ambiguous and obscure, and technical terms are used which are quite unnecessary, and, instead of elucidating, tend rather to obscure their meaning. It is to be greatly regretted that the revisers of the Rules did not see fit to consult the English Rules on this point, as they are a model of simplicity and perspicuity. They are only seven in number (Rules 1030-1036)—instead of forty-four—and provide for form of order for arrest, and for applying to discharge the order,—the indorsements to be made on the order before its delivery to the sheriff,—and on the arrest being made for the issue of concurrent orders, and the fees payable to sheriff. That security may be given by deposit of the sum mentioned in the order in court, to abide the order of the court, or by giving a bond to the plaintiff executed by the defendant and two sureties. The plaintiff, within four days after service of notice of the names and addresses of the sureties, may object to them, giving the particulars of his objection, which may then be adjudicated upon by the Master, who has power to award costs. The plaintiff is, within four days after giving his notice of objection, to obtain an appointment from the Master for the purpose of disposing of the objection, and in default, the security is to be deemed sufficient. The costs of the arrest, unless otherwise ordered, are to be costs in the cause. If money is deposited, a receipt is to be given, and if a bond is given, a certificate is to be given by the plaintiff or his solicitor, upon production of which receipt or certificate to the sheriff the defendant is to be released.

It may be that the adoption of the English Rules on this subject *verbatim* would not answer, because they appear to require the defendant arrested to give security for the payment of the claim if the plaintiff succeed in the action, whereas our statutes only require the defendant to give special bail conditioned to pay the condemnation money or render himself to the sheriff; and even when the plaintiff has recovered judgment and arrested the defendant under a *ca. sa.*, the latter is entitled to be released on giving a bond to abide by and observe the orders of the court. So that the arrest of a defendant in Ontario is by no means any security that the debt for which he is arrested will ultimately be paid. But some suitable modification of the English Rules would certainly have been far better than keeping alive the senseless rigmarole of "bail below" and "bail above," with all the other incidental technicalities. When the defendant is arrested he should be required to give security in the first place to the plaintiff and not to the sheriff; this might be done, either by depositing the sum in respect of which he is arrested in court, subject to the further order of the court, or by giving a bond with two sureties for the amount for which the arrest is made, conditioned that the defendant will abide by and observe the orders of the court, etc., as provided by R. S. O. c. 67, s. 14, for that is all the plaintiff can ultimately get, and he might as well be allowed to get it at first as being put to the useless expense of issuing orders on the sheriff to return the order of arrest, and "to bring in the body," and winding up with the writ of *ca. sa.* R. S. O. c. 67, s. 14, does in fact authorize a bond of this kind to be given by a defendant arrested on *mesne* process, but its beneficial effect appears to have been rendered nugatory by the Rules which require "special bail" to be given, which bail are to be subject to an entirely different condition (see Rule 1062).