

# The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXVII.

JULY 16, 1891.

No. 12.

It is always well that people should act up to their convictions. Mr. R. J. Wicksteed, of the Law Department in the House of Commons, having taken strong ground to the effect that a notary public should be required to take an oath of office, called upon the judge of the County Court to administer to him, as a notary, an oath in the form usually taken by these officials in England. We do not quite see the authority that the county judge had for administering the oath, except on the principle alluded to by a well-known text writer, that judges frequently act without law, and in some cases have power to make rules for their own guidance. We think Judge Ross must have had these two propositions in his mind when he administered the oath.

## REPORT OF THE MASTER OF TITLES.

The last Report of the Master of Titles shows that the Torrens system of registration of titles is making satisfactory progress. Although the actual volume of business done in the Toronto office during the past year appears to have been somewhat less than in the preceding year, and notwithstanding the reduction of the fees of office, it is satisfactory to find that the receipts were still more than sufficient to cover the expenses of the office by \$1245.45. During the year, land to the value of \$922,680 was brought under the Act. The present value of lands now under the Act in the County of York is estimated to be no less than \$11,000,000. The amount at the credit of the Assurance Fund is now \$13,318.27, of which \$12,365.38 has been paid in respect of lands in the County of York, and the remainder, \$952.89, in respect of lands in the districts.

The petty expense of bringing the land under the Act in the case of newly-patented lands in the districts is, we find from the Report, very unreasonably regarded as a grievance, notwithstanding the expense is less than would be incurred if the patent were registered in full under the old method of registration.

The table appended to the Report is interesting; it shows the value of each parcel brought under the Act during the past year, and the office fees paid on each parcel. The comparatively small amount of these fees must strike everyone with some surprise. The highest amount paid for fees was \$76.70, in respect of a parcel valued at \$7,100. But the fees for registering two other parcels valued at \$20,000, and another valued at \$50,000, were only \$6.50. The fees, we presume, vary with the circumstances of each case. Those in which the title is short and free from difficulty involve a very trifling outlay, while those where the title is more involved necessitate a larger expenditure.