

railway has assumed such proportions that a measure of this kind might be so onerous and so damaging to shippers generally, that I must, for my part, adhere to the opinion that Parliament at that time expressed, that it would be unwise to interfere with that traffic. With regard to the excursions on the Lord's Day, I must say frankly to my hon. friend that I am perfectly clear and positive that this Parliament has no possible jurisdiction over that subject. I cannot conceive how the Parliament of Canada could have any more power to prevent steamboats or railways carrying passengers on the Lord's Day than they would have to prevent a cabman carrying a passenger on that day. Parliament would not undertake to legislate upon that subject. This is one of the civil rights which must be left to the provinces, and which each province had better determine for itself. In my province, it is not an offence to have these excursions, while in some other provinces they would be looked upon with disfavour. This is a case in which the morals, education and habits of the people must be considered. I claim for the province of Quebec that, though the observance of the Sabbath is not so rigid as in other provinces, it is as religious as others. It is altogether a matter of opinion. I remember the case of a good Scotchman who happened to live in one of the settlements in my province in which Scotchmen and Frenchmen live contiguous. He expressed the opinion that the French Canadian people were good people, obliging, civil, good Christians and good neighbours, but they played cards on the Sabbath, and he could not understand it. Playing cards is an inoffensive pastime, and is indulged in on Sunday evening in my province. No man would think of not going to church faithfully in the morning. But he allows himself some recreation in the evening. My hon. friend must allow some latitude of habits and manners in observing the day. I think he ought to be satisfied if his Bill, on this occasion, as on the former occasion to which I have referred, is passed with only the first two clauses.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

#### RAILWAY RETURN FARE TICKETS.

Mr. McLELLAN (Glengarry) moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) respecting railway return fare tickets. He said: I do not feel that it is necessary that I should offer a lengthy explanation of this Bill. It was before the House last session, and I think that the reason it did not pass then was that it was referred to the Railway Committee and, owing to the large amount of business that came before the committee at the last part of the session, my Bill was one of those left over. This Bill is intended to extend justice to men who find it neces-

Mr. LAURIER.

sary or prefer to travel second class. At present many railways that run second class cars do not issue second class return tickets on proportionately favourable terms with the return first class tickets, so that they discriminate against the class of people that are least able to pay for their passage. The object of the Bill is to compel the issue of second class return tickets at the same percentage of reduction as in the case of first class tickets. Of course this applies only to railways that run second class cars. From this the House will clearly see that it is not my intention by this Bill to put the railway companies to any inconvenience. Suppose two passengers from Ottawa to Montreal and return. One asks for a first class return ticket which is given him. The other asks for a second class return ticket, but is refused. He must then pay full second class fare to Montreal and, on returning, pay the same fare back to Ottawa. By the time he comes back to Ottawa his railway fare will have cost him nearly the same as that of the man who rode first class, in a car that costs very much more money to construct than does a second class car. The objection was raised last session that this would interfere with excursion trains. That is not necessary. Excursions are specially arranged by the companies, for special purposes only, and the Bill can be so modified in committee of the whole as to meet these exceptional cases. I consider that this is a measure of justice; it will prevent discrimination against the poorer class of people, many of whom would enjoy a ride in a second class as much as in a first class car. This is not a party matter or a matter of politics, and every hon. member in this House should be willing to do this measure of justice to the classes of people who desire to take advantage of these rates.

Mr. LISTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. Can he give us any precedent for the legislation he is asking for? Does he know of any country in the world which has a statute such as he proposes here?

Mr. McLELLAN (Glengarry). I know there are certain restrictions placed on the railway companies in regard to the carrying of passengers and the percentage of profit they make upon the capital invested. Then again, a few sessions ago, certain members on the Government side claimed that it should be made compulsory upon railway companies to issue passes to members without any payment at all. If the members of the Government and other hon. members who sit in this House consider that they themselves are entitled to free passes, I think surely the poorer classes of the people of this country, when they are willing to pay a fair and proportionate amount, are justly entitled to privileges that are similar