

met, to mention a few clerical errors I happened upon while so doing, some of which may be thought worth the trouble of correction. These are scarcely to be wondered at when we find that the table of *addenda et corrigenda* in the Revised Statutes itself needs correction in the following points: Page 849—"Section 49" should read "Section 4"; page 2351—the reference at s. 5 we are told should be "R.S.O. (1877), c. 196, s. 5," *which it is*.

Taking the chapters of the Revised Statutes in their order, we find the following seeming anomalies:

Chapter 13 is, by 51 Vict., c. 8, s. 3, "further amended so far as the same restricts the Executive Council to six members," but how? Is the number further restricted, or is the restriction removed in whole or in part?

Chapter 104, s. 68, has two sub-sections numbered 2; the first, with sub-section 3, having been added by 51 Vict., c. 16, s. 1, and the second by 53 Vict., c. 28, s. 1.

Chapter 114, s. 95, as amended by 53 Vict., c. 30, s. 8, has an aching void between its sub-sections 12 and 14.

Chapter 184, s. 24, having originally three sub-sections, by 51 Vict., c. 28, s. 2, received an addition of numbers 4, 5, 6, and 7, and by 53 Vict., c. 50, s. 1, a further addition of numbers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. What a pretty tangle the unlettered municipal annexationist would get himself into in attempting to cite these sub-sections!

Chapter 184, s. 73, gets from 51 Vict., c. 28, s. 9, s-ss. 2 & 3, and from 53 Vict., c. 50, s. 4, another s-s. 2. Truly this is a liberal government!

Chapter 184, s. 382, is twice amended in the same way, once by 53 Vict., c. 12, s. 1, and again by 53 Vict., c. 50, s. 10. Do these amendments run concurrently, or are they cumulative?

If the cumulative principle be applied to c. 190, s. 5, as amended by s. 1, and again by s. 4 of 54 Vict., c. 44, the result is not artistic, as one may see by making the amendments literally and in order of time, and then attempting to read the section as amended.

Chapter 221, s. 12, as amended by 53 Vict., c. 70, s. 2, has two s-ss. 2. There is really no excuse in this instance for the oversight, for the original s-s. 2 is amended by the very next section of the amending act, which might surely have drawn attention to the double numbering.

Turning next to the acts passed since the revision, we find that s-s. 3 of s. 15 of 51 Vict., c. 13 is, by 52 Vict., c. 17, s. 6, replaced by a new one with the same number, and afterwards, by s. 10 of the latter act, s-s. 3 of s. 15 of the former is repealed. Does this mean the old s-s. or the new, or both? The same process is applied to s-s. 1 of s. 21 of 51 Vict., c. 13, by ss. 8 & 10 of 52 Vict., c. 17. The usual practice of repealing and replacing by means of the same section would have left the matter in no doubt.

As an example of amendments made at leisure and repented in haste, take the following: 51 Vict., c. 28, s. 24 (itself an amending section), is by 52 Vict., c. 36, s. 26, amended by striking out certain words in the third and fourth lines and inserting others. This latter amending section is repealed by 53 Vict., c. 50, s.