McCarthy, Q.C., Civil Rights; Mr. W. R. Meredith, LL.B., Q.C., Municipal Institutions; Mr. B. B. Osler, Q.C., Criminal Jurisprudence; Mr. Z. A. Lash, Q.C., Commercial and Maritime Law; Mr. Chas. Moss, Q.C., Equity Jurisprudence; Mr. J. J. Maclaren, LL.D., Q.C., The Comparative Jurisprudence of Ontario and Quebec. Mr. Justice Proudfoot's department is in the fourth year, but as there are no fourth year students yet, his lectures will not be delivered until next year. The Hon. David Mills commenced his lectures on the 17th instant, and will continue after the new year. The Honorary Lecturers will begin work with the new year according to the calendar which has just been prepared. Mr. Justice MacMahon, on account of his recent appointment, and Mr. Meredith, on account of other engagements, desire to defer their lectures till next year. The appointments are limited to five years, so that such changes can be made without inconvenience, either by omission or addition, as may be considered necessary.

THE TORRENS ACT IN MANITOBA.

From a paragraph which recently appeared in some of the Toronto daily papers we learn that the Torrens system of registration of titles is proving a great success in Manitoba. The Act is fortunately being administered by a gentleman who appears to be fully in sympathy with its provisions, and enthusiastic in his efforts to make it efficient. A recent decision of the learned Chief Justice of Manitoba, however, seems to us likely to have a somewhat retrograde effect. *In re Lewis*, 5 Man. R. 44, the question came up for decision, whether the provision of the Real Property Act, 1885, which provides for the devolution of real estate upon the personal representative of a deceased owner extends to all lands in the province, or only to lands registered under the Act. The learned chief justice came to the conclusion that the provision in question only applies to registered lands, and that as regards lands not registered, the old law of descent prevails. The inconvenience of having two different systems of succession to real property in force in the same province would, one would have thought, have weighed with the court as a very strong reason against arriving at this conclusion; but there is not only the argument of inconvenience which may be urged against the learned chief justice's conclusion, but there is also the fact that his decision is apparently opposed to the policy inaugurated by the Real Property Act of 1885. The manifest policy of that Act, we take it to be, was to simplify titles and to facilitate the registration of titles to land under the Torrens system. One of the means by which this simplification of titles was to be accomplished, was, by the alteration of the law of succession, by getting rid of the heir-at-law, the fruitful source of so many of the difficulties in the title to real estate. By the operation of this new law of succession, the Act designed by a gradual and imperceptible means to simplify titles, and in this way facilitate their ultimate registration under the Act. The learned chief justice, however, by his construction of the Act, has given a very effectual set-back to this policy. Under his decision the old difficulties attendant upon the common law system of descent are to accumulate, and titles, instead of gradually