

The time will soon come for meetings of Bar Associations, notably the Canadian Bar Association, the American Bar Association, and the International Law Association. The American Association is to hold its twenty-second annual meeting in Buffalo on August 28th, continuing for three days. In the latter part of the same week the International Association will meet. It is expected that these two important organizations will bring together an unusually large body of lawyers, statesmen, and professors of jurisprudence from all parts of the world, and their proceedings will doubtless be of great interest. The place of meeting, moreover, is conveniently close to the chief city of the most populous province of the Dominion. We notice that the Hon. Joseph H. Choate, United States ambassador to England, is president of the American Bar Association for the coming year, and it is hoped that he will be present. A writer in the *Albany Law Journal* enlarges upon the practical utility of Bar Associations, and makes out a strong case in favour of their support by the profession. In speaking of the New York State Bar Association, he says that it has exerted a powerful and beneficial influence on the profession, on legislation, on codification, on constitutional amendments, and in causing the profession of objectionable members. We may add that everything that tends to unify the profession and increase its esprit de corps should be encouraged, and these associations should be a powerful factor in this direction.

In the recent case of *Wright v. McCabe*, 30 O.R. 390, it is laid down by MacMahon, J., at p. 396, that the obligation of a father to maintain his infant children is only a moral one at common law. If the common law imposes no such duty, then no legal duty to support his children rests upon a father unless imposed by some statute. No such statute appears to have been passed in Ontario, and, therefore, so far as Ontario is concerned, no such legal liability exists, if the law be as laid down by MacMahon, J. But if that is so, what becomes of the Cr. Code s. 210, which provides that "every one who as a parent, guardian, or head of a family, is under a legal duty to provide necessaries for any child under the age of sixteen years, is criminally responsible for omitting, without lawful excuse, to do so," etc., etc., if the death of such child is caused, or his life or health is endangered by the omission. As far