

with his neighbours, outrage their feelings of decency, and thereby make himself a public nuisance. All this is outside of the provisions of the Bill. I am not saying that these provisions are too stringent, or that they are not stringent enough. I am merely arguing that they are provisions which should not be enacted by this House, but should be brought before a provincial parliament.

Let me call the attention of the House to the completeness of the existing legislation of Ontario on this subject; I am not so familiar with that of the other provinces. Chapter 203 of the Consolidated Statutes of Ontario is called "An Act to prevent the profanation of the Lord's Day." It provides that no sales shall take place on Sunday, that no ordinary work shall be done, with certain exceptions, that political meetings, tipping, and so forth, shall be prohibited on that day. It is rather a queer collocation of words to place tipping and political meetings together; but so it seemed good to the wisdom of our provincial legislators, and we shall have to accept it. It is not lawful for any person on that day to play at skittles, ball, foot-ball, rackets, or any other noisy game, or to gamble with dice or otherwise, or to run races on foot, or on horseback or in carriages or in vehicles of any sort. Is not that pretty comprehensive legislation? and its constitutionality is not disputed. Except in defence of his property from any wolf or any other ravenous beast or a bird of prey, it is not lawful for any person on that day to go out hunting or shooting. It is not only forbidden to a man to catch fish on Sunday, but to go out fishing, which some members of this House may realize is a very different thing. It is not lawful for any person on that day to bathe in any exposed situation in any water within the limits of any incorporated city or town, or within view of any place of public worship, or private residence. Sunday excursions by steamboats plying for hire or by railway or in part by any such steamboat and in part by railway, and having for their only and principle object the carriage of Sunday passengers for amusement or pleasure only, and to go and return on the same day by the same steamboat or railway, or any other, owned by the same persons or company, shall be unlawful. This is legislation on one of the very points embraced in the Bill of my hon. friend from North Norfolk. It has stood for years as the legislation of the Ontario legislature, and has been enforced time and again; its constitutionality has never been disputed, and I think it fills the Bill with regard to Sunday excursions. The owner of any steamboat or railway by which any such Sunday excursion is wholly or partly made, is liable to a fine of \$400. Then provisions are made for the mode of enforcing the provisions of the Act and collecting the penalties. So far as Ontario is

Mr. CASEY.

concerned, I think the Sunday observance ground is pretty well covered. Subsequently, I think last year, an Act was passed in regard to the running of electric cars on Sunday, and it applies to all electric railways which have been constructed since that Act. On these grounds alone, I think we ought to hesitate before giving this Bill its second reading.

At the same time, if there is anything in the Bill which the majority of the House consider to be within our jurisdiction, and which they think could be worked into practical shape in the Committee of the Whole, I have for my part no objection to see it pass the second reading, with the distinct understanding that its second reading shall not be taken as a precedent or an endorsement of the principle that this House has the right to legislate generally on the question of Sunday observance.

Coming down to particulars, I will take first that clause which is undoubtedly within our powers and which provides that no canal belonging to Canada shall be open for traffic on Sunday. I beg to point out that this is utterly inconsistent with the clause which permits through traffic over our railways on Sundays. Why should this Bill provide for the stoppage of through traffic by vessels when it does not provide for the stoppage of through traffic by rail? It provides that vessels shall be laid up every Sunday, while through trains of cars are allowed to continue their journey. What would result from this provision in the case of the Welland Canal, the hon. gentleman must know, from his knowledge of the locality. He must know what a tremendous blockage of freight would occur, what difficulty there would be getting that blockage started again on Monday, and what loss of time, and perhaps of markets and money to shippers would result. I am afraid he will find it difficult to advance reasons for the stoppage of vessels and the enforced idleness of sailors, who would not be doing anything while going through the canals on that day, and who would be simply wasting time on the Sunday, while he allows through railway traffic to continue.

As to the publishing of Sunday newspapers, I fully agree with my hon. friend in his detestation of the sort of Sunday literature that is published in the States. I fully agree with him that if such Sunday literature as that became common in Canada, it would have a most disastrous effect on our young Canadian population. But it is not only on Sunday that such literature is published, and what is required is a law which will prohibit its publication on every day of the week. I do not know why it should be a special crime to publish immoral matter on Sunday and not on any other day. In my opinion, it should be an offence to publish such literature on any day, and I will go as far as anybody in providing legislation to prevent it. I do not like to see a