

the system of Private Bill legislation in contra-distinction to that of the general Act. It is because I believe the latter system is prejudicial to the public interest, and that the efficiency of the Joint Stock Act is dependent largely on our paying strict regard to its provisions, that I have thought proper to make these observations.

Mr. POPE (Compton). I am satisfied that the hon. member for West Durham is entirely wrong in his contention. No doubt we have a general law, but that is no reason why a company which is incorporated under the general Act should not come before the House with a Private Bill, and ask hon. members to consider whether they should not receive greater powers.

Mr. GAULT. I hope the Bill will be allowed to go to a second reading. A point had already been considered in regard to the election of directors, the majority of the stock being now held by foreigners, and, therefore, there can be no objection to the Bill going to the second reading, and being referred to the Private Bills Committee.

Bill read the second time.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

House resumed consideration of Bill (No. 9) concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister.—(Mr. Girouard, Jacques Cartier.)

Amendment (Mr. Amyot) negatived on a division.

Sir ALBERT J. SMITH moved that the amendment be not now considered, but that it be considered this day six months.

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

- | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Amyot, | Daly, | McQuade, |
| Blake, | Elliott, | Montplaisir, |
| Boulton, | Farrow, | Mousseau, |
| Bourbeau, | Fiset, | Olivier, |
| Brecken, | Hackett, | Quimet, |
| Brooks, | Kirkpatrick, | Patterson (Essex), |
| Bunting, | Langevin, | Pope (Compton), |
| Caron, | Lantier, | Smith, |
| Charlton, | McDonald (C. Breton), | Thompson, |
| Cimon (Charlevoix), | McDonald (Vic. N.S.), | Tyrwhitt, |
| Cimon (Chicoutimi), | MacDonnell (Inv'ness), | Weldon, and |
| Coughlin, | McQuaig, | Yeo.—36. |

NAYS:
Messieurs

- | | | |
|---------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| Arkell, | Geoffrion, | Mongenais, |
| Bain, | Gigault, | Muttart, |
| Beaty, | Gillies, | Ogden, |
| Beauchesne, | Gillmor, | Orton, |
| Bécharde, | Girouard (Jac. Cartier), | Pickard, |
| Benoit, | Grandbois, | Pinsonneault, |
| Bergeron, | Guillet, | Platt, |
| Bill, | Gunn, | Poupore, |
| Bolduc, | Guthrie, | Reid, |
| Bourassa, | Haddow, | Richey, |
| Bowell, | Hay, | Rinfret, |
| Brown, | Hesson, | Robertson (Hamilton), |
| Bunster, | Holton, | Robertson (Shelburne), |
| Burpee (Sunbury), | Hooper, | Rogers, |
| Cameron (Huron), | Houde, | Ross (Dundas), |
| Cameron (Victoria), | Hurteau, | Ross (Middlesex), |
| Carling, | Irvine, | Rouleau, |
| Cartwright, | Ives, | Routhier, |
| Casgrain, | Killam, | Royal, |
| Cockburn, | Kilvert, | Ryan (Marquette), |
| Colby, | King, | Ryan (Montreal), |
| Costigan, | Kranz, | Rymal, |
| Coupal, | Landry, | Seriver, |
| Coursol, | Lane, | Skirner, |
| Currier, | Longley, | Snowball, |
| Cuthbert, | Macdonald (Kings), | Sproule, |
| Desaulniers, | Mackenzie, | Strange, |
| Desjardins, | Macmillan, | Sutherland, |
| Doull, | McCallum, | Tellier, |
| Drew, | McCarthy, | Tilley, |
| Dugas, | McDougald, | Trow, |
| Dumont, | McLennan, | Wade, |

Ferguson,
Fitzsimmons,
Fleming,
Fortin,
Fulton,
Gault,

McRory,
Malouin,
Manson,
Massue,
Merner,
Méthot,

Wallace (Norfolk),
Wheler,
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings), and
Wiser.—113.

Mr. STRANGE. I think it very unfortunate that this Bill should have been altered from what it was in 1878. It now makes no mention of the marriage between a woman and the brother of her deceased husband. I cannot find any objection to such marriage. I move, therefore, that the amendments to the Bill be not now considered, but that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole, with instructions to strike out all the words after "deceased wife," and substitute the following: "And between the woman and the brother of her deceased husband are hereby repealed, and such marriages are hereby declared legal and valid."

