

---

*A FICTION OF LAW.*

In giving judgment in the recent case of *Rex v. Dibdin*, in which the effect of the Imperial statute of 1907 allowing marriage with a deceased wife's sister was in question, Lord Justice Farwell remarks: "It is to my mind so repulsive as to be inconceivable that the King, by and with the advice of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons, should have continued the declaration that such marriages are contrary to God's law as incestuous, and yet should have legalized them as regards clergy and laity alike, and authorized their solemnization in church to the desecration of the House of God." If the Act in question had in fact been passed "with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual," that fact certainly would well warrant the learned judge's opinion, but inasmuch as a matter of fact the Act was passed against the advice and without the consent of a single bishop, and on the contrary in direct opposition to the votes of the Archbishop of Canterbury and ten other bishops present, it is a mere fiction of law to describe it as being enacted "with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual." In the interests of truth would it not be better that even Acts of Parliament should not be made to bear on their face what is nothing less than a falsehood?