

EXCHEQUER COURT OF CANADA.

By general order special sittings of this Court for the trial of cases, etc., will be holden at the following times and places, provided that same case or matter is entered for trial at least ten days before the day appointed for the sittings.

City of Ottawa	Monday, March 29th.
City of Toronto	Tuesday, April 6th.
City of Montreal.....	Tuesday, April 13th.
City of Quebec	Tuesday, April 20th.
City of Ottawa	Monday, April 26th.
City of St. John	Thursday, May 20th.
City of Halifax	Tuesday, May 25th.
City of Ottawa	Monday, June 7th.

Flotsam and Jetsam.

MARRIED WOMEN.—What are the turnings and doublings of the hare to those of a married woman with a pack of creditors after her? Now it is no property, and no contractual capacity, now restraint on anticipation, now acting as agent of her husband. The married woman in *In re Dagnall* (40 Sol. J. 731) struck out a new line which certainly exhibited genius of a high order. She had carried on business separately from her husband. She had contracted debts. She could not pay her debts. So to solve her difficulties she simply dropped her business and then she said, "Now I am not a married woman carrying on business within the meaning of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882. I did carry it on once, but I don't now, and I can't be made a bankrupt." It would have been unfortunate if this simple device had been allowed to defeat the Act, but the reasoning which the Court used to dislodge the lady from her position, viz., that a trader must be deemed to be carrying on a business so long as any debts incurred in it remain unpaid, is certainly artificial. The doctrine at all events has twice been disclaimed by the Court of Appeal under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, though it found favor under earlier Bankruptcy Acts, but in dealing with the provoking Protean evasions and subterfuges of the married woman perhaps the Court contracts a little of her unscrupulousness. She must really elect soon whether she will take the benefits and burdens of independence or of dependence. She cannot have both much longer.—*Law Quarterly*.

ERRATA.—The article on the subject of Queen's Counsel, which appeared in our last issue, was on the cover of the JOURNAL by mistake attributed to Geo. S. Holmested, Q.C. This was a two-fold mistake, as Mr. Holmested reminds us that he is not a Q.C.; and for the article in question the Editor was responsible.

A typographical error crept in (owing to the difficulty of deciphering manuscript) on p. 193, 15th line, where "three towns" is printed instead of "shire town," and in 17th line, where "district" for "distinct."