Mr. GIROUARD. I agree with the principle of the amendment, but that portion of the Bill of 1880 was left out to meet the views of some members of the Senate. For that reason it is important, if we wish the Bill to pass the other House, that the amendment of my hon. friend should not be accepted.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot quite agree with the view of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. I voted for the amendment to strike out that clause the last time, but I cannot agree that we ought to pass the Bill precisely in the form in which it is acceptable to the Senate. The Senate can alter the Bill to please themselves and send it back to us; but to tell us that we must pass the Bill in a form we do not approve of or they will throw it out, is to tell us what I do not think is correct. I intend, at all events, to vote against the amendment, because I think the Bill, though a bad one as it stands, is better than if amended in the direction proposed.

Amendment (Mr. Strange) negatived on a division.

Mr. McCUAIG. I am opposed to this Bill altogether. It is contrary to the law of the Empire. Under the English law, two British subjects, if they leave for the United States or Canada, or any part of the world, for the purpose of evading the law of England on this question, the issue of that marriage is considered in England illegitimate, and cannot inherit title or property. I think, as we are a dependency of that Empire, our laws should be made to meet theirs. No man has a right to marry his deceased wife's sister when he knows very well that in the Empire itself the children of that union are illegitimate. The law is so particular that, although a person may marry in the United States, the issue of that marriage is considered in England illegitimate, as far as inheritance is concerned, and I think no man has a right to place that stigma on his children. I move that the Bill, as amended, be not now taken into consideration, but be recommitted to the Committee of the Whole House, for the purpose of amending the same by adding the following proviso:—

"Provided that no clergyman or minister of the Gospel, authorized by law to perform the ceremony of marriage, shall be obliged to perform such ceremony if the woman is the sister of the former wife of the man to whom she desires to be married."

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would suggest that the hon. member for Prince Edward get married to the hon. member for Halifax. The hon. gentleman speaks of the law of the Empire. There is no such law in existence. He speaks as if this were a new question, when he ought to know this marriage is legal in the Australian colonies, that opinions are almost equally divided in England on the question, and that an overwhelming majority of our people are in favor of removing the unjust restrictions now existing; and the remarks he made are not complimentary to hundreds of thousands of people in England who have contracted such marriages and who are as respectable as any members

of this House. The motion is absurd as well as wrong. We have no business whatever to direct a minister what to do or to prescribe the duties of clergymen. That rests entirely with the Local Legislatures. The motion is entirely out of order in proposing to do what the Act of Union declares we have no right to do.

Mr. McCUAIG. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that it is not the law in England, that if a man contracts such a marriage in the colonies, the issue is considered illegitimate as far as inheritance is concerned.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong.

Amendment (Mr. McCuaig) negatived on a division, and the main motion agreed to.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier) moved that the Bill be now read the third time.

Mr. AMYOT moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be declared the Federal Parliament has no jurisdiction to legislate on this question, but that the terms and intention of the Federal Act gave that right exclusively to the Provincial Legislatures. He said: I am in a position to prove that my motion is directly conformable to the law, and that the law has been so interpreted by the highest authorities of the country. In such an important question which excites so much public opinion, we are called upon to give a vote that will form a precedent at the beginning of Confederation, for we are still at the beginning of Confederation, that every one should know exactly the meaning of his vote. In the debates on Confederation what do I see? That on the second day a member who has retired from political life, leaving behind him, however, an excellent name—I mean the Hon. Mr. Dorion—asked the following question, as reported in the Debates on Confederation, page 267—and he was a gentleman who did not often change his mind, and I am sure that were he still with us, he would speak as he did on that occasion. He enquired:

"But what is meant by the regulation of the marriage question? Is the General Government to be at liberty to set aside all that we have been in the habit of doing in Lower Canada in this respect? Will the General Government have the power to determine the degree of relationship and the age beyond which parties may marry, as well as the consent which may be required to make a marriage valid? Will all these questions be left to the General Government? If so, it will have the power to upset one of the most important portions of our civil code, and one affecting more than any other all classes of society," etc.

