

off of all appeals—a species of law reform, by the way, which may not always make for justice.” We regret that in this he is not able to concur with some of his learned brethren in the Province of Ontario who think that appeals should be almost, if not entirely, done away with. The writer is a curious combination of an optimist and a pessimist, and longs for the time when “the law can be codified in lay language, and then if procedure could be simplified so that an intelligent layman could take his own case before a lower Court, the cost of justice in this country would be tremendously reduced.” He is apparently like Diogenes of old seeking with his lantern for the public man who would take up law reform in this spirit, and so become the most popular man in the country “outside of the law offices, yes, and inside the best of these, for the good lawyer does not make the most of his money out of litigation.” The last remark indicates that the writer has some lucid intervals. But possibly we misjudge him, for, after all, he may be a man of infinite jest who thus seeks to instruct his less sensible brethren of the press.

SOME RECENT CRITICISMS ON REAL PROPERTY STATUTES.

There are some observations in Mr. Armour's interesting address before the Ontario Bar Association to which, if correctly reported, we think a demurrer might be entered. We say this, however, with some diffidence, as it is a bold thing to question a legal proposition laid down as such by Mr. Armour.

In taking exception to the wording of the Wills Act, R.S.O. c. 128, s. 10, he is reported as having referred to it as follows: “A man can make a will of anything that would devolve upon his executor. There could not be anything more absurd. It is a mere mistake, of course.”

The section referred to reads as follows: “Every person may devise, bequeath or dispose of by will executed in manner hereinafter mentioned, all real estate and personal estate to which