

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TISDALE. I think not. Did I say anything of a boastful nature?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. TISDALE. I say no. I did not treat the measure with disrespect. On the contrary, I showed the insincerity of the hon. gentleman, either here or when he ascends the platform in the ridings of the county, from which we both come. If I am correct in the principle I advocate, that the Provincial Legislatures should deal with this matter, it is extremely unfair upon a matter on which public feeling is so strong, and properly so, namely, Sabbath observance, to attempt to place me in a false position. But was there any want of respect when I took the highest possible grounds that can be taken on any question of legislation in this country, that where subjects are properly relegated to the provinces, the question of dealing with them should be left to the provinces? When the hon. gentleman assumes to speak for the christian sentiment of this country, for what does he speak? The hon. gentleman placed himself in a most inconsistent position with regard to christian sentiment of this country when he endeavoured to force on the people, whose religious feelings were different from his own, action which they did not think fair to themselves. So long ago as when the Separate school question was brought up in the Province of Ontario the hon. gentleman was one of those who joined with his associates in bitterly attacking the Separate school system. I am a Protestant as he is, but I believe, under the circumstances, that the Catholics are entitled to Separate schools, and I never was sorry for having supported them. When the hon. gentleman rises here, and when he declares that I am attacking the christian sentiment of the country, I ask what is the christian sentiment for which he speaks? christian sentiment does not belong to any kind of man or to any legislation, but it is that broad right that our thoughts and feelings, on moral questions, should be free and should not be questioned. Did I question them? On the contrary; and if christian sentiment is not broad enough to cover this view, then I do not agree with it. I said that all the people in the provinces should have the right to regulate their own affairs in regard to this christian sentiment. That cannot be gainsaid. I have not boasted of my christian achievements. The Bill to which the hon. gentleman has referred may have been, in his opinion, an excellent Bill, but there was nothing in it that attacked the foundations of the constitution as between the Provincial and the Dominion Legislatures, and I do not understand it to be christian sentiment to induce people to follow sentiments which they do not accept. At all events, if it is christian sentiment which has been presented to us, I have never been able to embrace that sort of christianity, although I claim to be a christian equally with the hon. member. The hon. gentleman declares he will keep on introducing the Bill each year. Let him do so. If it is wrong the people's representatives will keep on throwing out the measure every year. Hon. members of the House are sufficiently independent, although party ties are so strong, to unite on moral questions and reject such a measure as that now under consideration, and unless proper justification can be adduced

for it by the hon. gentleman, he may bring in his Bill as many times as we sit here and it will be rejected. A word as to his last point. The hon. gentleman claims that this Parliament has the right to regulate the running of Government railways and to control operations on the canals on Sunday. I agree with him that we have the right to do so; but I say that not only as regards this Government, but the Government controlled by hon. gentlemen opposite, it would be a reflection to pass such a measure, for there is no cause or complaint to be remedied, and both the Government of Mr. Mackenzie and the present Government so controlled the canals that no cause of complaint existed. If this Parliament tied down the Government by a strict set of rules, an occasion might arise when the restrictions would appear to be monstrous, and when there would be no discretion left to the Government. We have not, perhaps, that hon. gentleman's sentiment of christianity, we may not have his peculiar tenets on this question, but I am satisfied that we have, among the leaders of the great political parties, sufficient of that sentiment to guard all that should be guarded. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to place me in a false position. I am quite prepared to leave this question with the liberal-minded christian people, if it is explained to them in a proper way so that they will understand it, and I believe they will not thank the hon. gentleman for trying to force on other people his views. Or if they should, they ought to be checked, because I believe that each province should have within itself the control over these matters. I also believe that the leaders of both political parties in this country are sufficiently God-fearing and sufficiently upright to see that the Sabbath day is not degraded in the management of our public works.

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I was under the impression that the question of Sabbath observance had been fully dealt with by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario. I remember that after the question had been discussed in this House, a somewhat similar Bill to the one brought before this Parliament but more restrictive in its provisions, was introduced in the Ontario Legislature and after some amendments became law. The contention there was, that it should be the duty of each province to enforce, so far as it was considered in accord with the consciences of the people, and its practicability, the observance of the Lord's Day. I am very strongly in favour, and I have always been in favour of preventing the carrying on of business on the Sabbath, and more especially am I against Sunday newspapers and their circulation throughout the country. I cannot understand, however, that it would be any more wicked for me or any other printer to begin work at 6 o'clock in order to print the Monday morning's paper, than if work was commenced only at 9 o'clock at night. I do not know, as we understand the Sabbath, whether it is more wicked for a man to begin work immediately after church or in the morning, than it is if he begins work at 9 o'clock at night and works until 12; or, in other words, that he is to be religious for 21 hours of the 24, which are supposed to constitute the Sabbath, and as wicked as he pleases during the three hours between 9 and 12 o'clock. However, to my mind, this Bill seems to be of a sort of hermaphrodite character; it is