

hundreds of gentlemen in this country who do not yield in kindness of heart to any one here, who visit the different fishing rivers in this country and kill their salmon and enjoy the sport. And is it to be supposed that the gentleman who kills 15 or 20 salmon a day is able to consume all this salmon? They kill them for the sake of killing, as the hon. gentleman says; and I repudiate entirely, on the part of those who oppose this Bill, any such thing as an intention to be cruel towards either animals, birds or fishes. And now a word about some of the officers of the humanitarian societies; I speak of what I have seen since this Legislature met. I have seen ladies who are prominent in these humanitarian societies, riding behind horses who have been clipped and exposed to the winter's cold, being in fact almost naked. I have seen these humanitarians driving lame horses in their carriages, and if it be cruel to shoot a pigeon, I think it is quite as cruel to drive a horse whose foot is so sore that it is difficult for him to put it to the ground. I have seen those horses standing before shops in this city for from half an hour to three-quarters of an hour, in the coldest weather, with the wind blowing upon them, and nothing to protect them. Yet, forsooth, we are to be told by people who are guilty of these things that they are the only people who are opposed to cruelty in this country, and they denounce us who are sportsmen because we indulge, in a legitimate way, in that which has come to us honestly from our fathers.

Mr. BARRON. I have no doubt that under this Bill it will be impossible for any one to clip his horse. The only question will be as to whether or not it is an act of cruelty. This Bill, I think, originated with the Humane Society in Toronto. They have published a book, which is used throughout the schools of Ontario, and in this book they state that they have already placed in the hands of Mr. Lees, a member of the Provincial Legislature, a Bill similar to this, and in that book they state the different acts of cruelty, one of which is the clipping of horses. I have no doubt that under sub-section *a* of section 2 it will be impossible for any one to clip his horse. It will rest, I repeat, with the magistrate to decide as to whether such is an act of cruelty. Some say it is and some say it is not. Having had some little experience I hold that it is not an act of cruelty, that it is absolutely necessary that some horses should be clipped in winter.

Mr. BERGIN. Is it necessary to have their tails cut off?

Mr. BARRON. That is another act of cruelty for which people may be tried under this Bill. I think myself, that docking a horse's tail as is sometimes practiced is an act of cruelty, and when persons not only simply cut the tail off but dock it so that the tail shall assume a particular shape, that is an act of cruelty.

Mr. BERGIN. It is fashionable all the same.

Mr. BARRON. I repeat that I do not think clipping a horse is an act of cruelty. In winter it is absolutely necessary, especially with long-haired horses, because we know that a horse in a state of perspiration will get cold if it stands and the perspiration is allowed to freeze on its coat, all of which can be avoided if the horse is clipped. My chief objection to that Bill is that in that particular it will open the door to all sorts of litigation, and it will leave in the hands of the magistrates the power to say whether horse clipping is or is not an act of cruelty.

Mr. DAVIES (P.E.I.) I think some hon. members of the committee will be very apt to vote for or against the Bill from some misconception, because, judging from the remarks of my hon. friend, he has hardly gathered the meaning of the amendment proposed. The clause against which his speech was made is not a new clause; it was explained the other night. That clause has stood as the

Mr. BERGIN.

law of the land for some time. The hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill seeks to amend the law in three particulars. It proposes to amend the interpretation clause by extending it to cover some additional animals, and it provides in sub-sections *a* and *f* certain new offences. I think that in committee, probably, if we reach that far, these offences will have to be more specifically defined, but I do not see why any humane person should object to the punishment of a person who, having the charge or custody of an animal, unnecessarily fails to provide the same with proper food, drink, shelter and protection from the weather. I do not see why a person who, having the charge or custody of an animal, wantonly and unnecessarily leaves, disables or abandons such animal, should go scott free. We have already placed a law on our Statute-book on this subject, and if the jurisdiction lies with the Parliament, as appears to be the general opinion, it is an exclusive jurisdiction, and if we determine to have a law on the Statute-book we should not approach it with any feelings of maudlin sentiment, but should look at the question as sensible men, and make the law, if possible, a perfect law. There is a provision against keeping animals or birds as targets to fire at. I do not believe true sportsmen are of the opinion that it is necessary to keep animals or birds as targets. I have been a member of a gun club for some years, and we have used clay pigeons, as have many other gun clubs. The two objections raised against this Bill are, first, on the ground of jurisdiction, and second, that the Bill goes too far. The first is untenable, and the second is really aimed at the law on the Statute-book, and not at this Bill at all.

Motion that the Committee rise agreed to: Yeas, 68; nays, 67.

#### RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. COOK moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) to amend the Railway Act. He said: The first clause provides that—

"All railway trains for the conveyance of passengers shall be drawn up at the stations or other stopping places so as to enable passengers to alight from the car on to a platform which shall be constructed at each station or stopping place."

I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that all railway companies have platforms at their stations and that if they neglect to land passengers on the platforms it is directly the fault of the company. This clause will only cause railways to be more careful and will not cause them any additional expenditure whatever. We know that very serious accidents have occurred through the carelessness of the companies in landing passengers at the stations. I have in my mind now a case where a young man was killed in my own constituency but a short time ago. The North Simcoe Railway is now owned by the Grand Trunk Railway, and at the town of Orillia they have two platforms at the station, one platform connected with the station and another between the two sidings. The platform near the station is much lower than the outer platform and it is necessary to have a descent on the platform so that baggage can be taken on to it. A short while ago an able and energetic young man was returning home after attending his legal duties in Toronto and he was going down the declivity of the platform when he slipped and fell as the train was moving. Both his legs had to be amputated from the result of the injuries he received and a short time afterwards he died. All the papers in the county as well as the Toronto papers had articles on this unfortunate accident, and I can give you no better idea of the loss caused by the death of this young gentleman than to read an article from *The Switch*, a paper published in the town of Barrie:

"It is not beyond the functions of *The Switch* to record the sad event which has deprived the county—yes, the Province—of a promising and