property belonging to the wife, as well as articles of personal use and adornment, and corresponded perhaps more than anything else to what we now style the wife's "separate property." By Cod. 5, 14, 8, the matter in question was dealt with as follows: "Hac lege decernimus, ut vir in his rebus quas extra dotem mulier habet, quas Graeci parapherna dicunt, nullam uxore prohibente habeat communionem; . nullo modo, muliere prohibente, virum in paraphernis se volumus immiscere." In commenting upon this provision Lord MacKenzie (Rom. Law, 6th ed., p. 107) says: "All the property of the wife not comprehended in the dowry, was called paraphernal." Again, Mr. Schouler, in his admirable work on the Domestic Relations (4th ed., p. 208), emphasizes the very distinction 11 distinction that we are here indicating between the Roman and English and English systems of jurisprudence in relation to this subject and some services and some subject and some services and some subject and som ject, and says: "The word [paraphernalia] has a more limited signification in England and America, being confined to personal necessity. sonal necessaries or ornaments, and having no possible application to real cation to real estate." These authorities (and there are others which we be which we have not space to quote) justify us in thinking that it is incorrect. it is incorrect to say that "the English law of the wife's paraphernalia is borrowed from the civil law." On the whole, however, Mr. Uttley's article is both interesting and instructive and if it ive, and if he has made one or two slips in his exposition of the law, why-Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus!

A CANADIAN BAR ASSOCIATION.

A new chapter in Canadian legal history has been opened he formation of the by the formation of the Canadian Bar Association. speak the careful attention of our readers to the constitution adopted and to 11 adopted, and to the report of the proceedings of the preliminary conference inary conference at Montreal, which appears in an appendix to this issue

The highly representative character of the attendance and the ability with which the meeting was managed, augur well for a useful future of letters from leading barristers in various parts of the province, Ontario was not an full Ontario was not so fully represented as some of the other pro-