

Michigan Law Review

Volume 46 | Issue 6

1948

McGowan: TRUST RECEIPTS

Michigan Law Review

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr>



Part of the [Estates and Trusts Commons](#), and the [State and Local Government Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Michigan Law Review, *McGowan: TRUST RECEIPTS*, 46 MICH. L. REV. 862 (1948).

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/mlr/vol46/iss6/31>

This Regular Feature is brought to you for free and open access by the Michigan Law Review at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Michigan Law Review by an authorized editor of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact mlaw.repository@umich.edu.

TRUST RECEIPTS. By *George B. McGowan*. New York: Ronald Press Co. 1947. Pp. viii, 198. \$7.50.

The author is vice president of the Corn Exchange Bank Trust Company, New York. In this book his avowed intention is to explain the proper function of trust receipts to the layman. The development of the trust receipt is traced briefly from its origin (approximately 1877) to the present day. Indoctrination is followed by an analysis of the Uniform Trust Receipts Act and the author's opinion of its meaning. He concludes that the act is slightly partial to the entruster (the party who takes the trust receipt as security) and suggests that this could be remedied by two modifications: (1) Decreasing the period in which the entruster must file in order to be protected; (2) Providing for the filing of statements of prospective transactions in the same office in each county where chattel mortgages are filed. Since 1934 twenty-five states¹ have adopted the Uniform Trust Receipts Act or similar legislation; thus attorneys as well as laymen would profit by reading this book. Its chief value to the layman lies in the simple, concise manner in which the author sets out the situations in which a trust receipt should or should not be used. Mr. McGowan suggests that banks and finance companies are using it where the legal relationship should be confined to a bailor-bailee status, and that others are failing to use it in situations for which it is custom-made. The only other book in this field consists of a forty-seven page analysis of the Uniform Trust Receipts Act by Christian Djourup, titled "Analysis of the Uniform Trust Receipts Act." The present study clearly supersedes Djourup's work; and its helpfulness is endorsed by Karl Llewellyn, who drafted the Uniform Act.

¹ Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wyoming.