

tion of the right of action for assessments, are also dealt with. The Act must have entailed an immense amount of care and labour, and it is to be regretted that, instead of being limited to insurance corporations, most of its provisions were not made applicable to the winding up of all companies.

Another long and important Act is that "Respecting Electric Railways." For the preparation of an Act of this kind care has to be taken that, while the public interests are properly guarded in disposing of valuable franchises, private enterprise is not unduly fettered. Many of the sections of this Act appear to be very stringent, and its usefulness must be left to be determined by future experience of its working.

There is an unusually long "Municipal Amendment Act"; an Act to provide for the appointment of an official municipal arbitrator for the city of Toronto; an Act to prevent the quashing of convictions under municipal by-laws by reason of the want of formal proof of the by-law before the convicting magistrate; an amendment and consolidation of the Acts respecting Free Libraries and Mechanics' Institutes; and an Assessment Amendment Act. The second section of this last-mentioned statute shows signs of excessively careless preparation, and has already been the subject of much comment in the public press.

There are a number of other Acts which we cannot now refer to. They are mainly drawn under the direction of the members of the Government familiar with the practical working of the laws governing their departments in the administration of public affairs, and they may be very safely trusted as judges of the necessity of amendments. On the whole, our annual grist of legislation appears to be somewhat larger and more important than usual. Whether its usefulness will justify its volume remains to be seen.

CURRENT ENGLISH CASES.

The Law Reports for May comprise (1895) 1 Q.B., pp. 673-770; (1895) P., pp. 161-178; and (1895) 1 Ch., pp. 577-778.

LANDLORD AND TENANT—AGREEMENT FOR LEASE BY TWO, ONE OF WHOM IS AN INFANT—INFANT JOINT CONTRACTOR—SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—INJUNCTION.

Lumley v. Ravenscroft, (1895) 1 Q.B. 683; 14 R. April 307, is a case which one would naturally expect to find in the Chancery Division. The action was brought for the specific performance