

Bar. This memorial commences by alleging that in the past, judicial "appointments to the High Court Bench in the Province of Ontario have been merited by previous distinction at the Bar, and without regard to any consideration other than the public interests." Whilst we doubt whether this statement can be said to be entirely accurate, it is, in the main, correct; and as it was a politic introduction to the petition of the memorial we do not quarrel with it. The memorial then proceeds as follows:

"Your signatories wish to express to you, as First Minister among his Excellency's advisers, their hope and trust that when the present or other vacancies upon the Ontario Bench come to be filled, the Government will not depart from the traditions surrounding this high office in the past, but will continue to deserve the confidence of the people by selecting for such exalted positions men of standing and of eminence in the profession, without attaching any weight to other considerations which may be urged."

The occasion of the presentation of this memorial was opportune, as the Premier had, during his recent visit to Toronto, at the dinner of the Osgoode Legal Literary Society, been saying highly complimentary things of the Bench and Bar of Ontario, evincing a knowledge that there is no dearth of good material in this Province to fill vacancies on the Bench. In his reply, the Minister said that he and his Government heartily assented to the principles laid down in the memorial, and that there would be no departure from the practice of the past. There may be those who doubt whether the few courteous remarks expressed in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's peculiarly happy and captivating manner really mean very much, or whether his own desire in the matter may not be over-borne by the supposed necessities of party politics. So far as we are concerned, however, we shall loyally hold to the hope, and shall expect, that the promise thus given, will be redeemed in a manner satisfactory both to the Bar and to the country.

MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY.

Barrett v. Howard, 83 L.T. 301, recently decided by the English Court of Appeal, reveals an apparent defect in the English Married Women's Property Act, 1893. That Act was apparently passed to advance the rights of creditors against married women. By section 1 it provided "that every contract thereafter entered into