

wife: "What is thine is mine, and what is mine is my own;" when, according to the old legal joke, in matters of property, the law regarded husband and wife as one, and the husband that one. In those days, as Earle, C.J., said in *Capel v. Powell*, in 1864, 17 C.B.N.S. 743, 748, seeing that all her property was vested in the husband, it would be idle to sue the wife alone—the action would be fruitless.

In conclusion I would submit, with all proper deference, that the Ontario Legislature, relieved as it is of many duties and functions proper to a legislature, by the Dominion Parliament, and of others by the Imperial Parliament, might do worse than appoint a Commission to take evidence and to report whether on these or any other points, our common law ought not to be altered or modified so as to make it even more worthy than it is now, of the respect in which we justly hold it.

Toronto.

A. H. F. LEFROY.

NOTES FROM THE ENGLISH INNS OF COURTS.

A PROPOSED MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

At a special general meeting of the Incorporated Law Society, which was held on January 25, 1918, the President, Mr. Samuel Garrett, took occasion to point out that a Ministry of Justice is much needed in this country. In support of this proposal he brought forward all the old arguments in favour of law reform. The following are some of the most familiar of these:—that the legal profession is out of touch with the public; that our system of legal education is defective; that legal procedure as we know it is old fashioned and cumbersome. As a first step towards the removal of all these great ills a Minister of Justice must be appointed. Such a Minister is to be wholly free from judicial duties, but in him (according to Mr. Garrett) all the patronage now wielded by the Lord Chancellor is to be vested. Space does not admit of a full presentment of the arguments *pro* and *con* this suggestion, but it may at least be pointed out that if one object of having a Ministry of Justice is to get rid of the political