

previous sessions as had been amended, altered or compiled, by the Legislature *then* in session, such appendix to be printed with the Acts of *that* session." Our correspondent's suggestion is very useful and valuable, but we doubt whether it would take the place of a revision. It is worthy of consideration whether in view of the endless mass of amendments of Acts made at every session, a revision of the first volume of the Revised Statutes should not be made at least every five years, and perhaps a revision of the second volume every seven years, the Acts in the latter volume being amended to a much less extent. But it would be the greatest blessing of all if it could be provided that no amendment should be made until after the end of at least two years from each revision. This constant tinkering with the statutes is a crying evil.

We publish in another place some new Rules made under the Ontario Land Titles Act. Rule 81 was passed on account of complaints made that solicitors had all the trouble and responsibility of examining and certifying to titles in the first instance, instead of simply bringing in the applications and removing objections, if any should arise. Rule 82 is to get rid of the expense of advertising, when the value of the property does not exceed \$3,000. This has been found a heavy burden, costing on the average about \$12 in each case. Rule 83 enables the solicitors for proposing applicants to estimate what the costs in the Land Titles office will be, without incurring the expense of obtaining, in the first place, an abstract from the Registry Office, which was necessary under the tariff heretofore in force, as the main charge was a fee of thirty cents in respect of each instrument examined in connection with the title. The Master of Titles, in his last report, suggests giving applicants the option of paying the assurance fees either at the time of first registration, or at any time within six years thereafter, unless the owner wishes to deal with the property in the meantime. These rules are a step in the right direction, and we think the Master's suggestion as to the assurance fees an excellent one.