

last was face to face with them ; and they have this further disadvantage, that their geographical position renders it more difficult to communicate with them than with other parts of the Dominion. It is possible that, sometimes, even British Columbia may be more easily communicated with in winter than Prince Edward Island. Looking at all these things, and being, as I am, aware of the fact that many men connected with my Province, for whose opinion I have the very highest respect, are opposed to the marriages legalized by the Bill now before the House, I think it my duty to support the amendment. I may say that the views which I entertain with regard to the Bill itself are very much in conformity with those expressed here yesterday and repeated to-day by the hon. Senator from Richmond. I am in favor of that portion of the Bill which permits marriage with a deceased wife's sister, but I am not in favor of that portion of it which permits marriage with the widow of a deceased brother. Under those circumstances, even if I were aware that the opinions of the people of my Province were in favor of the Bill, I could not vote for it in its present shape. It is, therefore, the more incumbent on me to vote for delay. I will, with the permission of the House, touch upon a few points that have been alluded to in this debate. In any remarks that have fallen from the speakers who have preceded me, with the exception of the hon. Senator who has just resumed his seat, no allusion was made to special cases of hardship, and I think that the House can readily understand the reason. No person can wish to have paraded before the public his own case or the cases of friends, and, therefore, the difficulties of those who advocate the passage of this Bill are increased. I look upon this measure as the removal of a disability. Now, in my three-score and some more years, I have seen several disabilities removed, and I remember that, previous to their removal, terrible consequences were contemplated. I remember the sad anticipations that were indulged in when the disabilities of Catholics were removed ; but no such evils occurred. Then, again, there was another measure which occupied the attention of the Imperial Parliament session after session, which

was rejected over and over again, but which, finally, was passed—I allude to the removal of the disabilities which prevented Jews from sitting in Parliament. That was a measure which was very unpopular, not only in Parliament, but throughout the country. The disabilities were removed, and how many Jews do you find returned to Parliament in the last election ? It is not hard to trace who is, and who is not, a Jew, for, along with their religious and national peculiarities, they preserve their family names ; and anyone who runs his eye over the list of returned members, can see that, probably, not over half-a-dozen Jews will take seats in the newly-elected Parliament. Now, as to the religious points of this question, which have been so ably discussed, I may say that I have given them careful consideration, and I have come to the conclusion that, with regard to the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister, there is no scriptural objection. I think we may very safely accept the opinions of a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church on that question, so far as Roman Catholics are concerned. We have the opinions of Cardinal Wiseman, as alluded to by the hon. Senator from Alma (Mr. Penny), and they are very emphatic in favor of the removal of this disability. In the Episcopal Church we have the opinions of Archbishop Whately, also emphatically expressed in favor of the removal of such disabilities ; and when I find two men, holding such an elevated position as those two ecclesiastics, I cannot hesitate to accept their opinion as conclusive upon this point. The hon. Senator from Fredericton (Mr. Odell) alluded to a numerous meeting of clergy and others in London, England. While I am willing to attach as much importance to a meeting of that sort as it is worth, it must be considered that it was not held in our own country or amongst our own immediate countrymen. What is far more to the purpose, and should weigh more with us, is the fact that a meeting of the Ministerial Association was lately held in a city much nearer to us than London—in Montreal—for whose opinions we ought to have greater respect. It was called for the purpose of discussing this question, and, though not