

to sell. *Hudson v. Hudson*, 110 Mass. 181, 182.

Richard and His Wife—Plaintiff—*Richard v. Richard*.
 Action for alimony, tried at Brockville. The learned Judge said
 that there was no reason to suppose that the plaintiff was in any
 way to blame for the difficulties that had arisen, and she was
 entitled to alimony. The conduct of the defendant had been
 such as to indicate that it would not be altogether safe for the
 plaintiff to continue to reside with him at present. Alimony
 £125 per year on the understanding that the plaintiff has the
 youngest child to maintain. Judgment accordingly, with costs
 to be paid by the defendant. H. A. Stewart, K.C., for the plain-
 tiff. J. A. Hutchinson, K.C., and J. A. Jackson, for the defend-
 ant.

H. A. Stewart, K.C., for the plaintiff. J. A. Hutchinson, K.C., for the defendant.

WILLIAM W. WALKER, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, 110 Queen's Street, West, Toronto.

Major and Mrs. Richard—*Richard v. Richard*.
 Action for alimony. The learned Judge said that there was no reason to suppose that the plaintiff was in any way to blame for the difficulties that had arisen, and she was entitled to alimony. The conduct of the defendant had been such as to indicate that it would not be altogether safe for the plaintiff to continue to reside with him at present. Alimony £125 per year on the understanding that the plaintiff has the youngest child to maintain. Judgment accordingly, with costs to be paid by the defendant. H. A. Stewart, K.C., for the plaintiff. J. A. Hutchinson, K.C., and J. A. Jackson, for the defendant.