

the right of supplying water. The question involved in this case seems to have some resemblance to that in *Toronto Street Railway v. Toronto, infra*.

AGREEMENT TO LET LAND FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE—APPLICATION OF PREMISES TO ANOTHER PURPOSE—INJUNCTION.

*Kehoe v. Lansdowne*, (1893) A.C. 451, a decision of the House of Lords affirming a judgment of the Court of Appeal of Ireland, shows that where a person makes an agreement to allow another to use a parcel of land for a particular purpose the diversion of the land by the licensee to any other purpose may be restrained by injunction. In this case the respondent had agreed to permit the use of a parcel of land for a priest's residence, and the priest had erected on the property a number of huts to shelter evicted tenants; and it was held that such a use of the premises was unauthorized, and could properly be prevented by injunction.

SHARES HELD "IN TRUST"—TRANSFER OF SHARES—CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE—SIGNATURE OF BANK MANAGER AS "MANAGER IN TRUST."

*The London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company v. Duggan*, (1893) A.C. 506, which in the previous stages of its career was known as *Duggan v. London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company*, is a case to which we have already referred, *ante* vol. 27, p. 289. It is one of those cases which are calculated to induce a sense of thankfulness that there is a Privy Council; for though it is true that the inconvenient decisions of our Supreme Court may be corrected by legislation, yet it is always a difficult matter to get the legislation, and where it is got it is liable to be emasculated of its meaning in the process of judicial construction. It is, therefore, on the whole, a great deal more satisfactory when such decisions are reversed by a superior tribunal. The public dealing with a bank manager holding shares "in trust" may hereafter do so with the assurance that the words import no more than that the manager is trustee of the shares for his bank, for so the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has decided.

AGREEMENT—CONSTRUCTION—RIGHT OF PURCHASE OF STREET RAILWAY.

*The Toronto Street Railway v. Toronto*, (1893) A.C. 511, is another decision of the Privy Council upon an appeal from the Court of Appeal in which their lordships have affirmed the judgment of the court below. By an agreement entered into between