

speeches, also appeared to differ with him in regard to matters of detail. Considering all the arguments of the case, with a sense of all the difficulties of the situation, I do not feel disposed, as a member of the Church of England, to share in the prejudices of the hon. member for South Leeds. I will confess that I have been convinced by the power and learning of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and, consequently, that I will give his Bill my support.

Mr. GAULT: I sent a copy of the Bill of my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), immediately after it was printed, to the Lord Bishop and clergymen of the Church of England, also to the Roman Catholic Bishop and several of the clergy, also to clergymen of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregationalist and Baptist Churches in Montreal to ascertain their opinion of the measure, and have had only two replies—one from a clergyman of high standing, who quite approves of the Bill and says it is not contrary to the Word of God, and the other from the Rev. Dr. Corder, of the Unitarian Church, who says he believes the Bill will conduce to the interests of good morals and sound public policy. With these views in possession and none disapproving, it is my intention to vote in favour of the Bill. A great many of my friends in Montreal, who have married their deceased wives' sisters, are gentlemen of the very highest respectability and standing, and I do not see why they should be held as law-breakers for that cause.

Mr. McCUAIG: I do not rise for the purpose of adding any remarks to those already expressed by hon. gentlemen, members of the learned profession, and of this House, both for and against this measure, having reference to the effect the passage of this measure may have on society in Canada. My desire is to call the attention of the House to the opinions entertained in England, for which Canadians have great respect, by eminent men, as reported in the English *Hansard*, 1877. In doing so, it is my duty to place before this House the views of the representative men of the various bodies, as well as the equally distinguished public men of the Empire, from both points of view. In favour of the Bill, 1877, then before the British Parliament, permitting a widower to

marry the sister of his deceased wife, I will read the views of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops residing in England, as addressed by those Prelates to the members of a Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the state of the English law, as well as the replies of Cardinal Wiseman to certain questions he was called upon to answer. In the letter addressed to the Royal Commission on the law of marriage, by the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of England, is the following passage:—

"With respect to the much debated question of marrying a deceased wife's sister, with us the impediment is diriment of marriage; but urgent cases will arise when ecclesiastical authority finds it reasonable to remove the impediment by dispensation. And among the motives for such dispensations are the preventing of greater evils, the protection or reparation of character, the difficulty of forming another marriage, the consideration of children born, or that may be born, etc., and, although cases of this kind are comparatively rare, we could wish to see the civil obstacles removed which stand in the way of remedying what may prove to be grave matters of conscience.

(Signed)

+ HENRY EDWARD MANNING,
+ THOMAS JOSEPH BROWN,
+ WILLIAM BERNARD ULLATHORNE,
+ THOMAS GRANT,
+ WILLIAM TURNER,
+ JAMES BROWN,
+ ALEXANDER GOSSE,
+ WILLIAM VAUGHAN,
+ WILLIAM CLIFFORD,
+ FRANCIS KERRILL-AMHERST,
+ RICARDUS ROSKELL,
+ ROBERT CORNTHWAITE."

The following questions were put to Cardinal Wiseman:—

"Do you construe that passage in Leviticus XVIII, 18, as prohibiting marriage with a deceased wife's sister, or merely as saying that a man should not take two wives together, at the same time being so related?

"Reply—Certainly, that verse appears to have the latter meaning, that two sisters shall not be living together in the same house, as wives of the same person.

"Question—Is such a marriage held by your Church as prohibited in Scripture.

"Reply—Certainly not. It is considered a matter of ecclesiastical legislation."

This influential advice in favour of the Bill will no doubt have a powerful influence on the minds of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen in Canada. Though from a Canadian or Colonial standpoint in favour of a similar Bill passing the Dominion Parliament, with the law of England in its present shape,