The speaker went on to establish that it would be bad legislation to give that power to the Central or Federal Parliament. Now, an answer was given by the then existing Government, by those whom we justly call the Fathers of Confederation, and what was the answer and the reason why the law was framed in the existing terms? It reads as follows:—

"The hon. gentleman has asked the Government what meaning was to be attached to the word 'marriage' where it occurred in the Constitution. He desired to know whether the Government proposed to leave to the Central Government the right of deciding at what age, for example, marriage might be contracted. I will now answer the hon. gentleman as categorically as possible, for I am anxious to be understood not only in this House, but also by all those who may hereafter read the report of our proceedings. And, first of all, I will prove that civil rights form part of those which, by Article 43 (paragraph 15) of the resolutions, are guaranteed to Lower Canada. This paragraph reads as follows:—'15. Property and civil rights, excepting those portions thereof assigned to the General Parliament.'"

Then the speaker goes on to explain his meaning, which any hon. gentleman may read at page 388 of the Debates, but I will only read his conclusion:

"So that the word 'marriage,' placed where it is among the powers of the Central Parliament, has not the extended signification which was sought to be given to it by the hon. member. With the view of being more explicit, I now propose to read how the word marriage is proposed to be understood:

"The word marriage has been placed in the draft of the proposed Constitution to invest the Federal Parliament with the right of

Mr. MACKENZIE.

declaring what marriages shall be held and deemed to be valid throughout the whole extent of the Confederacy, without, however, interfering in any particular with the doctrines or rites of the religious creeds to which the contracting parties may belong."

"There is something still more explicit on this point of great importance. He goes on to say that we should be thankful to them for the great care we have taken not to expose that important act of our lives to improper interference. I invite the attention of hon. members to these remarks:

"The whole may be summed up as follows:—The Central Parliament may decide that any marriage contracted in Upper Canada, or in any other of the Confederated Provinces, in accordance with the laws of the country in which it was contracted, although that law might be different from ours, should be deemed valid in Lower Canada in case the parties should come to reside there, and *vice versa*."

Some hon. members pretended that the clause was not necessary, while others argued that it was. The Speaker (Solicitor-General Langevin) thus replied on this point:

"It means that a marriage contracted in no matter what part of the Confederacy, will be valid in Lower Canada, if contracted according to the laws of the country in which it takes place; but also, when a marriage is contracted in any Province contrary to its laws, although in conformity with the laws of another Province, it will not be considered valid."

That was the existing law on this subject, and if there is anything plainer I would like to know it. But it will be said the question has already come before this House, and that the House seems to have declared that the Constitution should be interpreted otherwise. But since the question came before this House, the highest tribunal of the Empire, the Privy Council, has been called upon to decide an analagous question, and I will read its decision, as published in the *Globe* of 21st December last. The question was as to the power of the Provincial Legislatures to regulate insurance policies. In the celebrated case their lordships laid down the rights of the Local Legislatures on that point in the following language:

"Take as one instance the subject: Marriage and divorce contained in the enumeration of subjects in section 91. It is evident that solemnization of marriage would come within this general exemption; yet, 'solemnization of marriage in that Province' is enumerated among the classes of subjects in section 92, and no one can doubt, notwithstanding the general language of section 91, that this subject is still within the exclusive authority of the Legislatures of the Provinces."

I have quoted from the law and the words of its framers, recalling the solemn promise that was then given to the country by the father of Confederation—in order to establish that the meaning of the paragraph on marriage was not the giving of jurisdiction to this Parliament in regard to the act of marriage itself, or its conditions, but it was only intended to give the right to parties married in Lower Canada, or in any other Province, under a law different from that of the Province of Quebec, a right to be regarded in Quebec as legally married. We have the solemn promise of the old Canadian Legislature that such would be the law, and we have now the solemn interpretation of the highest tribunal on the same side. Under these circumstances should we be justified in passing a law in a contrary direction? Would we be justified in voting a law that would infringe upon the right of the Local Legislatures? Would it be reasonable, for instance, for the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to impose a law on the Province of Ontario? The Act of Confederation has secured to the majority of each Province the exclusive right to settle these questions. What would be the consequence, after the wrong we have received from the Privy Council? Our law would be declared to be unconstitutional, and 206 legislators would be declared by that Court to know nothing about their jurisdiction. I do not say whether the Bill itself is good or bad. But I say that if he consented to the Confederation Act, it was with the express understanding that these subjects would be left to the Local Legislatures. More than that, I think such is the interpretation given by the Courts to-day. Under these circumstances I make this

motion, that the law be declared unconstitutional, so that the Confederation Act may not be broken, and that the unity of Confederation may not be broken by such a law.

