

and the law for any surveyor to certify, under the Registry Act or the Land Titles' Act, to the correctness of any plan where he has not actually surveyed the land on the ground. I cannot understand how any surveyor can have formed a different idea of his duty, as any contrary practice would make the certificates of surveyors attached to plans simply worthless.

Sometimes surveyors are called upon to draw plans showing proposed divisions before survey. It seems to me that it would be correct for the Association to enact a rule requiring that in all such cases the fact that the plan shows an intended subdivision and not an actual survey should appear upon the face of the plan.

How far it is necessary in practice to make the subdivisions upon the ground so as to ensure accuracy is a practical matter on which I am unable to give an opinion.

It has been supposed that all plans of sub-division show actual work, but I presume from what I have since learned that this is a mistake, and that in many cases it is not deemed necessary to plant stakes at the corners of each lot before certifying a plan. Of course, if the outline measurements are mathematically correct this can make no difference. As, however, it is practically impossible to make absolutely accurate measurements of any long distances, I think the surveyors might well lay down a rule fixing the limits beyond which paper divisions must not be made.

I have noticed in the Registry Office many plans certified as being in compliance with the Registry Act which ignored many of its provisions. I trust, however, the clearer language of the recent Act will prevent the occurrence of these omissions.

I have, of course, to be more particular than registrars, as the duty is thrown upon me of seeing that a plan is in accordance with the rule, and is consistent with other descriptions of the same land in my office, or, if not, that the discrepancies are properly explained.

It has been the practice of surveyors, when a number of lots have the same width, to content themselves with simply inserting the width of the lots at each end leaving the intervening lots unmarked. The statute requires that the width of each lot should be shown.

Ought not surveyors to adopt the practice showing what is the governing line both in plans and in descriptions wherever the courses are given? According to the present practice it is impossible to tell from most descriptions whether they are magnetic, astronomical or assumed courses. Most, I believe, are assumed courses. That is, it is assumed that a former survey, as, for instance, the old lines of "north 16° west," are correct. I understand surveyors sometimes put these assumed lines within inverted commas, but this is a very unsatisfactory way of stating the governing line, and I think it would be well to adopt the practice of saying "in above description — street is assumed to run on a course north 16° west," or, where the survey is made from actual observation it should be stated "the courses are astronomical by actual observation." My attention has been particularly called to this by two adjoining surveys made by the same surveyor, whose courses, seemingly intended to be a continuation of the same lines,