

favour of this Bill. Now, how have these petitions been got up? Have they not been written for? Have they not been sought for? Has not the hon. gentleman written to almost every clergyman in his Church; written to every Bishop, to get up these petitions in favour of his Bill? Were there any petitions presented to this House before the 16th of February, in its favour? The hon. gentleman has stated that he had no interest whatever in it. Who are his friends, then, in whose behalf he has brought up this Bill? He must have many friends, many sympathisers, in different parts of the country, for whom he has taken all this trouble, and yet he coolly tells the House that he has done it from purely sympathetic and philanthropic motives, and that it is for the general welfare of the world. The hon. gentleman says that only the Church of England opposes it. As regards the Church of England, were that the only body which oppose it, is a very large and influential body in this country. And when we see all the Bishops of the Church of England in this Dominion, with the exception of those in Manitoba and British Columbia, who had not sufficient time to send petitions, have petitioned against the Bill, I think it is only reasonable that the delay that is asked for should be accorded. The hon. gentleman says the Presbyterian body are in favour of it. But on the 3rd of March last, a large meeting of Presbyterians was held in England, opposed to a Bill of this kind. We have also seen ministers of the Presbyterian Church in Montreal holding a meeting opposed to this Bill; and when we see other bodies in the country opposed to the Bill, I think it only right that some delay should be granted, and not rush the Bill; through the House in this manner. I think the Conservatives in this House, and on the Treasury Benches, should grant the delay asked for. I am very sorry to see that there is a disposition in this House to pass this Bill. We were taken by surprise in regard to it, and by some hon. members the Bill has been regarded with great levity. I protest against the measure as a member of the Church of England, because I think the Synods, which will meet during the summer, should have an opportunity of

considering it. There is no difference of opinion amongst the Bishops of the Church of England on the subject. I beg to move:

“That the Bill be read a third time this day six months.”

MR. GAULT: I have seen no reason to change my view in regard to this measure, and I see no reason whatever why this Bill should not become law.

MR. CAMERON (North Victoria): The hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Jones) has ventured to speak on behalf of the Church of England, as being opposed to this Bill. As a member of the Church of England, I deny that that Church, as a body, is opposed to this Bill. It is true that those bishops who have thought fit to petition this House on the subject, are opposed to the Bill, but there are some English bishops who have voted in favour of this measure on one or two occasions. The basis of the objections to this measure is only to be found in the Prayer-book, and I do not coincide with the party who considers that the Prayer book is superior in point of sanctity and obligation to the Bible. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Leeds speak of the measure as having been regarded as a huge joke. I do not think that we can consider a Bill of this importance as a joke, in view of the past history of the question in England. There is only an unsupported assertion that the law of God is against the Bill, and there is no social reason against it, and, therefore, I venture to think that the third reading of this Bill ought to be carried.

MR. CHARLTON: I think there is a good deal of force in the observation made by my hon. friend from Leeds, that there was no agitation in favour of this Bill. It is certainly a very radical change, and if we pass the Bill this Session, I am of opinion that we will be guilty of precipitancy. It is a matter of great importance, and one in regard to which we should ascertain more fully the feeling of the religious bodies in the country. Therefore, I hope the further consideration of the measure will be deferred until another Session.

MR. PLUMB: I was pained to hear the manner in which the hon. member for Victoria spoke of the Prayer-book, which is not at all under discussion here. I do