

There is difficulty in dealing with the last two classes. Applicants may desire to take advantage of or avoid some special provisions of the Dominion or Provincial Acts, and there must necessarily be an overlapping of the jurisdiction in such cases. The only rule for guidance should be from a fair construction of the objects of the company. Is it intended or not at the time of incorporation that it should do business in more than one province? With respect to licensing, the first and third class should have a provincial statutory license and in all other cases the provinces should have discretion in licensing.

As in most cases, there are two sides to the question discussed in the above article. It is from the pen of an occasional contributor, than whom there is no one better qualified to discuss the subject. His leanings are in favour of more power being vested in provincial governments in reference to the incorporation of companies and their jurisdiction and control. We are not at present prepared to express an opinion on the subject; and would like to hear what may be said by those who would prefer that the federal government should have more ample control in the premises.

BREACH OF PROMISE OF MARRIAGE.

Mr. Justice Bigham, in charging the jury in an action for breach of promise of marriage, very tersely stated the law which nearly thirty years ago was subjected to the philosophic criticisms of Sir Henry James (Lord James of Hereford) in debate in the House of Commons. "This young man," said Mr. Justice Bigham, "has changed his mind. In the affairs of love it is often so, but according to our law the girl is entitled to damages." Speaking in debate on a motion proposed by Mr. Herschell (Lord Chancellor Herschell) in the House of Commons on the 6th May, 1879, in favour of the abolition of the action for breach of promise of marriage, Lord James said:—"The learned Solicitor-General (Sir H. Giffard, Lord Chancellor Halsbury)