

11 App. Cas., 152, that a verdict of a jury ought not to be disturbed as against evidence, or the weight of evidence, unless it is one which a jury, viewing the whole of the evidence reasonably, could not properly find.

TORRENS TITLE—ABSENCE OF CAVEAT—POWER OF COMMISSIONER TO REFUSE REGISTRATION—(R.S.O., c. 116, ss. 10, 76-78.

Manning v. The Commissioners of Title, 15 App. Cas., 192, is a case which may be referred to as illustrating the practice under the Ont. Land Titles Act (R.S.O., c. 116). The case is an appeal from Western Australia, in which the Judicial Committee, affirming the Colonial Court, decide that according to the proper construction of the Land Transfer Act, 1874, of that Colony, sections 19 and 21, the Commissioners of Titles, who answer to our Master of Titles, is not bound to register a title merely by reason of the issue of the prescribed notices and the non-filing of a caveat, but that such notices may lead to the production of evidence, and the Commissioners have a discretion in consequence thereof, or of a reconsideration of the application, to refuse to register, subject to the opinion of the Supreme Court. We may, however, remark that under the Ontario Act and Rules the power of the Master of Titles to refer a matter for the decision of the Court appears to be restricted to cases where there is a contest, or where he is requested to do so by some person interested in the title. See R.S.O., c. 116, ss. 10, 76-78, Rules 15, 60. It is by no means clear that he has jurisdiction to do so for his own satisfaction.

Correspondence.

REPORT OF MACMILLAN v. GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Editor of THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

SIR,—The letter which appears in the July number of THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL, signed by Mr. C. H. Masters, Assistant Reporter S.C.C., takes me to task for misrepresenting the facts of the above case and the result of the judgments, in an article published in the June number of the *Canadian Law Times*. Mr. Masters identifies me as being "evidently the plaintiff's solicitor," and makes use of this argument as a weapon for a personal attack.

I am not aware of any impropriety in a lawyer criticising a judgment or the official report of a case which has been finally decided, merely because he was one of the solicitors engaged in it.

I do not intend at present to gratify the Assistant Reporter by stating whether his guess is correct or not, but as he seems to imagine that solicitors are under some indefinite obligation to never comment on their clients' cases, I would direct his attention to a recent case in the Supreme Court, in which Mr. Justice Strong, having referred to a letter written by you, Mr. Editor, while acting as solicitor in a proceeding then pending, says: "I at present fail to see that it exceeded the bounds of that fair criticism upon the public administration of justice, which every one is entitled to write and publish"; and in which Mr.