

MR. JONES: I do not rise for the purpose of prolonging this debate, but merely to say a few words on the vote I intend to cast. I may state that I intend to support the amendment for the six months' "hoist." At whose request is this Bill brought before the House? Has any petition been presented? I would ask, moreover, if any opportunity has been given to the country to protest against this measure? I can tell the hon. gentleman that, if an opportunity were given, the Church of England, to which I belong, will protest against this Bill, which has been brought forward so hurriedly. In my opinion it should be allowed to stand over. Some hon. gentlemen have stated that the Hebrew translation of the 18th chapter of Leviticus is an error. I should be sorry to make such an assertion on the floor of the House, and I should be sorry to think that the translation of the Scriptures was an error, because, if it were so, it knocks down a portion of the structure, and the whole question of affinity is destroyed. No later than 1877, at the Provincial Synod of the Church of England held in Montreal, the following resolution, brought down by the House of Bishops, was passed:—

"No clergyman of this Ecclesiastical Province shall, knowingly, solemnise a marriage forbidden by the 99th Canon of the year A.D. 1603, which is as follows:—No person shall marry within the degrees prohibited by the Laws of God, and expressed in a table set forth by authority, in the year of our Lord God 1563."

Now, that is the rule regulating the Church of England, and I do not agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, that the jurisdiction for the regulation of marriage in every way resides with this House. I believe it should rest as it has for ages with the Churches to which we belong. I am sure that, if proper time be given for petitions against the Bill, they will come in large numbers from members of the English, the Roman Catholic, Presbyterian and other Churches. The Bill is brought forward in the interest of individuals, the endeavour being made to push it hurriedly through the House; but I shall oppose it with all my powers, and support the six months' "hoist."

MR. WRIGHT: I confess I see few difficulties in the case presented so ably

by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard). He has, I must admit, manifested profound research and a wonderful knowledge of all matters connected with the subject of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, almost from the beginning of the practice till the present. We can imagine this eloquent, graceful advocate seated in the solitude of his studies, probably digesting grave problems of social and moral science, waited upon by this charming lady—for we will assume she is charming, which would give the motive usually looked for in such cases—because, as we see no petition, one cannot otherwise understand why the hon. gentleman brings his forces to bear on this problem. It is the old story, the old irrepressible conflict between the law and the lady, and in the present as in past cases of this kind he will find the lady will be victorious. We can understand all the influence upon the hon. gentleman of this good-looking, graceful lady, coming into his office arrayed in all the habiliments of love, wearing looks of the deepest despair and darkest desolation; she has loved, not wisely, but too well; she has placed herself in a sad position, and now appeals to this good counsel for that relief which the Draconian Code does not afford. I cannot, any more than the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Jones), see why this question has been brought up here. We all know that the family is the archetype of society, and as it is secure, society will be secure, and we must be careful how we meddle with the family relations. But, from the research manifested by the member for Jacques Cartier, we must assume that some things are at fault, and that we in the 19th century must bear with a little more ease and humility on the errors of humanity than was done at the time of the framing of the Code of Leviticus. I have been seriously troubled by the theological question. The hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson) produced authorities to which we all bow, but upon which the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Anglin) does not look with such great respect; then came the legal address of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who presented other claims to attention by a manner of singular ability, and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) and the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott), in able