

Geo. V. c. 46). The plaintiff was a permanent employee of a newspaper called the "Financial Times" and was specially employed by the paper to translate and summarize a speech reported in a foreign language, but this work was done in his own time and independently of his ordinary duties. The speech so translated and summarized was published as an advertisement in the "Financial Times," with the words added, "Translated from the Portuguese language by F. D. Byrne." The defendants, who were publishers of another paper called the "Statist," applied to the authority on whose behalf the advertisement had been published in the "Financial News" for authority to publish it also in the "Statist," which was granted, and a copy of the advertisement was accordingly published in the "Statist" as an advertisement. The plaintiff claimed as the translator of the speech in question that he was entitled to copyright in his translation which had been infringed by the defendant's publication. Bailhache, J., who tried the action came to the conclusion that the plaintiff's claim was well founded and he gave judgment for the plaintiff for £150 and costs.

SAVAGE DOG—PARENT AND CHILD—DOG KEPT BY DAUGHTER OF SEVENTEEN IN HER FATHER'S HOUSE—LIABILITY OF FATHER FOR INJURY CAUSED BY DAUGHTER'S DOG.

*North v. Wood* (1914) 1 K.B. 629. This was an action brought for the loss of a dog in the following circumstances. The plaintiff owned a Pomeranian puppy and the defendant's daughter, a girl of seventeen, kept at her father's premises a bull terrier which was known to be savage and to have a particular aversion to dogs of the Pomeranian breed. The plaintiff was leading her puppy past the defendant's premises when the bull terrier rushed out and bit the puppy, of which injury it shortly afterwards died. The action was tried in a County Court and was dismissed. The plaintiff appealed, but the Divisional Court (Ridley and Bankes, JJ.) held that as the daughter was of sufficient age to allow of her exercising control over her dog, she and not her father was responsible for the damage done by it. The appeal therefore failed.

CONTRACT—BUILDING CONTRACT—INTERFERENCE BY WRONGDOER WITH ACCESS TO PREMISES—DELAY AND DAMAGE TO BUILDER—LIABILITY OF BUILDING OWNER.

*Porter v. Tottenham Urban District Council* (1914) 1 K.B. 663. The plaintiff in this case had contracted with the defend-