, they cannot form an appropriated trade-name.

Among the common law cases, that which has caused most discussion is probably *Monson v. Tussaud*, in which Lord Halsbury and, to some extent, Lords Justices Lopes and Davey, seem to have been inclined to grant an interlocutory injunction to restrain a libel under conditions far less stringent than it was imagined the famous *Perryman Case* imposed. It was decided that the jurisdiction to grant such injunctions is not restricted to cases of trade libels. In *The South Hetton Coal Company v. The North-Eastern News Association*, a joint-stock company succeeded in maintaining an action for a libel injurious to its business without alleging special damage. In two actions against the London & North-Western Railway Company the validity of an infant's contract came into question. In one (*Clement's Case*) a contract barring the infant's remedy under the Employers' Liability Act