to say the least, is not judicial. It is moreover an abnormally costly mode of administering justice, which ought not to be resorted to, except in cases of absolute necessity, and from a legal point of view it would be far better for Parliament, if it intends to sanction the principle of dissoluble marriages as opposed to Christian marriage, that it should commit to constituted Courts the power to dissolve them, and make throughout Canada the causes for dissolution uniform.

That some matrimonial jurisdiction should be conferred on the Courts of Ontario and Quebec seems obviously necessary. They should certainly be empowered within proper limits to grant sentences of nullity: but with all due deference to the opinion of others to the contrary we venture to doubt whether the conferring any jurisdiction to grant divorces *à vinculo* is necessary or expedient.

How far it is expedient that Quebec Courts should exercise what is a really divorce jurisdiction under the specious pretence of sentences of nullity, seems deserving of consideration. Only recently a marriage by an Anglican priest was declared by a civil Court to be null because one of the parties happened to be a Roman Catholic, notwithstanding s. 129 of the Code, expressly declares "All priests, rectors, ministers and other officers authorized by law to keep registers of acts of civil status are competent to solemnize marriage."

Such apparent judicial aberrations however may possibly be corrected by appeal, but in such cases appeals are not likely, because, as a rule, both parties are desirous of the dissolution of their marriage. In the meantime such divorces appear to be illegal, and a prostitution of justice.

WHENCE CAME THE COMMON LAW INTO CANADA?

The general impression is that the Common Law was introduced into Canada in 1763 by the Treaty of Paris, when Canada (as then known) and Nova Scotia and Cape Breton were ceded to England by France. To understand what we are about to relate it is necessary to recall some history. Nova Scotia and Cape