Mr. McCUAIG. The hon. member for Lambton contradicted the statement I made a little while ago. I have the *Law Journal* of Canada, containing the opinion of Mr. Todd, who is considered as good an authority on such matters as the hon. member for Lambton. Mr. Todd says:

"Whatever the effect of a Colonial law may be within a Colonial jurisdiction, I believe it to be at least most doubtful whether a marriage wanting in these conditions can be made valid in England by any Colonial law; and if this be not the case, if the validity of such marriages and divorces is confined at most to the Colony in which they take place, the greatest embarrassment might result from the prevalence of different laws in different parts of the Empire. Marriages legally contracted in one Colony would be inoperative, for all legal purposes, in another. Children legitimate in one part of the Empire might in another find themselves incapable of inheriting their parents' property anywhere else."

I stated that if this law passes, even the children of such marriages will be considered illegitimate in England, and that is confirmed by Mr. Todd.

Mr. BUNSTER. I would like the hon. members of this House to proceed to business instead of losing our time at this season of the year. We are trifling with the time that belongs to the people in discussing a Bill like this which, in my opinion, has no right to be here. The hon. member for Lambton threw considerable light on it. He said it was a matter for the Local Legislatures to deal with.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me. I said the mode of the solemnization of marriages belonged to the Local Legislatures and not to this Parliament.

Mr. BUNSTER. I stand corrected, I was not taking any notes. In the various Provinces we have different laws on marriage, and the different churches regulate the laws of marriage better than we can.

Mr. GIROUARD. I wish to say one word as to the decision of the Privy Council. I am sorry the hon. gentleman did not read the report as it is to be found in the *Law Report*. I have the *Legal News* of January, 1882, and here is what I find with reference to the jurisdiction of this Parliament on the subject of marriage:

"Take as one instance the subject of 'marriage and divorce,' contained in the enumeration of subjects in section 91, it is evident that solemnization of marriage would come within this general description; yet 'solemnization of marriages in the Provinces' is enumerated among the classes of subjects in section 92, and no one can doubt, notwithstanding the general language of section 91, that this subject is still within the exclusive authority of the Provinces."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the hon. member behind me is in conformity with the declarations which I made in Parliament fifteen years ago on behalf of the Government to which I belong. Those declarations were made in precisely the same sense, although not in the same words. We did not consider then that in placing the words "marriage" and "divorce" among the attributes of the legislation of the Federal Parliament, that we were giving that Parliament the right to determine what were to be the conditions of celebration of marriage, any more than the other conditions mentioned in the debate which took place at the time; but we were of opinion, and it was the intention of the then Government and Parliament, as well as that of the legislators and others busying themselves with the question in London, that the word "marriage" should be inserted merely to determine that a marriage contracted in a Province according to its laws, should be considered as valid in other parts of the country. Such was the only qualification we gave the word "marriage." Now, according to what has just been read by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), the highest tribunal of the Empire seems to agree with that opinion and endorse what I said on behalf of the Government fifteen years ago,

in 1867, when the measure came before Parliament. I did not think it was necessary to make this declaration to-day, as the present Bill—towards which I am, nevertheless, opposed—does not contain any declaration to the contrary; but since the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has made a motion in conformity with the declarations made by the Government in 1867, I will vote for the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. In the debates on the Confederation Act there was a declaration made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works with reference to the meaning of the word marriage. The hon. gentleman read a written statement of what the meaning of the word was, but he enlarged upon and expanded his view of the meaning of that statement. The written statement, I presume, was made on behalf of the Government, and the oral argument with which he embellished it, as he always does every subject he touches, was his own meaning of the written statement. I have always regarded that exposition to be rather more authoritative than the written statement. I observed that when the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) was making his statement, that his views appeared to be familiar to me, and the most of them appeared to be in an article from *Le Canada* of the 22nd of March. I see an extract in that from the hon. gentleman's speech. I observe that the written statement that the hon. gentleman made of what the word marriage meant, is this:

"Le mot mariage a été placé dans la rédaction du projet de constitution pour attribuer à la législature fédérale le droit de déclarer quels seront les mariages qui devront être considérés comme valide dans toute l'étendue de la confédération, sans toucher pour cela le moins du monde aux dogmes ni aux rites des religions aux quelles appartiennent les parties contractantes."

