formed by an unauthorized officiator; and the marriage thus voidable can be rendered void by proceedings commenced and persevered in within a reasonable time after the ceremony—which was done in the particular case under consideration.

RICHARD JOHN WICKSTEED.

Ottawa, December, 1889.

[We publish the above as the subject is interesting. As to whether he is right in his contention, we give no opinion. He may be, but we cannot say that we agree with all the lines of argument he advances.—ED. C.L.J.]

Notes on Exchanges and Legal Scrap Book.

CHANCELLOR KENT.—He was one of the many distinguished sons of Yale, where he graduated in 1781. After graduating, the future Chancellor began reading law with Egbert Benson, then Attorney-General, and afterwards one of the judges of the Supreme Court of New York; but law was not his only reading. All good reading became a ruling passion, varied by extensive studies in the ancient and modern classics.

Taking his degree of Master of Arts in course, in September, 1784, he was admitted an attorney of the Supreme Court in January, 1785, and the following April married happily and settled in Poughkeepsie, then a mere country village.

In 1787, the great political events of the time called for a decision in his mind of the federal question, with the decided result of his embracing those principles adorned by Jay, Hamilton, and other eminent men of that party. It has been noticed that of all graduates of Yale who have lived in the history of their times, none have fallen under the charge of lukewarmness or indecision; it does not seem to be in the atmosphere of those college elms. This was as true of Calhoun as of Evarts, of Kent as of Waite. This is testified to by the universal use of the first volume of Kent's Commentaries, published after nearly forty years' belief in the principles which are to-day styled National.

As an example of the polished yet forcible style of his celebrated Commentaries, we extract the following passages on the powers and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court (Vol. I., 296):—

"The judicial power in every government must be co-extensive with the power of legislation. It follows, as a consequence, that the judicial department of the United States is, in the last resort, the final expositor of the Constitution as to all questions of a judicial nature. Were there no power to interpret, pronounce, and execute the law, the government would either perish through its own imbecility, as was the case with the articles of confederation, or other powers must be assumed by the legislative body, to the destruction of liberty.

"That the interpretation of treaties, and the cases of foreign ministers, and maritime matters, are properly confided to the federal courts, appears from the close connection those cases have with the peace of the Union, the confusion