consolidator may, by a stroke of the pen, become a legislator.

Amendments of the law are not always made by striking out certain words of an Act and substituting new ones. This style of amendment has its advantages; not much room is then left for judicial interpretation beyond the grammatical construction of sentences, and the amending Act becomes a part of the previous enactment. Most new provisions, however, cannot be introduced in this manner. When a leading principle of an Act is invaded, the amendment must generally be embodied in a substantive enactment. A new principle thus introduced may have the effect of modifying, not only the entire Act which is the immediate object of the amendment, but it may be also that provisions contained in other Acts are in effect repealed or modified. All of these provisions may not be individually present to the mind of the legislator, satisfied of the correctness of the new principle, and of the expediency of giving it universal effect; but, by the consolidator every remote application of the principle must be kept in view, and the requisite modifications of language made, in accordance with what appears to him to be the true legal effect of the amending Act. Before any consolidation takes place, however, every reader of the statutes must take the words before him in connection with what, to his mind, appears to be the legal effect of the amending Act, and notwithstanding that "*quot homines tot sententiæ*," the minds of all Her Majesty's subjects must, by a pleasant fiction of the law, be made up in the same way.

In order partially to remove this source of doubt upon the construction of the statute law, a bill was introduced in the Legislative Assembly of this Province, in 1873, by Mr. McLeod, M.P.P. for West Durham, to provide that every amending statute should re-enact the whole law upon the subject dealt with. This proposition, in the general form in which it was presented, was considered impracticable, and apparently with reason, but it seems to us that some modification of it would meet with the acceptance of the public, and greatly facilitate a knowledge of the law. For instance, all amendments to a particular Act might be required to be introduced into it by definite verbal alterations or by substantive sections, numbered as parts of the Act amended and introduced in their proper place in the original Act, wherever this course was practicable. (See 27-28 Vict., cap. 27.)

If this were done any person who, after each session, went through the process known as "booking up" his statutes, would be in possession of the Legislature's own wording of each section. It is the constant practice, however, of our Legislatures to amend an Act by passing a new one, covering much of the same ground as a previous Act, and extending or modifying without expressly referring to the previous Act. The effect of such legislation is, of course, to repeal so much of the prior Act as is inconsistent with the later one, and a clause to that effect is sometimes unnecessarily inserted; but the draftsman must have known what provisions it was intended to repeal, and an express statement of those provisions might easily have been given. This not having been done, however, a minute examination of the prior Act becomes necessary, and a decision as to what remains unrepealed is with difficulty, and seldom with certainty, arrived at. The various Acts respecting Municipal Institutions, for instance, although twice consolidated since 1859, have never been repealed, except in this uncertain manner, and portions of the consolidation of 1859, not contained in or inconsistent with the later Acts, may still be in force.

A form of repealing clause is sometimes employed, which intensifies the difficulty