ject of the registration of land, it never will be published." Queen Elizabeth in the Parliament of 1597 assented to forty-three Bills, public and private, and rejected forty-eight that had passed both Houses. James I., in assenting to all the Bills of the session, explained that he did so "as a special token of grace and favour, being a matter unusual to pass all Acts without any exception." Although the Stuarts preferred to use the dispensing power and lightly assented to Bills that they never intended to observe, yet the close of their system brought back the use of the old prerogative. On four important occasions, and once afterwards on a matter of less moment, William III. declined to sanction Bills. Once, and once only, after his death, when Queen Anne vetoed the Scottish Militia Bill under peculiar circumstances and in conformity to the wishes of both Houses, were the words *La Reine s'avisera* heard in Parliament. —*Law Times.*

POSSESSION AS A ROOT OF TITLE.

In these days when nearly every transaction connected with land is committed to writing there is a tendency to overlook the importance attached by the law to mere possession. but nevertheless possession still remains a root of title. In very early days, no doubt, possession was practically the only title to land; he was the owner who, with his retainers, was strong enough to take, and then to retain, possession. And in the more civilized of ancient communities land was transferred from one person to another by physical possession being given in the presence of witnesses. A record of what was done might be drawn up and signed, as in the case of livery of seisin, but the writing did not constitute the title to the land; it was merely evidence in support of the title.

If a person to-day enters upon and takes possession of a parcel of land, without any title or even colour of title thereto, but merely as a wrongdoer, what is his position in the eyes of the law? At first no doubt he is a mere trespasser, and could