Marriage Laws, and the result was the bringing in of a Bill in the Commons by Mr. Stuart Wortley. The second reading was carried on the 20th June, 1849, by 177 to 143, but the Bill did not reach the third reading. In 1850, Mr. Stuart Wortley's Bill was again brought before the Commons and passed by 144 to 134. In 1851, the question was raised in the Lords by Lord St. Germans, but his Bill was lost by 50 to 16. In 1855, the same Bill was presented to the Commons, where it reached the second reading by 164 to 157; but in the following year it was again rejected by the Lords, 43 to 19. In 1858, Lord Bury introduced the Bill before the Commons, where it was passed by 100 to 70, but the Lords rejected it, 46 to 22. In 1859, the same result was obtained. During the years 1861, 1862, 1866 and 1869, the Commons sided with the Lords, and in every instance rejected the Bill. Public opinion, however, did not support the action of the Parliament. Petitions from the people, boroughs and corporations poured in, and finally, in 1870, Mr. Chambers's Bill, which had been withdrawn in 1869, was carried unopposed, and in Committee was adopted by 184 to 114. The Lords rejected it, 77 to 73. In 1872 and 1873, the same course was followed with the same result. But in 1875, Sir T. Chambers's Bill received a check in the Commons. The second reading was negatived by 171 to 142. Finally, in 1879, the Bill was again introduced in the Lords by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, and was rejected by 101 to 81. The laws in England, therefore, stand as they were laid down by William IV in 1835, the marriage with the sister of a deceased wife being not only voidable, but void, and such is the law in all the British Colonies settled since that time. I believe Manitoba and British Columbia are among these. The Statutes of Henry VIII which declares such marriages only voidable, applied to the Colonies settled before, as the Provinces of Ontario, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, etc.

"It cannot be doubted" said Vice-Chancellor Esten in the Ontario Case of Hodgins vs. McNeil, "that the marriage in question in this case was unlawful, and void at the time of its celebration, and could have been annulled by the sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court at any time during the lifetime of both parties."

We were told last Session during the debate on the Campbell Relief Bill that no Ecclesiastical Court exists in Ontario. However, this would only involve a difficulty of procedure, which can be solved by an Ontario attorney, and it remains certain that under the laws of Ontario the validity of the marriage with the sister of a deceased wife may be questioned and set aside during the lifetime of the parties; and it may be a doubtful point, not to say more, whether in British Columbia and Manitoba such validity may not be questioned even after death. In the Province of Quebec, until the promulgation of the Civil Code, in 1866, these marriages were tolerated, and among Catholics they were altogether left to the discretion of the Church, which, as in England before the Reformation, grants dispensation from the impediment of affinity. But article 125 of the Code says:

"In the collateral line, marriage is prohibited between brother and sister, legitimate or natural, and between those connected in the same degree by alliance, whether they are legitimate or natural."

It is not, therefore, surprising that the question under consideration should have attracted public attention, as well in the Colonies as in the Mother Country. South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania, New South Wales, Queensland, and Western Australia have passed Acts legalising these marriages. A Bill of the same nature has passed the Lower House of New Zealand, and twice that of Natal. At the Cape of Good Hope such marriages are valid if celebrated under dispensation from the Governor. When the Bill was moved in the House of Lords last year by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, the progress it had made was reviewed. One of its ablest advocates, Lord Houghton, said:

"At home the question has made great progress, especially in Scotland and Ireland. I remember the time when only three representatives from Scotland could be counted in support of the Bill, but now you have the important petitions from the Convention of Royal Burghs, representing sixty municipalities, which I present to-night, as well as many representative petitions from other municipalities not included in the Convention. The Magistrates and Town Council of Edinburgh recently agreed by a majority of 24 to 12 to petition in support of the