

only 2,319 belonged to the opposers of this measure. Out of 43,000 men employed only 7,400 were employed by those who were against the measure. Out of 16,000,000 of pieces printed, only 4,500,000 were printed by those who opposed this bill. Unless these figures could be successfully impugned, it was certain that the general sense of the trade was in favour of the measure. With respect to the objections which had been made to this bill, they were divided into two classes. One class of objectors were opposed to any legislation on the subject; the other class objected to the mode of registration; but he thought that was a matter which would be more properly attended to in committee. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sheil had estimated the number of designs which would be registered every year at the enormous amount of half a million. [Mr. Sheil, "No."] Well, then, he was mistaken, and the right hon. Gentleman, he trusted, had discarded this ground of objection. It might be that some thousand designs would have to be registered every year, and that in consequence a more efficient organization of the register-office might be needed; but this was no objection to the bill. The right hon. Gentleman had objected to the certificate of the registering officer being made admissible as evidence in courts of law; but it was admissible only as *prima facie* evidence, and it would be perfectly competent to any party to bring an action at law to show that the certificated design was an old one, in which case the certificate would be overruled by direct evidence, and the party adducing it would be cast. But the position of the retail dealers would be altered, the right hon. Gentleman insisted, by this bill, and the mode and manner of bringing these parties to account had been much objected to. But was the right hon. Gentleman aware of the clause to the same effect in the existing law? There was no additional severity, but, on the contrary, somewhat of relaxation in the mode of bringing these parties to account, as compared with the act of the 2nd of Victoria. Another objection was, that two parties might purchase the same invention—that one might register, and the other being a *bona fide* purchaser, might be treated as a pirate. This certainly was a possible case, which might occur under this bill; but so it might occur under the existing law, or under any law of patents, and he must be permitted to say, that when it did occur, it must be owing, in a great measure, to the negli-

gence of the parties themselves. It was material that the House should observe, that the great objection, after all, was the fear that the measure would be injurious to foreign trade. But he should expect a judicious law of copyrights of designs to benefit materially, not only the foreign, but the home trade also, by stimulating the genius of inventors, and so stimulating commerce. It had been said, they ought to rely, not on a copyright-law, but on schools of design, for the extension of taste. He, for one, should like to see schools of design flourishing; but though it was all very well to establish schools of design, and thereby create a race of good inventors, yet, if you did not also give those inventors, when educated, the means of obtaining a livelihood by some such measure as this, the institution of schools of design would be nugatory. This difficulty had already been experienced in the matter of primary education. It is vain to found normal schools, unless you have the means of retaining by sufficient remuneration those who may be trained in them. Seeing, then, that the objections were either minute or unfounded, and that the bill came before them under the recommendation of a committee, he trusted that the second reading would obtain the unanimous consent of the House.

Bill read a second time, and ordered to be committed.

COPYRIGHT.] Viscount Mahon said, that on moving the second reading of the Copyright bill, he had conceived that it would have been his duty to state the main arguments in favour of it, and also to reply to the main objections which had been taken against it; but since he had come into the House, the hon. Member for Finsbury (Mr. Wakley), who had formerly taken so active a part in the discussions on this subject, had told him that, in his opinion, it would be far more convenient to the House if the discussion were postponed till they came to the third clause in committee, as it was that clause which involved the principle of the measure, and as probably only one discussion on that principle would be required. In that opinion, he (Lord Mahon) had found, that his right hon. Friend, the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Macaulay), also concurred. He should, therefore, reserve himself for the next stage of the bill, and merely move that it now be read a second time.

Mr. *Wakley* was very glad that the noble Lord had consulted the wishes of several hon. Members on that side of the House. He believed that the general wish was, that authors should receive adequate protection for the great services which they rendered; the only difference was as to the mode of securing that protection.

Mr. *Macaulay* said, that last year he should not have divided the House on the second reading, if language had not been used which rendered the step, as he considered, imperative upon him. The measure as it now stood was a great improvement on that of last year, though there were still a great many defects of detail which he would wish to see altered. Upon the whole, however, he was not without hopes that they might be enabled to arrive at a satisfactory measure.

Bill read a second time; to be committed.

MARRIAGES—ADJOURNED DEBATE.]
Mr. *Borthwick* did not move the adjournment of the debate on the motion that leave be given to bring in a bill to amend the present marriage law; yet he hoped the House would allow him to state briefly the grounds upon which he should give his vote. There appeared to him to have been urged against any measure of this nature three main objections. First, that it was a bill contrary to the revealed will of God; secondly, that the whole course of legislation in this country for nearly the last 1,500 years had been in opposition to the principle of the bill; and, thirdly, that the practical operation of such a law being once incorporated in the statute-book would be to take off the fine edge of that morality which now existed in families. If these three propositions could be maintained, then he was sure that the noble Lord who had proposed the measure (Lord Francis Egerton) for the consideration of the House, would have been the very last man to have brought it all under discussion. If it could be proved that the revealed will of God was in direct opposition to the proposal now made, it was the duty of the noble Lord, even at this stage of the measure, to withdraw it. But in his opinion the argument which had been advanced in support of that proposition could not be sustained. The text which had been quoted from Leviticus clearly forbade the marriage of a wife's sister only during the life-time of the wife herself, and did not in any way prohibit the mar-

riage of such sister after the death of the wife. Then with regard to the second proposition, he confessed that it was one which, at first sight, wore the appearance of much gravity. It asserted, that for nearly 1,500 years, the united opinion of the Catholic Christian church had been directly against the law now proposed by the noble Lord. He had to observe, first, that although they found in the Roman Catholic church there were prohibitions against these marriages, yet they found also that there was a prohibition against any marriage at all on the part of the priesthood. Now, he would ask those who put this argument as against the present bill becoming the law of the land, did the Roman Catholic church forbid marriage to their priesthood as a matter of discipline, or as a matter of moral rectitude? The reply must be, that the Roman Catholic church forbade it as a matter of discipline solely. The English Protestant Church had, so far as regarded their priesthood, annulled the prohibition. The same principle which induced the Roman Catholic church to prohibit their priests from marrying, also induced them to prohibit a man from marrying his deceased wife's sister. And if the reformed church had the power to annul the former class of prohibited marriages, so also had it the power to annul the latter class. The Pope also could grant to parties dispensation, and allow them to marry within the prohibited degrees. But no dispensing power was ever given to the Pope by the Catholic church over acts which were in themselves and in their own nature directly sinful. It would not be attempted by any Protestant to be argued that the Pope had a dispensing power over acts that were contrary to the revealed will of God. It was clear, then, that the argument founded upon the long continuance of the law which forbade such marriages could not be adduced in support of any other proposition than that the Roman Catholic church had deemed it right to make the prohibition as a matter of discipline merely; and as a mere matter of discipline on the part of that church it could not be put as a reason why the Legislature of a Protestant community should not alter such a law. Then with respect to the third objection, founded on the moral effect of this measure on society. It had been said, that the opposition of the Church of Rome to the marriage of a