

MEGARRY'S MANUAL OF THE LAW OF REAL PROPERTY. 4th Edition.
Edited by P.V. BAKER. [London: Stevens & Sons Ltd. 1969.
li + 652 pp. (including index)]. Paperback £2. 10s.

This fourth edition of the Manual maintains the high degree of clarity and conciseness set by Megarry J. himself in the earlier editions. Its primary objective, of being an aid to those who are "puzzled and confused" (which I suspect include almost all students) is admirably attained, when one considers the immense organisational effort that must go into organising the unwieldy mass of the law of real property. As with previous editions the glossary provided will prove an invaluable aid to the student's understanding of the subject.

While this Manual will continue to be the constant companion of real property law students, local students will have to embark upon it with great circumspection. The reason being that since 1925 local and English land laws have taken separate paths. Thus the omnibus reforms created by the Law of Property Act of 1925 are irrelevant

here. Again the Perpetuities and Accumulations Act of 1964, which appears to be the prime cause of this new edition, further widens the divergence. Fortunately this new edition continues the practice of subheadings which identify these portions, which can thus conveniently be ignored by students. The whole of chapter 5 on Settled Land and Trusts for Sale, based on the settled Lands Act of 1925 is irrelevant also.

Almost the whole of chapter 8 on Wills and Intestacy are relevant to the extent that we have identical legislation. However the amendments enacted under the Wills Act, 1968 have to be noted. Further because of our Intestate Succession Act, 1967 the whole treatment of the pre-1925 law on intestacy can be disregarded.

Over and above the major statutory differences local cases have applied and modified the common law as applicable *via* the 2nd Charter of Justice, 1826. Thus the case of *Khoo Kheat Luck v. Haji Yusop* (1929) S.S.L.R. 210 (C.A.) provides an interesting application of the principle in *Walsh v. Lonsdale*.

The right of prescription, particularly the application of *Dalton v. Angus* in Malaysia/Singapore remains a moot point as a consequence of opposing cases like *Ohnā Mohammed Abubakar v. Tho Yan Poh* 13 S.S.L.R. 39 and *Anguilla v. Ong Boon Tat* (1921) 15 S.S.L.R. 190.

Finally, the treatment of registration of deeds and titles is somewhat cursory and thus inadequate even for the student of English Land Law. At any event the local student cannot rely on the Manual as the local law on this topic is different from that which prevails in England.

It may appear odd that the major portion of a review contains a delineation of relevant from irrelevant material. This is wholly necessary as it indicates the diminishing relevance of English real property textbooks to local students. The climax of this growing divergence will see the total irrelevance of English text books in this area of law.