solemnisation of marriage is left exclusively to the Provincial Legislatures. When the Confederation Resolutions were under discussion, in the old Canadian Parliament, the language was not the same; there was no grant of power to the Local Legislatures in reference to the solemnisation of marriage. Some anxiety being felt in reference to this subject, enquiries were made of the Government, and the hon the Minister of Public Works, then Solicitor-General, gave, on behalf of the Government, the following explanations:—

"The word 'Marriage' has been placed in the drat of the proposed Constitution, to invest the Federal Parliament with the right of declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the Confederacy, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rights of the religious creeds to which the contracting parties may belong."

He proceeded to declare that the whole effect of the clause was to give power to decide that marriages contracted in any one Province, according to the laws of that Province, should be valid in the other Provinces, : hough their laws might be different, in case the parties came to reside there; .nd again he stated that when a marriage is contracted in any Province, contrary to its laws, though in conformity with the laws of another Province, it will not be considered valid. He subsequently assured the House that the resolutions contained only the principle of the Bill to be carried in the Imperial Parliament, which would be drawn up in accordance with the interpretation he had already put upon the clause. Mr. Dorion asked:

"Will a Local Legislature have the right of declaring a marriage between parties not professing the same religious belief invalid?"

Attorney-General Cartier replied:

"Has not the Legislature of Canada now the power of legislating in that matter, and yet has it ever thought of legislating in that way?"

Such was the explanation at time given, from which it is obvious that a very limited power was intended to be conferred on this Parliament. The British North America Act passed, and subsequently, in the year 1869, with reference to a Bill of one of the Local Legislatures,

solemnisation of marriage is left exclusively to the Provincial Legislatures. When the Confederation Resolutions were under discussion, in the old Canadian Parliament, the language was not the same; there was no grant of power to the local Legislatures in reference to the for conferring upon the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province the power to issue marriage licenses, in his report upon that Bill, the then Minister of Justice Parliament, the language was not the pointed out that two questions arose. The same; there was no grant of power to the licenses, in his report upon that Bill, the then Minister of Justice same; there was no grant of power to the licenses, in his report upon that Bill, the then Minister of Justice same; there was no grant of power to the licenses.

"The second question as to where the power of legislation on the subject rests has excited much interest in Canana, and conflicting opinions exist with respect to it. The power given to the Local Legislatures to legislate on the solemnisation of marriage was, it is understood, inserted in the A t at the instance of the representatives of L wer Canada, who, as Roman Catholics, desired to guard against the passage of an Act legalizing civil marriages without the intervention of a clergy man and the performance of the religious rite. They therefore desired that the Legislature of each Prov nce should deal with the portion of the law of marriage. The Act must, however, of course, be construed according to its terms, and not according to the assumed intention of its frame s. The undersigned is of opinion that the right to legislate respecting the authority to marry, whether by publication of banus, by license, or by episcopal dispensation, is part of the general law of marriage, respecting which the Parliament of Canada has exclusive jurisdiction. The publica ion of banus, or the leense, as the case may be, is no part of the sciencisation, it is merely the authority to solemnise. The solemnisation is n t commenced by the issue of the license or the publication of the banns; all the English Marriage Acts treat tue authority, and the solemnisation, under the authority, as quite different matters. Thus, it is provided, in Geo., IV. chap 76, sections 9 and 19, that 'Whenever a marriage shall not be had within three months after publication of banns, or the granting of license, no minister shall proceed to the solemni ation of such marriage until a new license shall have been obtained, or a new publication of banus had, and, b. the 21st acction, the solemnisation of marr ages without due publication of banns, or l.cense of marriage, is made a felony. In order to convict a person under this clause, it must be alleged and proved that the s. lemis ation was not only c mmenced, but completed, and, if the license or banns were a nece-sary portion of the solemnisation, the offence would never be completed without them. The subsequent Marriage Acts seem to draw the same distinction between the authority and the solemnisation. The u dersigned is there ore of opinion that this reserved Act is beyond the jurisdiction of the Local Legisla ure, should not receive the a-sent of Your Excellency. As the subject is one of the very gr atest importance, affecting the validity of mar-ria es, post and future, the unders gu d would suggest that the olonial Minister be requested to submit the two questions above raised to the Law Officers of the Crown for their opinion.

That opinion was given, and it is reported, as follows:—