

wronging him as if they snatched away his money or his land. He had a claim on their justice to be allowed to do that, and they were trespassing on his rights in debarring him. If Scripture said nothing, people would be left to form their own opinions. But when a line had been precisely drawn between allowed and disallowed marriages, surely those who demanded to use the freedom which God had given them were wronged if that freedom were taken away upon the pretence of some fancied awkwardness arising to imaginary people. The case for the Bill seemed overwhelming if they took the ground of expediency alone. But the true, the decisive reason for supporting it was that the existing law was a trespass on men's natural rights, and that it filched from them the freedom reserved to them by the law of God."

Mr. Monckton Miles, in the same debate, cited the following testimony of Dr. McCaul, one of the best Hebrew scholars of the day; at the same time, his orthodoxy cannot be disputed. Dr. McCaul says:

"I confess that, when I entered upon this inquiry, I had no idea that the case of those who wish a change in the present marriage law was so strong. I had thought that the opinions of grave and learned students of the Bible were more equally divided; and that, as authorities were pretty evenly balanced, they who had contracted such marriages must bear the inconveniences arising from doubtful interpretation. But I do not think so now. Confirmed by the testimony of antiquity and the judgment of the most considerable interpreters at the Reformation, and since the Reformation, I now believe there is no reasonable room for doubt—that there is no verse in the Bible of which the interpretation is more sure than that of Leviticus xviii, 18; and I think it a case of great hardship that they should, by the civil law, be punished as transgressors, whose marriage, according to the divine law, is permitted and valid; and harder still that the children of such marriages legitimate in the sight of the infallible Judge should be visited with civil disabilities."

I have quoted these authorities to shew the opinions of leading divines in England upon the subject.

The House then divided upon the amendment, which was adopted by the following vote:—

CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Allan,	Grant,
Archibald,	Guévremont,
Armand,	Haythorne,
Bellerose,	Kaulbach,
Boucherville, De,	McClelan (<i>Hopewell</i>),
Bourinot,	LcLelan (<i>Londonderry</i>),
Bureau,	Macdonald,
Campbell, Sir Alex.,	Miller,
Chaffers,	Odell,
Chapais,	Power,
Christie,	Pozzer,
Cormier,	Ryan,
Cornwall,	Sutherland,
Dickey,	Trudel,
Dickson,	Vidal,
Dumouchel,	Wark—33.
Girard,	

NON-CONTENTS:

Hon. Messrs.

Aikins,	Lewin,
Baillargeon,	McMaster,
Benson,	Macfarlane,
Botsford,	Macpherson (<i>Speaker</i>),
Boyd,	Montgomery,
Cochrane,	Pâquet,
Dever,	Pelletier,
Fabre,	Penny,
Ferguson,	Price,
Ferrier,	Read,
Flint,	Reesor,
Gibbs,	Simpson,
Hamilton (<i>Inkerman</i>),	Smith,
Hamilton (<i>Kingston</i>),	Stevens,
Hope,	Thibaudcau—31.
Leonard,	

The House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.