

requirements, etc. That however does not touch the question referred to by our correspondent ; nor have we heard any expression of opinion adverse to our strictures as to the conduct of business in the Supreme Court in other respects. On the contrary we are told that the statements made are more than justified by the facts ; and that as to one of the matters referred to, it should be made quite clear that as to the complaints so frequently made by the Bar the Chief of the Court is chiefly to blame. But however this may be, he certainly is responsible for conducting business so as to obtain the highest possible efficiency of the Court and the best results with the material at his command. This can only be done by a. an example of patient courtesy and untiring attention and industry ; and also by having a system of full and frank consultation and interchange of views between the Judges of the Court. This of course requires entire harmony between them, as well as a readiness to consider and give due weight to opposing views.

*MINORITY SHAREHOLDERS
IN JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.*

The case of *Earle v. Burland* (1902) Appeal Cases 83, marks another step in advance in the formation of definite company law. The principles involved in it are, however, simple and in that respect resemble those of *Beatty v. North-West Transportation Company*, a case for which Canada must get the credit (12 Appeal Cases 589), and also of an English case, *Salomon v. Salomon & Co.* (1897) Appeal Cases 22.

The *Beatty* case was said to have involved a question novel in its circumstances and important in its consequences, but the general effect of the opinion expressed by the Privy Council in that case absolutely recognizes the right of shareholders as such, to exercise their voting power in any manner they please. This principle was applied to a shareholder who held a majority of the shares of the company and whose votes carried a resolution sustaining his action as director, in selling to the company a vessel of which he was the owner. The power of the holders of shares to vote as they choose, and the right of the majority so voting to control absolutely the affairs of the company was carried in this case to the length of enabling them to confirm an action of a director, who by law is precluded from dealing on behalf of the company with