

scribed the class of court orders which should be entered in full in all the Divisions. This, we regret to say, has not been done. *Rules* 546, 773, 774, do not cover the ground.

The filing of reports of Local Masters is regulated by *Rule* 84. The reports of Local Masters are to be filed in their own offices, but may at the request of any party be forwarded to the Clerk of Records and Writs; in other cases a report is to be filed in the proper office of the Division at Toronto. Reports are to become absolute at the expiration of fourteen days from their filing, unless notice of appeal is served within that time (*Rule* 848); and appeals from reports are no longer to be heard in chambers, but are in all cases to be brought on in court. The notice of appeal is to be seven days' notice, and is to be returnable within a month from the date of the report, and is to be set down for argument before a judge in court for the day on which the motion is returnable (*Rules* 849, 850).

*Rule* 892, which relates to the amounts to be indorsed on writs of execution for the costs of writs, appears to be defective. It states that it shall be the duty of the officer issuing the writ to indorse the amounts "hereinafter mentioned," but, unfortunately, no amounts whatever are thereinafter mentioned.

One of the worst instances of the typographical blundering to which we have referred is to be found in *Rule* 1020, which, as printed, is simply nonsense. It reads as follows:—

"The Local Master shall be entitled to confer or correspond Act time to time with the Inspector of Titles, for advice and assistance from questions of practice or evidence, or other questions arising under the one or under these *Rules*."

By *Rules* 1038-1044, the procedure with regard to contested municipal elections is simplified. Writs of *capias ad respondendum* are abolished by *Rule* 1045, and an order for arrest substituted. We are not, however, quite clear that the provision as to the issue of concurrent orders is sufficient to authorize such orders being addressed to different sheriffs from the one named in the original order.

The *Rules* relating to *bailable proceedings* appear to us to be sadly defective. If there be any branch of practice more than another which needs simplification and codification it is this, and yet these *Rules* leave the practice in about as incomprehensible a condition as it was before.

Writs of replevin, *mandamus*, prohibition and *certiorari* have been abolished, and orders substituted. The *Rules* 1141-1169, relating to interpleader applications appear to be well framed.

With regard to the vacations, some changes have been made. Since the Judicature Act came into force, the long vacation has included the 1st September, but this day has now been excluded. Formerly the Christmas vacation was excluded in the computation of time, for filing or amending pleadings, for setting down demurrers, appealing from reports, moving to discharge orders of revivor, moving to set aside a judgment by a party served therewith, or taking proceedings in appeal; but hereafter, as we read *Rule* 484, only the long vacation is excluded from the time allowed for the foregoing proceedings, so that Christmas vacation is to a great extent blotted out.