

sonal property—"As if this Act had not been passed"—is not, as we suggested, that it is to pass wholly to her husband, but that it is now governed by R.S.O., c. 108, s. 5. It is possible that our correspondents may be right in this contention. At the same time, we are disposed to think that neither of them have given sufficient attention to an important difference which we pointed out which exists between the two sections. One, R.S.O., c. 108, s. 5, is a provision affecting "the real and personal property of a married woman"; the other, R.S.O., c. 132, s. 23, relates to "the *separate personal property* of a married woman." It is apparently assumed by our correspondents that the "personal property" and "separate personal property" are equivalent expressions; but we think the many decisions under the Married Woman's Property Acts, both here and in England, have decided that there is a very material distinction. It is only necessary to refer to the late case of *Crowe v. Adams*, 21 S.C.R. 342, to see this. The question is how would "separate personal property" pass if R.S.O., c. 132, had not passed? We still think it would devolve on the surviving husband. Our correspondents say "No," because R.S.O., c. 108, s. 5, provides that her husband is to have one half, and, subject thereto, it is to go "as if her husband had predeceased her." To which we reply that that section applies to "real and personal property," but not to "*separate personal property*," which the Legislature has made a distinct class of itself. However, we very gladly publish our correspondents' letters, and must leave our readers to form their own conclusions.

---

IF there is one building more than another of which the people of this Province have cause to be proud of, it is, we think, Osgoode Hall. The central part, with its chaste and classic beauty, is the admiration of all who see it, and certainly one would never expect to see a building of this character permitted to go to ruin for want of the most ordinary attention. If the Province were bankrupt, one could understand the state of affairs; but it is too bad, with a copious supply of funds in the Treasury and an army of skilful workmen only too ready for a job, that a building of this kind should be permitted to suffer injury for want of necessary repairs. Owing to the defective