It is not seemly that a paragraph such as the following, introduced with large capital letters, should appear in a respectable daily newspaper:—

"Asked to be tried by Judge Morgan. Popularity of His Honour practically renders jury unnecessary. Since Judge Morgan has presided in the Criminal Sessions at the City Hall trial by jury has almost been eliminated. Out of a total of 96 cases in which the grand jury returned true bills, since the sitting of the court, only three prisoners have gone to a jury."

Why do alleged criminals ask to be tried by Judge Morgan—and how is his popularity to be accounted for?

If the facts as stated in the public press be correct it is clear that such travesties of justice as these should not be permitted to continue, and to that end it would seem desirable that the responsible authorities should enquire into the correctness of these reports and if found to be substantially true, to apply some appropriate remedy. If not true they should be contradicted. Public safety requires that the administration of justice should be sure, certain and swift; it certainly should not be brought into contempt and ridicule.

RIGHTS OF LIQUIDATORS IN PROPERTY OF INSOLVENT COMPANIES.

It would seem that there is in the minds of some members of the profession, an erroneous impression as to the nature of the title of a liquidator, under the Winding-up Acts, to the property of the company in respect of which he is appointed liquidator. It is assumed by some, that the effect of the order, appointing a liquidator under the statute, is to vest the estate of the insolvent company in the liquidator, and that, in case of a sale of the property, he is the person to convey. If, however, we look at the Dominion Winding-up Act (R.S.C. c. 144), and we believe most provincial Winding-up Acts are similarly framed, we do not find anything in the Act vesting or authorizing the court to vest the estate of the insolvent company, in the