

## Reports and Notes of Cases.

### Dominion of Canada.

#### EXCHEQUER COURT

THE KING v. RITHET AND THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL OF  
BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Cassels, J.]

[January 22.

*Constitutional Law—Dominion and Provincial rights—Revenues—  
Bona Vacantia—Secs. 102 and 109 B.N.A. Act 1867.*

*Held*, having regard to the provisions of sec. 102 of the B.N.A. Act, 1867, which refer to certain revenues, over which the provinces at the date of the Union had, and have, power of appropriation, as passing to the Dominion except such portions as are reserved to the provinces under sec. 109, it is apparent that all royalties of every kind were not intended to belong to the provinces under the wording of section 109. Royalties arising from lands, mines, minerals and from escheats, as referred to in sec. 1 of the Imp. Act 15-16 Vict. c. 39, passed to the provinces, but it was not the intention of the B.N.A. Act to give to the provinces royalties such as *bona vacantia*, and the like.

*E. L. Newcombe, K.C., and C. P. Plaxton, for plaintiff; J. A. Ritchie, for defendant.*

### Correspondence.

#### REGISTRY OFFICES—ONTARIO.

THE EDITOR CANADA LAW JOURNAL: FEB. 28th, 1918.

Sir:—Is it not time that a change was made in the ridiculous practice, which has prevailed for years, in every Registry Office in Ontario, of designating deeds, on the abstract index, as "B. and S," meaning bargain and sale? As the old deed of bargain and sale was superseded by the deed of grant (the present common form of conveyance) very many years ago, it is nothing short of an absurdity to go on labelling these deeds "B and S,"