

marriages are hereby declared to be legal and valid";—which was negatived on division by 87 to 49. The Bill was then read a third time, and passed. As finally adopted, the measure reads as follows:—

"1. All laws prohibiting marriage between a man and the sister of his deceased wife are hereby repealed, both as to past and future marriages and as regards past marriages, as if such laws had never existed.

"2. This act shall not affect in any manner any case decided by or pending before any court of justice, nor shall it affect any rights actually acquired by the issue of the first marriage previous to the passing of this act, nor shall this act affect any such marriage when either of the parties has afterwards, during the life of the other, lawfully intermarried with any other person."

THE SUPREME COURT BILL.

The following are the provisions of the Supreme Court bill introduced in the Senate by the Minister of Justice:—

1. For the purpose of hearing and determining cases of the class hereinafter described of appeals from the Province of Quebec, the Supreme Court shall call to its assistance two "judges in aid," who shall be judges either of the Court of Queen's Bench or of the Superior Court of that Province, and who shall, for all the purposes of such appeals, have the like powers and duties as are possessed and discharged by the ordinary judges of the Supreme Court, and shall take, *mutatis mutandis*, the like oath regarding the discharge of the duties of office.

2. The Chief Justice and the other judges of the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province of Quebec, and the Chief Justice and five of the *puisse* judges of the Superior Court for the same Province, to be selected by the Governor-in-Council, shall be "judges in aid" to the Supreme Court of Canada, and commissions under the great seal shall issue to them as such.

3. The twelve "judges in aid" to the Supreme Court shall be placed upon a roster by the Chief Justices of the Queen's Bench and Superior Court, so as to place them in six divisions of two each—the two Chief Justices not being of the same division—and upon a warrant from the Supreme Court, under its seal, the two

Chief Justices shall assign for duty, at each succeeding sessions of the said court, two or four of the said "judges in aid" who have not heard, in any of the courts below, the cases coming within the class herein described, in which appeals are set down for argument at the then next sessions of the Supreme Court.

4. Two or four of the "judges in aid" so chosen shall attend the then next sessions of the Supreme Court, if any cases of the class hereinafter described shall be set down for argument at such sessions, and two of them shall sit with the judges of the Supreme Court and hear and determine, with equal voice, all cases in appeal from the Province of Quebec coming within the class hereafter described, and such "judges in aid" for each sessions of the Supreme Court so attended by them, including the determining of the cases then heard with their assistance, shall be paid the sum of \$300.

5. In every case of appeal from the judgment of any court in the Province of Quebec, a preliminary summary examination of the pleadings and papers in appeal shall be made by the Supreme Court, without argument or the hearing of counsel, and if the Court shall declare, by certificate under its seal, that the appeal is one the decision of which must be governed by, and adjudged according to, laws which are peculiar to the Province of Quebec, as distinguished from those of the other provinces of the Dominion, the case shall be deemed to be one coming within the class which may be heard under the special provisions herein enacted, and shall be heard and determined as herein provided.

6. The judges of the Supreme Court shall have power to make such rules as may be necessary for giving effect to the provisions of this Act, and from time to time to vary the same, and if necessary to make new and additional rules.

NOTES OF CASES.

SUPERIOR COURT.

MONTREAL, February 28, 1882.

Before JOHNSON, J.

MORSE v. MARTIN.

Trade-Mark—Registration—42 Vict. c. 22.

Held, that a person who had obtained a trade-mark in the United States in 1870, but who did not