

ties which bind together all parts of the great world wide Dominion of which Canada forms a part. We have also those who, though recognising difficulties and inconveniences, have carefully studied the subject, and consider that these difficulties are outweighed by the great advantage of having British law made as uniform as possible for the whole Empire and settled by Judges of greater learning, more varied experience and larger vision than is possible under the conditions surrounding those who are called upon to administer justice in the outlying parts of the Empire.

On the other side we have a small minority who think differently, and their views are before the public and need not be repeated here. The question as to whether or not a Provincial legislature can deprive a citizen of his right to present his petition at the foot of the Throne is as yet undecided.

EFFECT OF THE EXPRESSION "IN TRUST" IN A CONVEYANCE.

In our last issue we published a very interesting article by Mr. F. P. Betts, K.C., on the above subject. Mr. John L. Whiting, K.C., of Kingston, calls our attention to the fact that neither the Court in the case of *Re McKinley and McCullough*, 51 D.L.R. 659, nor Mr. Betts refer to R.S.O. 1914, cap. 126, ss. 95, &c. We referred the matter to our contributor, the writer of the article and having promptly heard from him we give his views in his own words as follows:—

“The sections of the Act spoken of enact:—

(1) There shall not be entered on the register or be receivable any notice of any trust, express, implied, or constructive.

(2) Describing the owner of any freehold or leasehold land, or any charge as a trustee, whether the beneficiary or object of the trust is or is not mentioned, shall not be deemed a notice of a trust within the meaning of this section, nor shall such description impose upon any person dealing with such owner the duty of making any enquiry as to the power of the owner in respect of the land or charge, or the money secured by the charge, or