Now, Sir, that statement is susceptible, perhaps, of bearing the exposition of the hon. gentleman, but it does not necessarily bear it. He says the word marriage was placed there to give the Federal Legislature the right to declare what should be the marriages which should be considered valid throughout the whole extent of the Confederation. The hon. gentleman to-night has said, and called our attention to the fact, that the words "marriage" and "divorce" appear together. These are two subjects given at once in the same breath, and as part of the same section, to the Federal Parliament. Now, does he mean to say that the word divorce, where it is there put, means only that it shall be an attribute of the Federal Parliament to divorce; that a divorce legally effected, under local laws in any Province, shall or shall not be valid throughout the rest of the Dominion; or that it means that the whole law of divorce shall be vested in the Federal Parliament? It obviously must mean the latter. It cannot but be that the law of divorce, and by parity of reasoning the law of marriage, save and except that portion which involves the solemnization of the marriage itself, have been expressly inserted as belonging exclusively to the Federal Parliament. When you find marriage given to the Federal Legislature, and when you find the solemnization given to a Local Legislature, you have in the strongest way declared that all that was to be given to the Local and taken away from the Federal was the solemnization of marriage. There has been this subject of discussion, and the law officers of the Crown, at an early period, were asked by the then hon. leader of the Government to advise as to whether, with reference to the Confederation Act, it was not an attribute of the Federal Government or Parliament to deal with the question of licenses in connection with the solemnization of marriages. They decided, and I think rightly, that that power properly fell within the Local Legislatures, because it was in point of fact part of the solemnization of marriage; but to go further and say that the whole law of marriage is with each Local Legislature, subject only to this exception, that the Federal Parliament has a right to declare that a marriage valid according to the law of the Local Legislature shall be

valid through the whole extent of the Dominion, is not, in my opinion, to interpret in any proper sense our Constitution, but is to give it a meaning which cannot fairly be drawn from it. I maintain that we have the right clearly to determine between what parties it shall be legal to contract marriage and between what parties it shall not be legal, and to determine all that for every Province of this Dominion, but to determine how a marriage between persons who can lawfully contract it under our laws shall be solemnized, it is not within our power to adjudge. That is disposed of by the Local Legislature, and therefore, I think the motion of my hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Aymot), is not only unnecessary, but is a misinterpretation of the true meaning and construction of our Constitution, and I shall certainly vote against it.

Mr. LANDRY. Mr. Speaker, the motion such as presented by the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) embodies, in my opinion, two things: first, a declaration that the Federal Parliament has not the right to legislate on the necessary qualifications for marriage; secondly, that the necessary legislation to determine the required qualifications for marriage, has been left, according to the terms and the intention of the Federal Act, exclusively to Provincial Legislatures. I think, Mr. Speaker, that if the motion of the hon. member embodied simply the first declaration, our duty would probably be to vote in its favor, but if the hon. member declares by his motion that the Federal Parliament has not the right to legislate as to the necessary qualifications to contract a marriage, I do not see why it should grant to Local Legislatures the right of defining what these qualifications should be. If marriage is a religious contract, I do not see why the Local any more than the Federal Parliament should have the right to legislate on that point. Consequently, if the first proposition is true, the second which is its negative should succumb, and I propose an amendment, seconded by Mr. Desjardins, that all words after the word "marriage" be expunged.

Amendment (Mr. Amyot) negatived on a division.

Mr. STRANGE moved in amendment that all the words after "deceased" be struck out and the following substituted therefor: "and between a woman and the brother of her deceased husband are hereby repealed, and such marriages are hereby declared to be legal and valid."

