

the Senate can possibly be, and, indeed, much more competent. It is well known that, in a body constituted as the Senate is, a certain amount of inertia must be expected; and as the sacredness of the marriage tie so deeply affects the moral, religious and social well-being of families and the peace of the home, as well as the best interests of the community, we trust that licensed polygamy may never obtain a foothold on our fair soil, as it has in some of the States of the neighbouring Republic.

We trust also, that if the Government will not now take up the problem, and deal with it in a statesmanlike manner, some private and independent member will bring in a measure to improve the present law. If there be a law at all, it should be administered in a judicial spirit. As we have insisted, the law, such as it is, as now administered, is found to be deficient, and any case which may be presented for the purpose of procuring a divorce, is neither hopeful nor hopeless. A committee is appointed on motion of a member who desires to promote the Bill. In this, as in most other cases, a strong man can have things to suit his own mind, and a rough and ready mode of dealing with the matter is pursued. This disturbs the sensibilities of those who duly appreciate the importance of the decision to be reached, whilst men who have no sensibilities are inert and apathetic.

In most of the States of the American Union a sort of licensed polygamy exists under the forms and sanction of law, and this evil our legislators in Canada may possibly take pattern from, in course of time, unless safeguards are established. These safeguards may be somewhat difficult to devise; but surely they are attainable by wise and moderate legislation, in the same way as other moral, social, and legal reforms. We may not secure all that we wish, but we obtain nothing by inaction, or by stupid conservation of haphazard, imperfect and unsatisfactory procedure. We have no hesitation in saying that, in some form, a Divorce Court should be established, or existing courts should have this jurisdiction conferred on them. This must not be for the purpose of facilitating divorce, or enlarging or extending the causes for which divorces should be granted. We hold to the scriptural rule, whatever others may hold. We trust that others will discuss this suggestion as we have endeavoured to do, upon the grounds of expediency and merit. The present mode of hearing and disposing of divorce measures is inexact and unsatisfactory, and we desire to direct attention to the absolute need which exists for rules of procedure, so that everything may be duly planned and settled in such a way as to avoid hasty, improvident, or prejudiced action.

In conclusion we may, we trust, be allowed to observe that, in the Divorce Bills of the past, no provision was made for permitting the delinquents to marry again. It has been strongly argued that, in the interests of morality, they should be allowed to do so upon the dissolution of the marriage tie.

The few discussions which have taken place on the subject of divorce in the different Church courts have not been followed by very definite action. No other Church has expressed so definite an opinion as has the Reformed Episcopal Church, which, at the meeting of its General Council, held at Philadelphia last