

but up to the middle of the year only about a dozen cases had been tried. The *Standard* called attention to the subject, inquiring from those in authority why it had such small success. The chairman of the Joint Committee of the Chamber of Arbitration and the City Corporation came to the defence of his tribunal, and said he was not discouraged; that he did not expect that it would be without the evil report and light esteem which a forum of this novel character might be expected to meet. Whilst this is true, we are inclined to agree with our English namesake that one principal cause of the failure is to be found in the apathy of the commercial community itself. That journal is still of the opinion that a judge informed by expert evidence, and aided by scientific assessors, is a better and more impartial tribunal for the disposal even of technical cases than any body of arbitrators could be. However this may be, it cannot be denied that the founders of this Chamber have done good service in stimulating a spirit of reform among the members of the legal profession, and in bringing about a discussion upon some of the defects of the old tribunals of the country.

Most of our readers will no doubt, have noticed that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Duggan v. The London & Canadian Loan and Agency Co.*, ante vol. 28, p. 343. The judgment of the Privy Council may be found in the November number of the *Law Reports' appeal cases*, p. 506. We have on more than one occasion referred to this case, and think it may be satisfactory to the moneyed classes of the community to find that the ultimate decision has been in favour of the defendants. It is somewhat remarkable that in the report of the case before the Privy Council no authorities are referred to. The arguments of counsel are not reported, and in their lordships' judgment, delivered by Lord Watson, not a single decision is mentioned. In the judgment of the Privy Council, the case turned on the simple question, Whether or not the fact that the bank manager from whom the defendant acquired the shares in question held them "in trust" was sufficient to put the defendants upon inquiry as to the prior title to the shares? Their lordships came, we are glad to say, to what appears to us to be the very common-