

23 O.L.R. 261; *Leakim v. Leakim* (1912), 3 O.W.N. 994; *Malot v. Malot* (1913), 4 O.W.N. 1577; *Proud v. Spence* (1913), 10 D.L.R. 215; *Langworthy v. McVicar* (1914), 5 O.W.N. 767; *Hallman v. Hallman* (1914), 5 O.W.N. 976; *Reid v. Aull* (1914), 32 O.L.R. 68.

In Upper Canada (now Ontario) the laws of England of October 15, 1792, were introduced. This would not include the English Act of 1857, which enacted new substantive law and transferred cases of divorce and matrimonial causes to the newly-created Divorce Court. Hence when Upper Canada entered confederation it did not bring with it any substantive law as to divorce. Since Confederation the Dominion Parliament has as before mentioned enacted no general law as to divorce and hence it would appear that in Ontario to-day there is no substantive law in force.

If some substantive law is hereafter enacted by the Dominion Parliament for the Province of Ontario and no provision is made for the administration of same then it would seem to follow from the *Walker* and *Board* cases that the Supreme Court of that Province must adjudicate as to pleas filed under such law.

The old fashioned forum for the trial of divorce cases in this country, a Committee of the Senate of the Dominion, is entirely inadequate, unsuitable, and inconvenient, and is so expensive as to remind one of the well known sarcastic remarks of Mr. Justice Maule, when passing sentence on a man convicted of bigamy, in which he calls attention in a humorous and sarcastic manner to the hardship to which a poor man or woman is subject in seeking relief from the matrimonial tie. This unfortunate prisoner had taken to himself a wife to replace one who had deserted him, without previously obtaining a divorce, which the Judge said might have cost him the impossible sum of a thousand pounds or so. The Judge concluded his remarks as follows: "You will probably tell me that you never had a thousand farthings of your own in the world; but, prisoner, that makes no difference. Sitting here as a British Judge, it is my duty to tell you that this is not a country in which there is one law for the rich, and another for the poor."

If this jurisdiction goes from the Senate to the Courts, in Ontario and Quebec, the staffs that will have charge of these