to another would be conscious that their rights would be everywhere governed by the same laws. Merchants in one province dealing with customers in another province would have the same confidence.

Unfortunately we do not appear to have at present in the Parliament of Canada any statesmen willing to devote his attention to this important subject, or to take any steps whatever to carry out the provisions of the British North America Act to which we have referred, and yet it is one which the fathers of federation evidently thought of importance, or the provision would not have been made.

---

## *EASEMENTS AND LAW OF LIMITATIONS.*

The case of *Mykel* v. *Doyle*, 45 U.C.R. 65, may be considered to have received another "black eye." It may be remembered that in that case it was decided by the majority of the Court of Queen's Bench (Hagarty, C.J., and Cameron, J.), affirming Patterson, J.A., that the ten years' limitation does not apply to actions to recover easements. Armour, J., dissented, pointing out that the definition of land in our Limitation Act (R.S.O. c. 133) includes incorporeal hereditaments, under which head an easement would come. The case was referred to in *Bell* v. *Golding*, 23 App. R. 485, and Burton, J.A., then said: "Without expressing any decided opinion I incline to the view that the dissenting judgment of Armour, C.J. (sic.), in *Mykel* v. *Doyle*, 45 U.C.R. 65, was correct." And now Meredith, C.J.C.P., has said in the recent case of *Ihde* v. *Starr*, 19 O.L.R., at p. 178, "if the matter were res integra I should be of the same opinion as Armour, J." After two such knocks, it would seem possible if the point were carried to an appellate court that a different conclusion might be arrived at. There is now an equal division of judicial opinion on the point in question represented by Patterson, J.A., Hagarty, C.J., and Cameron, J., on one side, and Armour, J., Burton, J.A., and Meredith, C.J.C.P., on the other.