

The present edition is, as might be expected, an improvement on the first, having evidently undergone a pretty thorough revision, and a new and valuable chapter on Payment and Discharge of Mortgages has been added. We could wish, however, that the author had seen his way to adopting the suggestion made in our review of his first edition, and given some account of such matters as estoppel, restrictive covenants, and tax titles. The absence of any reference to the last named subject, in particular, seems to us a serious defect. It may be true that "it cannot be dealt with comprehensively," but surely the Horatian maxim applies, *Est quadam prodire tenuis, si non datur ultra*, and we are sure that the hurried practitioner, when called upon to examine one of these thorny and perilous titles, would have got much more help from even a brief discussion than from the "excellent American treatises" to which the author obligingly refers him, and which, we fear, are neither so "easily accessible" in those regions where tax titles most abound, nor so generally useful, as Mr. Armour seems to think. We have only to add that the typographical appearance of this, as of the former edition, is excellent, and in every way creditable to the publishers.

Correspondence.

To the Editor of THE CANADA LAW JOURNAL:

DEAR SIR,—In the issue of your journal dated 10th September is an article on "Mortgagee v. Purchaser Subject to Mortgage," of which the opening sentence is as follows: "The argument that there is a 'want of priority' between a mortgagee and a purchaser of the lands subject to the mortgage, whereby the former is debarred from recovering his debt directly from the latter, does not appear to have been ever seriously questioned." We are told that there is no new thing under the sun, and certainly the question discussed by your contributor is not a new one. Somewhat more than twelve years ago I wrestled with the question as fully as I was able to do, and I arrived, by a different route, at the same conclusion at which your contributor has arrived. My treatment of the question was published in *The Canadian Law Times*, pp. 49, 109, 157, and 217. It may be that your contributor is of opinion that the matter is not there treated