

vexation would be the same. From the use of the expression, 'during her life time,' we see that all the other prohibited kinds of intercourse are of a permanent and unconditional character, but not the marriage with a wife's sister, respecting which, according to the analogy of the language employed in the other prohibited unions, the expression here should be: 'The nakedness of the sister of thy wife shalt thou not uncover,' which is not used, but in exceptional form employed. But the truth is that the design of the text is merely to prohibit the 'vexing' or afflicting his wife by exhibiting a preference for her sister, and hence again is marriage allowed after the wife's decease."

With this quotation, I think enough has been now written to show what are the views and practice of the Jewish Church in respect to the marriages you desire to legalise in Canada. My best wishes are for the success of your Bill, which I regard as calculated to subserve the cause of civil and religious liberty, which underlies it, and of morality, which it is calculated to promote. When a similar measure of relief, for many worthy and pious persons under the ban of illegal union, was brought forward by Mr. Stuart Wortley, in the Imperial Parliament, during the year 1850, the measure was denounced by an opponent as "scandalous, immoral, and mischievous." But I believe that you will find but few inclined to go thus far in opposing your Bill, especially in view of the fact that many dignitaries of the Christian Church, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, have pronounced in its favor.

You are fully at liberty to publish this, as you request.

Very truly yours,

ABRAHAM DE SOLA.

D. GIROUARD, Esq., M.P.

I believe that, under the circumstances, I can affirm with certainty that the prohibition to marry the sister of a deceased wife, or the widow of a brother, is not against the Scriptures, as the majority of Christians understand them. There is no doubt, moreover, that the Law of Moses is not always a safe guide for Christians. Polygamy, or plurality of wives, was admitted, or at least tolerated, among the Jews. We are assured that Solomon was allowed seven hundred legitimate wives.

Mr. BOULTBEE: And he was called Solomon the Wise.

Mr. GIROUARD: Mormonism can be defended upon the Leviticus, as well as the prohibition to marry a deceased wife's sister and even better. No one, not even the gallant member for Leeds (Mr. Jones), would dream of introducing Mormonism into our Christian community, because it is to be found in the Old Testament. Finally, it cannot be contended that the restriction in question,

which the opponents of the Bill desire to perpetuate and make permanent, is not based upon reason, morality or natural law; there is no blood relationship or consanguinity between the parties. And if the Bill were to make these marriages obligatory as it was sometimes the case under the laws of Moses, one would account for the opposition of the Church of England. But hereafter no more than in the past, do we intend to interfere with the liberty civil or religious of the subject, and the members of the Church of England, whose conscience and faith would forbid those unions, will not in the least be prevented from abstaining from the same. It has been observed that the Bill in its present form introduces into this country civil marriage. It has no such effect, I always understood that the character of the marriage law always depends from the character of the celebrating officer, and so long as this officer shall be the priest or minister of the parties, there cannot exist any reasonable fear that that the marriage shall be civil and not religious. This was the reason which induced the fathers of our Federal constitution to place the solemnization of marriage under the exclusive control of Provincial Legislatures. This great concession was made to quiet the mind of the Catholic population of the Province of Quebec, who, as a consequence have not much to fear from the marriage laws of the Dominion Parliament, the law of divorce excepted; but it is to be hoped that this Parliament will never follow the example of the British Parliament which, to use the language of an eminent Protestant legal writer (Dr. Redfield) "has degraded the solemnisation of that sacred relation to the level of a mere civil contract, allowing its solemnisation before the civil magistrate, and practically abandoning the former claim of its indissolubility." Now, one word with regard to the social objections raised by the opponents of the Bill. It is said that it will upset happy social relations and would destroy the relations between brothers and sisters-in-law, the free, truthful and pure feelings with which a man regards the sister of his wife. This objection exists to-day under the prohibitory laws, for these marriages are almost daily contracted; public feeling is decidedly in their favour and they are socially recog-