

Canada Law Journal.

VOL. XXI.

NOVEMBER 1, 1885.

No. 19.

DIARY FOR NOVEMBER.

1. Sun.....2nd Sunday after Trinity. All Saints' Day.
3. Tues.....Draper, C.J., died, 1877.
4. Wed.....First Intermediate Examination.
5. Thur.....Sir John Colborne, Lieut.-Gov. U. C., 1838.
6. Fri.....Second Intermediate Examination.
8. Sun.....23rd Sunday after Trinity.
9. Mon.....Prince of Wales born, 1841.
10. Tues.....Court of Appeal Sittings. Solicitors' Exam.
11. Wed.....Barristers' Examination.

TORONTO, NOVEMBER 1, 1885.

A NEW batch of Queen's Counsel for Ontario has been announced, though not yet gazetted. This has created no interest in professional circles, and has been received almost without comment. This may be rather hard on the very few of the appointees who are properly entitled to the distinction, but is the necessary consequence of the broadcast distribution of what was once an honour, but now appears to be the result of the "fortuitous concurrence" of some circumstances quite unconnected with professional position, seniority in the ranks, or otherwise.

THE case of *Turnbull v. Forman*, 15 Q. B. D. 234, noted *ante*, p. 329, has been followed, it will be observed, by O'Connor, J., in *Scott v. Wye*, also noted *ante*, p. 339. *Cameron v. Rutherford*, 10 P. R. 620, is therefore overruled, and the law must be taken to be settled, at all events for the present, that contracts made by a married woman prior to 25th March, 1884, only bind the separate property which she had at the date when the contract was made, and which she continues to have when judgment is recovered against her, according to the rule laid down in *Pike v. Fitzgibbon*.

THE law relating to married women's rights of property is full of surprises. We had confidently hoped and believed that the efforts of the Legislature had at last conferred upon married women as full control over their property as it was possible for the Legislature to give them. Our hopes and expectations are, however, apparently doomed to disappointment. It appears, according to the view of Pearson, J., in *Re Shakspear, Deakin v. Lakin*, 53 L. T. N. S. 145, that a married woman has now less power over property in which she has an absolute interest, contingent on her surviving her husband, than she has over property in possession, which is by statute declared to be her separate property. Under a marriage settlement executed in 1843 between Mr. and Mrs. Shakspear, a life policy was transferred by the husband to the trustees upon trust to receive and invest the money and pay the income to Mrs. Shakspear and her assigns during her natural life, in case she should survive her husband, and for her sole and separate use and benefit during her life in case she should marry again; and after her death in trust for the children of the marriage as tenants in common. Two children were born of the marriage, both of whom died intestate and unmarried. Mr. and Mrs. Shakspear on 7th Oct., 1884, executed an assignment of all their interest in the policy to Mr. Edward Deakin. The surviving trustee having refused to transfer the policy under this deed, the question was submitted to Pearson, J., whether Mrs. Shakspear was able to execute a valid assignment of her interest in the policy, and he held that she was not. He says: "At the present moment the life interest