

or at all events at the port of discharge, but their Lordships were of opinion that s. 150 must be construed consistently and harmoniously with the rest of the Act and with reference to its context, and so construing it, the "report" referred to in s. 150 must mean the report to be made by the Master under s. 25 completed by the entry to be made by importer under s. 34, and adopting that construction it means the port where the goods are to be landed mentioned in s. 31.

Correspondence.

DIVISION COURT EXECUTIONS.

To the Editor of the CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

DEAR SIR: Referring to the letter of your correspondent in your number for November 15th, 1898, concerning the repeal by the Legislature of those sections of the Division Courts Act enabling a party to transfer a judgment to the County Court where the sum remaining unsatisfied thereon amounted to \$40, there is another point in which it appears to me that the new procedure of issuing execution against lands direct from the Division Court is defective. This is in regard to the seizure and sale of a term of years. The law was and still is that a term of years being a chattel could not be sold under an execution against lands, but only under an execution against goods: *Court v. Tupper*, 5 O.S. 640. But though it could be sold under an execution against goods issued from the Superior Court, it could not be sold under an execution against goods issued from the Division Court, as it is within sec. 234 of the Division Courts Act: *Duggan v. Kitson*, 20 U.C.R. 316. Under the former practice, when a transcript of a judgment from the Division Court was once filed in the County Court, it thereby became a judgment of that Court, and an execution could be issued thereon under which a term of years could be sold. Now the judgment remains a judgment of the Division Court. The term of years cannot be sold under the Division Court execution against goods, nor can it be sold under the execution against lands. Can it be sold at all?

Napanee.

W. H. PARRY.