scholars in despite of the methods under which they were bred to the Bar. There are many of the profession who say that this decadence is a mere phase of modernity which the law is passing through in common with other branches of human activity—in other words, an exploitation of the paradoxical "Art for Art's sake only" formula. But as the sole art which the average latter-day lawyer has any desire to become familiar with is the seductive art of money-getting, we profoundly suspect that his adhesion to it will wax rather than wane as the years go by. Will the mental and moral regimen of the new law schools, as at present constituted, be capable of combating this evil for the younger generation and endue them not only with sound scholarship, but also with a due sense of the august responsibilities of the legal calling? We trow not.

DOWER IN EQUITABLE ESTATES.

The Common Law as to dower was on the whole tolerably simple and easily understood, but the statutory alterations in the law which have been from time to time made in Ontario, have in some respects created difficulties which are not very easily solved.

At Common Law the right of dower only existed in regard to lands of which the husband was legally seized in fee. It did not attach therefore on any equitable estate. This was considered to be a hardship on the wife, and in the days before it was so widely considered as it is to-day, that the right of dower is altogether an anomalous right, and one which should be abolished altogether, and in lieu thereof a definite proportion of the husband's estate allotted to his widow, it was deemed advisable to extend the widow's right of dower to her husband's equitable estates. But it was thought that the Common Law rule which enabled a widow to claim dower in all the lands of which her husband had at any time during the coverture been seized, and in which she had not barred her dower, ought not to be extended to equitable estates, and so it was provided that her right to