a deceased wife's sister is not only not prohibited, 'either expressly or by implication,' but that, according to Leviticus xviii. 18 (concerning the translation of which there is not the least uncertainty), such marriage is plainly allowed. 2ndly. That this has been the opinion of the Jewish people, from the days of the Septuagint translators, nearly three hundred years before the Christian era, to the present time, as is testified by their greatest authorities, as Onkelos, probably contemporary with our Lord, Rashi, Maimonides, &c.; and, in our own time, those distinguished scholars, Zunz Furst, Arnheim, Sachs, &c. This conclusion is much strengthened by the fact that in the New Testament there is nothing against it. Our Lord, who strongly condemned the Jews, where their tradition or practice was opposed to the law of God, as in the matter of divorce, has left no trace of disapproval of marriages of this kind. Neither has St. Paul, who, being brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, was intimately acquainted with the laws and practices of his brethren."

It must be admitted, that is very high authority in favour of the position that marriages of this kind are not prohibited by the language of the Old Testament, and that the passage in Leviticus has been misinterpreted. I would also refer, in support of that, to the opinion of Dr. Adler, Chief Rabbi of the Jews, a very eminent Hebrew scholar, who, speaking of marriages of this kind, says:

"It is not only not considered as prohibited, but it is distinctly understood to be permitted, and on this point neither the Divine law, nor the Rabbis, nor historical Judaism, leave room for the least doubt;" and "according to Rabbinical authorities, such marriage is considered proper and even laudable; and where young children are left by the deceased wife, such marriage is allowed to take place within a shorter period from the wife's death than would otherwise be permitted."

Another authority I would refer to, is Professor Max Muller, a distinguished Oriental scholar, who said it was a puzzle to him, how any critic could have supposed the passage in question to prohibit marriage with a deceased wife's sister. I think, therefore, Sir, that we may fairly assume that it is not prohibited by the Old Testament Scriptures, and that the whole prohibition to it is contained in in the Prayer-book of the Church of England, or founded upon a misconception that prevailed at the time the Prayer-book was written, in regard to the proper interpretation of that passage. But there is even the very highest authority amongst the Bishops of the Church of England in favour of that same position which I have advanced. No less than twenty-six Bishops of the Church of England, including two Archbishops, have expressly declared that in their opinion marriages of this kind are not prohibited by Scripture. I think, therefore, that it would be idle to further argue the question that there is not any Scriptural prohibition against such marriages. If, then, there is no Scriptural probibition, upon what other grounds can objection possibly be raised? The only other argument that I have heard of as being advanced against it is that there is some social reason why marriages of this kind are not to be favoured. When the opponents of this Bill are compelled to fall back upon social reasons of that kind, they must be of an overwhelming character in order to be entitled to any weight. They must not be reasons as to which there is a strong difference of opinion. When we remember the numerous authorities in favour of the abolition of this restriction in England; when we find on the roll of names men distinguished for their high sense of morality, and their high position in public opinion, we may fairly assume that there is not that strong social reason against it which ought to sustain us in retaining a prohibition or restriction of this kind. My hon. friend who has moved the second reading of this Bill has dissomewhat the question of its social expediency. It would be idle perhaps, at this period, after the discussion has proceeded in England for thirty or forty years, to review the arguments upon that point. I am content to rest the case in favour of this Bill on the common sense of the members of this House, who, I am quite sure, in their own experience of life, in their knowledge of human affairs, will not come to the conclusion that there are those overwhelming social reasons against marriages of this kind which ought to justify them in maintaining the restriction which is not founded upon Scripture authority. My hon. friend who has moved this Bill has referred to the state of the law in this country upon it. We have only had one case fore the Courts of Ontario, as far as I am aware, in which the subject has been considered. It was the case of Hodgins *vs.* McNeil, decided by Vice-Chancellor Esten, in the year 1863, and shows the position of the law as it stood, and still stands, in Ontario. In that case it was decided that