

the clerks were pretty fully occupied already, but, judging from the voluminous returns required to be made annually by *Rules* 161-162, it would seem that the framers of the *Rules* consider the copying out of the suitors' accounts, running through over thirty large folio ledgers, a little matter which may be safely added to their duties. When the accounts of the Court of Chancery were kept in a pass book, and carried around in the registrar's pocket, such returns might not involve much trouble; but to require them to be made now appears to us to be somewhat absurd, especially as due provision is made for the auditing of the accounts. The returns required to be made by the Clerk of the Process, by *Rule* 16, seem equally useless. These are matters, however, which do not concern the profession.

The diversity of names by which the local officers of the court are known, viz., Local Registrars, Deputy Registrars, and Deputy Clerks of the Crown, we notice, is the cause of some slips in the *Rules*; e.g., *Rule* 18 prescribes that Local Registrars and Deputy Registrars are to perform their duties in like manner as the Clerk of Records and Writs. There is no reason that we can see why Deputy Clerks of the Crown should not also have been included. Then, again, by *Rule* 1,075, provision is made for the transmission of a bail piece and affidavit of justification by the Deputy Clerks of the Crown to the proper officer in Toronto; but the framers of the *Rules* have evidently overlooked the fact that the like duties by Local Registrars and Deputy Registrars should also have been provided for.

We notice that an old common law Rule relating to the shorthand reporters' account has been re-enacted, the framers of the *Rules* apparently being ignorant of the fact that the Shorthand Reporters' Fund has, by an Order in Council, been placed in the care of Mr. Clark, one of the taxing officers, and is now paid into court, an arrangement which, notwithstanding *Rule* 205, we presume, is not intended to be altered.

*Rule* 214, which relates to the sitting of the judges in vacation, strikes us as a curious piece of composition, which might, very properly, have been the subject of revision, a more involved string of sentences could not well be devised.

Among the changes which the new *Rules* will inaugurate is the extension of the right to specially indorse a writ and recover judgment under what is now *Rule* 80, in cases of ejectment by a landlord against a tenant whose term has expired, or been duly determined by a notice to quit (see *Rules* 245, 739). The English *Rules*, from which this provision is taken, contain a form of special indorsement in such a case, but these *Rules* omit to do so. By *Rule* 705, execution may be issued forthwith on a judgment for default of appearance to a specially indorsed writ, without awaiting eight days as formerly.

*Rule* 275, which regulates the time for appearance, prescribes ten days after service, if service is effected within Ontario elsewhere than in the Districts of Algoma or Thunder Bay; and if service be effected in the latter places thirty days for appearance is allowed in ejectment, and twenty days in other actions, with ten days additional in each case when service is effected between 1st November and 30th June. It appears to us that this *Rule* ignores the fact that other