

against the present mode of conducting such investigations. They deeply affect the morals and the best interests of that class of persons who are wealthy enough to seek for and obtain relief in circumstances which justify divorce. We need not say that, by the existing mode of proceeding in Parliament, those who are too poor to seek and pay for the ever-so-much needed relief must put up with their wrongs and bury their sorrows in some other way. This ensues simply because the Parliament of Canada has not deemed it wise to give them a relief which ought to be within their reach. They nominally possess the right to have the marital ties which bind them sundered for sufficiently grave reasons; but it is too expensive for any man of even moderate means—much more so for a woman without means—to seek to enforce that right. This thought is well expressed in an article in the *St. Thomas Daily Times*, as follows:—"Divorce is allowed to the rich and denied to the poor, and because one man has money in his purse to meet the necessary contingencies of employing counsel and of applying for an Act of Parliament by which alone, in those Provinces, divorce can be procured, he may obtain it by paying for it, whilst any other person may not do so. This state of the law is promotive of, and a direct incentive to, polygamy and immorality. A poor man in the year 1845 was convicted before the late Justice Maule of bigamy, and the absurdity of the then existing law was grimly brought out in the Judge's satire. The prisoner's wife had robbed him and ran away with another man. In passing sentence the Judge told him, 'You should have brought an action and obtained (?) damages, which the other side would not have been able to pay; and you would have had to pay your own costs, perhaps £100 or £150. You should then have gone to the ecclesiastical courts and obtained a divorce *a mensa et thoro*, and then to the House of Lords, where, having proved that these preliminaries had been complied with, you would have been enabled to be married again. The expense might amount to five or six hundred or perhaps a thousand pounds. You say you are a poor man, but I must tell you that there is not one law for the rich and another for the poor.' The trouble with the law, as it is administered by Parliament, is that although there be only one law for the rich and the poor, the remedy is placed so far above the means of the poor that they are like sheep stalled with the taller animals: they cannot reach the fodder upon which the bullocks are fed from high racks." Surely that is a one-sided, irremedial, incomplete and poorly administered law which cannot be invoked by every wronged one, man or woman, rich or poor.

Many persons have gone from Canada to the United States to take proceedings in a divorce court against a husband or a wife who lived in the Dominion, and who had never set foot on the soil of the United States or out of Canada. In one instance within the knowledge of the writer, a Canadian woman (once supposed to be a lady), whilst still living with her husband, betook herself to a Detroit divorce lawyer, a well-known affidavit broker and specialist. She retained him to procure a judicial separation *a mensa et thoro*, on account of incompatibility of temper. The papers were served on the husband just when she thought it about time to quit his house; and he, not caring enough about that kind of a wife to see a lawyer, and looking upon it as rather amusing than otherwise, let