

The Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXVIII.

OCTOBER 17, 1892.

No. 16.

WE have received advance sheets of a digest of the Game and Fishing Laws of Ontario, about to be published in pamphlet form of a size convenient for carrying. The numerous changes in the laws recently made both by the Dominion and Ontario Legislatures make this little work very timely, and a glance at a few of the references shows that the digest has been carefully and thoroughly compiled, a matter of no little difficulty when there is taken into consideration the number of amended statutes, not to speak of Orders in Council, suspended and re-enacted. The Ontario House has the admitted right to legislate concerning game, but with regard to the fisheries the case is different. Originally, the Provincial Legislature claimed jurisdiction over non-navigable and inland waters only, and the Dominion Parliament similarly over the greater lakes and navigable streams; but now the latter claims all rights throughout the Dominion, and the Ontario Government, in self-defence, claims all rights throughout the Province. We believe this question of jurisdiction will be settled by a test case shortly to be tried in the New Brunswick courts.

THE vacancy in the Supreme Court Bench caused by the death of Chief Justice Ritchie has not yet been filled. There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that Sir John Thompson would be a great acquisition to the court. It is said, however, that reasons of a political character prevent his retiring from public life at present. The name of Mr. Justice Strong is mentioned as the one likely to fill the vacant place. The court has not in the past commanded the confidence of the public to the extent that the court of final resort for the Dominion should. There are reasons for this quite apart from the *personnel* of the court, and it is very difficult to suggest a remedy. One defect there is, however, which could and ought to be remedied. It is most desirable that such a court should (as has before been pointed out) give its judgment *as a court*, without referring to dissenting opinions, if any such there be—in the same way as is done by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. If this should necessitate a consultation among the members of the court before the delivery of each judgment (which, as is generally supposed, is not the case at present), no harm would result.

WE fancy the conundrum propounded by Osler, J.A., in *Moore v. Jackson*, 19 A.R. 396, will set not a few members of the profession thinking. He asks: If a married woman disposes of her real estate which is not "separate estate" without her husband's concurrence, how, in the absence of some absolute ex-