

whole of clause 9. I am at a loss to see why shooting should be prohibited if the ordinary rules as to security be observed, which, in this case, should rather call for a police by-law than for criminal legislation. But I do not intend to deal with the whole clause at this stage. All I wish to do at present is to set anybody free to go-a-hunting on Sunday if he feels like it. Therefore, I will move, seconded by Mr. Camille Piché, that the word 'inanimate' be added immediately after the word 'thing' in the second line of said clause 9. So much for the French version. As for the English version, I propose that the word 'inanimate' be inserted between the words 'other' and 'object,' also in the second line of the same clause 9.

Mr. BERGERON. Will shooting at a target on the Sabbath be unlawful under this Bill?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is only the thing prohibited which is declared to be unlawful. There is no objection to inserting the word 'inanimate' if that is preferred.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the harm in shooting on Sunday? A man in his own yard, or at his own home wishes to shoot on Sunday but he cannot do it. Suppose he lives a long distance from any neighbour, he cannot go shooting on Sunday, he cannot go out with his boys behind the house or in the woods to shoot at a target but he can shoot at anything else. I am trying to find out the principle underlying the legislation.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I would suggest the insertion of an amendment to the effect that it shall be unlawful to go duck hunting or hunting any game on the Sabbath except for food.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the opinion of the Minister of Justice. Some of the provinces have passed game laws for the protection of game as for example in Ontario, and I believe for regulating salmon fishing in Quebec. It is illegal to hunt game in Ontario. Is that law still within the rights of the province or would it become ultra vires?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. This legislation does not affect it one way or the other.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. The principle of this Bill is to prevent any work being done on Sunday for which a fee is paid. If a man shoots at a target in his own house or yard, or at his country place, I do not see that he violates that principle.

Mr. BERGERON. Unless there is a cow around.

Mr. ARMAND LAVERGNE. I think this is one of the most unjust and arbitrary sections.
Mr. BEAUPARLANT.

tions of the Bill. You are allowed to shoot certain things but not to make the same noise shooting at a target. I move according to my belief that clause 9 be struck out.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have two amendments already.

Mr. PICHE. The amendment to insert the word 'inanimate' has been accepted.

Amendment (Mr. Beauparlant) agreed to.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What reason has the government for allowing duck hunting and deer hunting and partridge hunting?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The form in which the question is put is of a character well known among lawyers, a form which implies the answer that the person who frames the question wishes to have it inferred from his language is the intention. There is nothing in this statute one way or the other on the subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think in order to get at the exact object of the clause we should have some fuller statement. I must confess that for the moment I do not understand why we should permit shooting at pigeons or animate objects of that character and restrict the shooting at a target mark or other similar object. It seems to me that you would disturb the Sabbath as much and violate the principles of this Act as much by pigeon shooting or, as my hon. friend from York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) suggests, by turkey shooting. But I do not desire to treat the subject in a spirit of levity. I would like to know the principle, because I think the object to be attained is to prevent disturbance of the Sabbath and to prevent anything that could properly be declared desecration of the Sabbath. But is there any distinction in principle between the character of the act in the one case and the character of the act in the other. Would it not be desirable to make this clause a little more comprehensive.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. If my hon. friend has any desire to make the clause more comprehensive surely he will move to amend it so as to make it prohibit something he wishes to prohibit. This clause permits nothing. There is an enactment that some particular thing shall on Sunday be unlawful. I cannot understand on what principle it is argued that everything else, not specifically mentioned in this clause, is thereby included or excluded, or is thereby permitted. We have under the Act of Charles II which I take it is in force in many of the provinces, a general provision against the doing of some of such things as have been alluded to in the discussion upon this amendment. Here is something else, some-