

opinionated men to write anonymous letters. Think of a lawyer who will write an abusive and anonymous letter to another lawyer! This person has not even the plea of ignorance to excuse him, for he writes a good hand and spells correctly. But we would not take his stipulation without two witnesses. Make him sick, do we? Glad of it. Such fellows need to be made sick. We shall think we have not lived in vain if we make all of his sort sick enough to throw up their briefs. Bob Ingersoll would agree with us on this point."

---

THE letter of Mr. Saunders, which will be found in another column, points out an apparent inconsistency in the law of succession to intestates' estates under The Devolution of Estates Act (R.S.O., c. 108). The object of a law regulating the succession to property in the case of intestacy, ought to be to divide the estate in the way which any good man having regard to the natural claims of his relatives upon him, might reasonably be expected to do. In one sense, no doubt, no class of relatives have any right to claim the estate of a deceased person; it is all a matter of legal regulation, and if one class is included and another left out, the latter have no right to feel aggrieved. But we believe that the law in this respect, as in every other, ought to try and work out what the great majority of mankind looks upon as natural justice. In the case which Mr. Saunders puts of the intestate leaving a father and nephew, as the law now stands it would appear that the father alone will take, whereas if the intestate leave father and brother and nephew (child of a deceased brother or sister), the nephew will be let in to share, and will stand in the place his parent would have done if living. This certainly seems somewhat incongruous. We are disposed to think that this branch of the law is seriously in need of consolidation or codification, more especially since the revolution effected by the Devolution of Estates Act. It affects the estates of everybody in the community, and it is therefore particularly a branch of statute law, which should be included in our own Provincial Statutes, and not be left as at present, embodied in two or three ancient Imperial Statutes. There are one or two other points in connection with the Devolution of Estates Act, which require to be clearly defined on the statute book, and one is, how a devisee is to be deemed to take, whether directly from the testator or indirectly through the personal representative, and whether a formal assent of the personal representative to the devise is necessary, and if so, in what shape that assent is to be manifested; and further, some means should be provided for the protection of *bona fide* purchasers from a devisee, from any claims of the personal representative, or creditors. The scheme of the Act is to place realty on the same footing as the personalty, and it appears to us that the same rules should be made to apply to both classes of property as far as practicable. Then some provision should be made for vesting an intestate's estate in some public functionary in the interval between the death and the grant of administration or probate, so that it may always have a representative *in esse*. There is not much sense in putting creditors to the expense and delay of obtaining administration