

our steps and revert to the scheme of the Act as originally passed?

One defect certainly did exist in the original Act and that was the omission to provide for the vesting of the estate during any interval which may elapse between the death of an owner and the grant of probate or letters of administration.

In every case there must be a hiatus between the death and the grant of probate or administration. Where is the estate in the meantime? We do not mean the land, but the legal title?

In some of the Australian colonies they have provided for this by the appointment of a public functionary in whom the title to all estates vests subject to be divested on the grant of probate or administration. Is not that our proper remedy?

The sole reason of the recent amendment to the Act was to save the expense of conveyances from the personal representative to the beneficiaries. This might easily have been got over by some simple method which would not have invaded the fundamental principle of the Act.

One method which might be suggested would be a general vesting order vesting land in the beneficiaries according to their respective interests grantable at small expense by a County Court judge with the consent of the personal representative whenever the estate was below a certain value and in other cases by a judge of the High Court.

This is another illustration of the evils resulting from want of a careful supervision of legislation as it passes through its various stages by some specialist appointed for the purpose; the need of which is enlarged upon in another place.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE AND GOLF.

Whilst we trust that the glamour of golf has not swayed the judicial mind, we can scarcely concur in some of the utterances from the Bench in relation to this (shall we say) recreation, for we are told by some of these learned gentlemen that it is not "a game." It seems to be in their estimation a sort of