

reference to the husband, both in the wife's lifetime, and also in case of her death, there are few cases in which they would really choose to intermarry, and fewer still in which, after having children of her own, she would be better than any other step-mother to her nephews and nieces. So also, with reference to the other marriage intended to be legalised, the presence of a younger brother in the household, may not then be so satisfactory as it is now. The husband is much occupied with his profession or his business, anxiously providing for his family, while the younger brother, being much more free, is useful and attentive, and a pleasant companion to the wife. This is a happy, unobjectional state of things, so long as he can only be a brother, but admit the possibility of marriage after the husband's death, and, human nature being what it is, there will probably, in the course of time, be some feelings of jealousy and suspicion in the husband, more especially in case of ill health. There are probably few husbands whose happiness will be increased by the knowledge that their widows may be married to their brothers.

In the Bill now before Parliament there is a proviso that must certainly be condemned, when fully considered, for it makes the legality of the marriage depend upon the action of parties external to the Parliament. If these marriages should unhappily be legalized, it is but just to exempt from any obligation to celebrate them, ministers, who could not do so without transgressing the laws of the body whereof they are officers; and it is always in the power of any body of Christians to say to its members, you must not take advantage of this law, without a dispensation from us, and we shall refuse to celebrate your marriage without it. But suppose a mixed marriage, where one of the parties is a Roman Catholic, or a marriage of Roman Catholics by a minister of another Church, is the marriage to be invalid because such dispensation has not been obtained? There are several supposable cases, in which this proviso will occasion confusion and uncertainty, and the Legislature might as well undertake to determine what ceremonial shall be essential to the validity of a marriage, in any branch of the Church, as to require the grant of a dispensation as a condition thereof under any circumstances. Moreover, such a proviso in favor of *one* Church is a violation of the principle of religious equity.

Lastly, I cannot understand on what plea legislation of so great importance to the whole community can be justified, without allowing due time for ascertaining the sentiments of the people generally. The seat of Legislation is so far removed from the Maritime Provinces that they are placed at a great disadvantage. In England, what is spoken in London is scattered in print over the whole Kingdom, within a few hours; but here those living at any considerable distance from the Capital know nothing more of the speeches and arguments in Parliament than the contents of a few brief telegrams; and full time should be allowed them to obtain information, and to make known their wishes by petitions, or through their representatives. One of these changes peculiarly affects the happiness of women, and in England they have numerously opposed it, and time should be allowed for obtaining their petitions here, and