Amendment negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Fortin,	Mills,
Arnell,	Fulton,	Muttart,
Barnard,	Gillies,	Pickard,
Beauchesne,	Gillmor,	Poupore,
Bergeron,	Guillet,	Richey,
Bill,	Guthrie,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blake,	Haddow,	Rogers,
Bolduc,	Hesson,	Routhier,
Brown,	Irvine,	Ryan (Montreal),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Ives,	Rymal,
Bunster,	Killam,	Scriver,
Cameron (Huron),	King,	Skinner,
Casey,	Longley,	Strange,
Crouter,	Mackenzie,	Tellier,
Cuthbert,	Macmillan,	Trow, and
Elliott,	Merner,	Wheler.—49.
Fleming,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Fiset,	Massuc,
Amyot,	Fitzsimmons,	Méthot,
Bain,	Gault,	Mongenais,
Beaty,	Geoffrion,	Montplaisir,
Béchar,	Gigault,	Mousseau,
Benoit,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Ogden,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Olivier,
Bourbeau,	Gunn,	Orton,

Mr. BLAKE.

Bowell,
Brecken,
Brooks,
Cameron (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Casgrain,
Cimon (Charlevoix),
Cimon (Chicoutimi),
Cockburn,
Colby,
Coughlin,
Coupal,
Coursol,
Desaulniers,
Desjardins,
Doull,
Drew,
Dugas,
Dumont,
Ferguson,

Hay,
Holton,
Hooper,
Houde,
Hurteau,
Kilvert,
Kirkpatrick,
Landry,
Lane,
Langevin,
Macdonald (Kings),
McDonald (Cape Breton),
McDonald (Vic., N.S.),
McCuaig,
McDougald,
McLennan,
McLeod,
McQuade,
McRory,
Malouin,
Manson,

Onimet,
Patterson (Essex),
Pinsonneault,
Platt,
Plumb,
Reid,
Rinfret,
Robertson (Hamilton),
Ross (Dundas),
Ross (Middlesex),
Rouleau,
Royal,
Ryan (Marquette),
Sproule,
Thompson,
Tyrwhitt,
Wallace (Norfolk),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
Wiser, and
Yeo.—87.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to observe with reference to the discussion which took place a little while ago, that when the Bill on this subject was before the House, in the Session of 1880, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, on an amendment then proposed, which would have left the Bill in this shape: "marriage and a man with the sister of his deceased wife, or the widow of his deceased brother, shall be legal," made some observations, in which he said:

"As a Roman Catholic I cannot admit that the Parliament of Canada has a right to legislate on the subject of marriage, pure and simple, which would be an interference with the rights and privileges of my church, which holds marriage to be a Sacrament. * * * I would have preferred to put in this Bill a proviso that any marriage contracted according to the rules and prescriptions of the church or the churches, to which the parties belong, between brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law, would be legal; but considering the difficulties that such legislation would lead us into, and the difficulty there would be in determining the functions of the Legislatures and the Parliament on this point, I am ready for my part to vote in favor of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Bothwell. I cannot help thinking that the hon. gentleman who has just spoken is mistaken, if he says that the matter of dispensations is within the power of the Local Legislature. The Local Legislature has, by the Confederation Act, power to legislate about the solemnization of marriage, and the mode of celebration necessary to render the marriage legal and binding; but nothing to do with regulating as to the parties who shall marry. That, it is admitted, belongs to this Parliament, in the legal sense of the Confederation Act."

Main motion agreed to on a division; and Bill read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

The following Bills were read the second time:—

Bill (No. 103) to incorporate the Qu'Appelle Land Company.—(Mr. Boulton.)

Bill (No. 113) to amend the Act incorporating "The Canadian Steam Users' Insurance Association," and to change the name of the said Company to "The Boiler Inspection and Insurance Company of Canada," (from the Senate).—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 114) respecting the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.—(Mr. Abbott.)

MOTIONS FOR RETURNS.

The following motions for Returns were severally agreed to:—

Copies of any Order in Council, correspondence, reports, instructions, or papers, touching the appointment of a Commissioner in connection with the revision of the Canadian Statutes; and a statement in detail, with dates, of all payments made in connection with such appointment.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing the earnings, net and gross, of the Pacific Railway, constructed by the Government, and transferred to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, including the Pembina Branch, in accordance with the agreement; from