

Chesley this season, by the Port Stanley and Lake Huron Railroad; and if so, when?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It is not, at present, the intention of the Government to send the mails by that railway.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

Mr. GIROUARD, in moving the second reading of Bill (No. 9) concerning marriage with a deceased wife's sister, said: After having seen, as we have to-day, a petition from about three hundred ladies of Montreal, for the repeal of the prohibition of marriage with a deceased wife's sister, we cannot postpone the second reading of this Bill. It is perfectly clear that the passing of this Bill has become a necessity, not only in the interest of the female, but also in the interest of the male sex. This necessity is so manifest that I do not intend to repeat, to-day, the arguments which were made when this Bill was brought forward for the first time in 1880; the discussion then lasted four sittings. Every possible argument for and against the Bill was then advanced, and I would be abusing the indulgence of this House were I to deal with the subject-matter at any length. This House will recollect that on its second reading, this Bill was passed by 120 to 19, and on its third reading by a majority of 75. Finally, when the Bill was brought before the Senate, it occupied several sittings of that body, and there the Bill, after having been thoroughly considered, was not rejected, but its consideration postponed for another year. We have given the members of the Senate, not only one, but two years to consider it and arrive at a conclusion as to the tendency of public opinion regarding it, and what is the result? Do we find that public opinion is against the Bill? On the contrary, it is more in favor of the Bill than ever. So much so, that ladies have thought it necessary to adopt a very unusual proceeding on their part, and ask Parliament to adopt this measure. Since the Session of 1880 it has been constantly before the public. There is hardly a newspaper in the country which has not contained not only numerous correspondence, but also leading articles; and it is a most agreeable fact that not a single newspaper can be quoted against the provisions of this Bill. I do not intend to examine the question from any religious aspect. To-day, as two years ago, theologians are divided and will always be divided, but, I believe, that a large majority of the people of the Dominion are in favor of the measure, and that is the reason why I have the honor to ask the House to pass the second reading. I may add that this Bill has passed the British House of Commons ten or twelve times, and has been defeated in the House of Lords but by a majority of four—I believe in 1877. A similar Bill has become law in all the British Colonies except Canada. It has become law in South Australia, Victoria, Tasmania, New South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia. Since last Session it has passed the Legislature of New Zealand, and has also become law at the Cape of Good Hope. Undoubtedly those colonies but follow the natural law. I have changed a little the wording of the Bill. The first section provides that all laws prohibiting marriage with a deceased wife's sister are hereby repealed. The first Bill provided that hereafter it shall be lawful for a man to marry his deceased wife's sister. I make this change to meet the views of the hon. member for Maskinongé and others of his friends who moved an amendment to that effect. I do not see, really, that it makes much difference whether the prohibition be repealed or the marriage be made lawful; but I make the change to meet the hon. member's views, and secure as many votes as I can. That position in the old Bill which related to the widow's brother has also been left out, to meet the views of another portion of this House, who, to the number of thirty, supported an amendment to that effect. As far as I am personally concerned, I would be glad to see that

Mr. GILLIES.

portion restored. It is only a sentiment, but sentiment must be respected. The second clause is inserted in order to protect vested rights with which we have no desire whatever to interfere.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Fitzsimmons,	Merner,
Amyot,	Fleming,	Méthot,
Anglin,	Fortin,	Mills,
Arkell,	Fulton,	Mousseau,
Bain,	Gault,	Muttart,
Baker,	Gigault,	Orton,
Bannerman,	Gillies,	Paterson (Brant),
Barnard,	Gillmor,	Pickard,
Beaty,	Girouard (Jac. Cartier),	Pinsonneault,
Beauchesne,	Girouard (Kent),	Platt,
Béchar, d,	Grandbois,	Reid,
Benoit,	Guillet,	Richey,
Bergeron,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Bergin,	Guthrie,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bill,	Haddow,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Bolduc,	Haggart,	Rochester,
Bourassa,	Hesson,	Rogers,
Bowell,	Holton,	Ross (Dundas),
Brown,	Houde,	Ross (Middlesex),
Bunster,	Huntington,	Rouleau,
Burnham,	Hurteau,	Routhier,
Burpee (St. John),	Irvine,	Royal,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Jackson,	Ryan (Marquette),
Cameron (Huron),	Killam,	Ryan (Montreal),
Carling,	Kilvert,	Rykert,
Cartwright,	King,	Rymal,
Casey,	Kranz,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Landry,	Shaw,
Cimon (Chicoutimi),	Lantier,	Skinner,
Cockburn,	Laurier,	Sproule,
Colby,	Longley,	Strange,
Costigan,	Macdonald (Kings),	Sutherland,
Coupal,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tasse,
Coursol,	Macdonell (Lanark),	Tellier,
Crouter,	Mackenzie,	Trow,
Currier,	Macmillan,	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	McCallum,	Vallée,
Daoust,	McCarthy,	Wade,
DeCosmos,	McDougald,	Wallace (Norfolk),
Desjardins,	McDougall,	Wallace (York),
Doull,	McGreevy,	Wheler,
Drew,	McLennan,	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	McRory,	White (Hastings),
Dumont,	Malouin,	Wiser,
Elliott,	Manson,	Wright.—137.
Ferguson,	Massue,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Bourbeau,	Jones,	Quimet,
Brooks,	Kirkpatrick,	Patterson (Essex),
Bunting,	Langevin,	Plumb,
Caron,	McDonald (C. Breton),	Pope (Compton),
Charlton,	McDonald (Vis., N.S.),	Scott,
Daly,	MacDonnell (Inverness),	Stephenson,
Dawson,	McCuaign,	Thompson,
Desaulniers,	McQuade,	Vanasse,
Farrow,	Montréalais,	Weldon,
Fiset,	O'Connor,	White (Renfrew),
Geoffrion,	Olivier,	Williams.—34.
Hackett,		

Bill read the second time.

DRAWBACKS ON GOODS MANUFACTURED FOR EXPORT.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Paterson (South Brant) for a return of all claims presented for drawbacks on goods manufactured for export since January 22nd, 1881, &c.

Mr. CHARLTON. In view of the fact that the Budget Speech will be delivered shortly, and that matters pertaining to the trade policy of the Government will then be fully discussed, I shall not enter to-night into a lengthy discussion of the question under consideration. I shall confine myself to meeting a few of the views presented by the hon.