judicial districts have been set off since 47 Vict. c. 14, was passed, and that there are now local offices of the court established in Thunder Bay and Algoma. The time for appearance, we think, should have been regulated not merely by reference to the place of service, but also by reference to the place where the appearance is required to be entered. For example, it seems unreasonable to allow a man served in Thunder Bay, whose appearance is to be entered in Thunder Bay, forty days, or four times as long as he would be allowed if served in Toronto; and it does not seem reasonable that a longer time should be allowed for appearance where service is effected in Thunder Bay than is allowed where service is effected, say in Rainy River District.

In *Rule* 271, which provides in what cases action may be brought in the High Court against persons resident out of the jurisdiction, the revisers have followed the English *Rules* of 1883, instead of the present Ontario *Rule* 45, and the provision in the present Ontario *Rule* 45*e*, to the effect that an action may be brought against a person out of the jurisdiction when he has assets of the value of at least $200 within the jurisdiction, which may be rendered liable in the event of the plaintiff recovering judgment in the action, has been omitted. This, we think, is a serious mistake.

By *Rule* 299, when a notice disputing a claim is filed in a mortgage action, a motion for judgment will hereafter be necessary, whereas under the present *Rules*, according to the decision in *Trust and Loan Co.* v. *McCarthy*, 19 C. L. J. 188, judgment might in such a case be obtained on *præcipe*. It may be doubted whether the change effected by *Rule* 299 is any improvement. Under the former practice in Chancery a defendant simply filing a note disputing the amount claimed, was entitled to four days' notice of the taking of the account. This provision does not appear to be preserved in the new *Rules*—such a defendant would appear to be now entitled to the ordinary notice, but what is to be "the ordinary notice" does not appear.

Under the new *Rules*, all judgments delivered at places elsewhere than Toronto are to be settled "when necessary" by the Deputy Registrar, Deputy Clerk, or Local Registrar, at the places of trial, subject to the right of either party to apply on notice to one of the judgment clerks, or to the judge, to vary the minutes. As many of the local officers have unfortunately had no legal training, and have had no experience in equity practice, the duty which is thus cast upon them is one that we fear they will not, as a rule, be very competent to perform satisfactorily. The sole merit of the procedure prescribed by *Rule* 761, if merit it can be called, is that it will probably increase costs.

It was much to be desired that some uniform rule should be laid down as to the entry of orders. While in the Chancery Division it has been customary to enter all orders made in court in full, in the other Divisions, no court orders are entered at all. The consequence will be that in the investigation of titles depending on such unentered orders, in the event of their loss or destruction, not a little difficulty is likely hereafter to arise. While the practice in the Chancery Division has been perhaps too strict, the practice in the other Divisions has undoubtedly been too lax; and it would have been well if some *Rule* had pre-