

in the Manchester Canal Co's. warehouse, the shipowners notified the Canal Company of their claim for freight, and the Canal Company delivered the cargo to the owners against a deposit of £1,680 to meet the claim for freight. The shipowners then commenced an action claiming to be entitled to be paid freight, but this action was dismissed on the ground that, as the voyage had been abandoned, no freight was payable. The shipowners then applied to the Prize Court for a declaration that they were entitled to some remuneration in lieu of freight for carriage of the goods and Evans, P.P.D., referred it to the registrar and merchants to determine what remuneration the shipowners were entitled to in the circumstances, and it was from this order that the owners of the cargo appealed, claiming that the Prize Court had no jurisdiction to make any such order, and even if he had, it ought not to have been made. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lords Parker, Sumner, Parmoor, and Wrenbury) were of the opinion that the Prize Court had jurisdiction to determine all incidental matters arising in regard to property seized as Prize, even though it may be released, but on the merits of the case they reversed the order of Evans, P.P.D., on the ground that, the voyage having been abandoned, the shipowners could have no right to freight, or any compensation in lieu of freight, in respect of cargo seized in an English port subsequent to the abandonment of the voyage.

ALBERTA—HUSBAND AND WIFE—MARRIED WOMEN'S RELIEF
ACT (ALBERTA 1910 c. 18) s.s. 2, 8, 10.

Dreury v. Dreury (1916) A.C. 631. By a statute of the Province of Alberta 1910, c. 18, it is provided that the widow of a testator whose will gives to his widow, in the opinion of the Court, less than she would get if he had died intestate, may apply to the Supreme Court for relief, and on any such application the Court is empowered to make such allowance to the applicant out of her deceased husband's estate disposed of by his will as may seem just and equitable; but it is also provided that any answer or defence that would have been available to the husband in any suit for alimony shall be equally open to his executors or administrators, in any application under the Act. The widow of the deceased testator in this case, had twenty-four years prior to his death, without any legal justification, separated from him, and lived apart from him during the remainder of his life. Notwithstanding this fact, the Courts of Alberta granted the widow relief. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (Lord Buckmaster, L.C., and Lords Haldane, Atkinson, Shaw and Parmoor) reversed the decision, holding that in such circumstances the wife could have had no claim to alimony.