the matter go by default. In due time a decree was taken out and served upon him. Divorced after that form and fashion, they thereafter separated, and each mated with a more congenial, but equally easy-going, companion.

In the case of Susan Ash, already mentioned, a few more votes would have established the doctrine that these decrees of United States and other foreign courts, purporting to divorce British subjects married and residing in Canada, were binding upon our tribunals, and in every way valid. The temper of the Committee before which this case came, and the tenor of its discussions, were such that but a few more votes would have disposed of it in such a way as to go to the very tap-root of all morality and establish a doctrine most dangerous to our social well-being. The effect of such a decision would have been that, as in the case of the woman mentioned before, people dissatisfied with their spouses might pop over the lines, be divorced, and come back ready to marry (?) again.

We again quote from the article already referred to:—"We admit that this question is surrounded by difficulties, as a social question generally is; and, as a religious question, we find that all Parliamentary and judicial separations granted by civil tribunals are opposed by one denomination of Christians, whose members in the Legislature invariably vote against every divorce bill; but when in point of fact bills of this character pass almost every session of the Legislature, as the statute books show they do, we do not see why one set of persons should be denied or debarred from the remedy or relief of a social wrong any more than should another set. It has resolved itself into a sort of class legislation, as we view it from its results. If the Roman Catholic Church will not sanction divorces granted by a civil tribunal, or by that highest court, the Parliament of the land, it surely has a right to confine its voice to, or exercise its veto upon, Roman Catholic marriages, or marriages celebrated by Roman Catholic clergymen. We suggest, too, that if the Senate of Canada is to continue exercising the functions of a court of divorce for people who are suffering from social grievances and that form of family affliction for which divorces should be granted, the wronged ones, if necessity requires it, should have the power of petitioning Parliament *in forma pauperis*, or of showing that they have not the means of prosecuting or proving the case in the ordinary way, and praying that the evidence may be taken before a judge in the place or places where the facts are known or where the parties reside, under commission, to be returned to the Senate, and that the return of the facts made by the Judge should be taken and read in all respects the same as if they had been proven before the Parliament itself."

We insist, however, that, as these measures of relief cause inevitable divisions, and always result in votes adverse to the religious principles and scruples of the minority, it would be far better that all proceedings in divorce should cease at once and forever, or that the law of divorce should be settled and dealt with definitively. To that end a well-considered and final procedure should be adopted. The existing courts, which possess the power to settle rights of property and to determine questions of alimony, legitimacy and lunacy, as well as the care and guardianship of minors and infants, must be as competent to deal with and administer the law of divorce as any casual committee of