

Dealing with the question of limitation of actions, it would save a great deal of litigation if some scheme were adopted similar to that suggested in the last number of the *Law Quarterly Review*. The writer there points out the absurdity of the English legislation. In referring to the case of *Jay v. Johnstone*, (1893) 1 Q.B. 25, he says: "Is it not time that this piecemeal legislation with regard to the limitation of time within which actions may be brought should come to an end? It is a subject which ought to be made clear, and could easily be made clear to laymen. A parliamentary draftsman who is well versed in the Statute of Limitations could easily draw up a short Act, exhibiting the periods of limitation in a tabular form, and this," the writer points out, "would be a benefit both to lawyers and to the public." This remedy is so simple that the wonder is some one did not offer it long before this time.

There is a feeling abroad that the Quieting Titles Act, as also the Torrens system, should be simplified, and the cost of the proceedings reduced. It is not so clear, however, how this should be done. Time must be spent, great caution exercised, and expense incurred when title is being made, as it were, against the world. We should be glad to have some suggestion on these matters from those who are complainants in the premises. We think it would be quite proper to do away with the expense of advertising in applications under the Land Titles Act, and it would be very easy to dispense with much of the red tape now required to perfect a cessation of charge. The courteous Master of Titles certainly does his best to make the working of the Act a success. By the returns of last year, it appears that the cost to the Province for operating the land titles office in Toronto amounted to \$7,350, whilst the whole receipts from fees, as shown by the blue book, were only \$4,863, though it was, in fact, \$5,257, the difference being the percentage going to the stamp issuer.

Under the Master and Servant Act, a difficulty frequently arises which renders the Act inoperative. If the defendant puts in a set-off to the servant's claim the proceedings are ousted before the justice, and the parties are forced to go to the Division or other court, as the case may be, for a determination of their troubles. If the justice has power to deal with the subject-matter of the complaint, he ought to be given power to deal also with all matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, and it is