

rich man driving to his favoured church in his coach and the poor man being refused the privilege of riding on the street cars on Sunday, but he believed the latter was better without that privilege, because if he had it, the men connected with the street railways would be compelled to work. If this Bill had no stronger ground than the moral reason to recommend it, that would be sufficient. If he had his way he would stop running trains on Sunday, but he was not going that far, but merely asking that Sunday excursion trains should be prohibited running. He explained that his Bill proposed to do away with excursions on the Sabbath by railway or steamboat, then it provided a penalty for infringement, and finally it provided that the Bill should not apply to ferries and steamboats employed thereon.

Hon. C. F. FRASER said he had hoped when the hon. gentleman introduced this Bill that he did it for the purpose of eliciting discussion, and not with the expectation that it would become law during the present session. He now apprehended, however, that the hon. gentleman proposed attempting to bring it into effect, and he rose to say that so far as he was individually concerned he was entirely opposed to the legislation. He was opposed to it because he thought they had no jurisdiction in the premises, because they had no right to say whether railways should operate on Sunday or not, and if they had no jurisdiction with respect to railways he apprehended they had none with respect to steamboats. He was opposed to it also because he thought it was in effect class legislation, and that of the worst kind. It would have the effect of working entirely against the poorer classes. The rich men would laugh at the law, because they could have their pleasure in spite of it. It would pen the poorer classes up in their tenements, and instead of making the Sabbath a better observed day would make it a great deal worse observed. He referred to New York and London, where the railways were kept going on Sunday. There was no man who did not work on Sunday either mentally or physically. The Monday newspapers, which the hon. gentleman read, were made up by Sunday labour; the soldier was out on guard on Sunday even in times of peace; there were more policemen kept on duty than were absolutely necessary; Her Majesty rode to church in her carriage when it was not perhaps necessary; the merchant sold goods which were brought across the Atlantic by Sunday labour; he sat under the pulpit even and thought of sending out his commercial traveller on the Monday. There was no more harm in a man going on a Sunday excursion than in hiring a boat and taking a row, or in going for a walk into the country, and yet in no case would they pretend to bring the law down to the level of these things.

Hon. O. MOWAT stated that on this point the Government was not a unit. The House had not to consider whether art schools or museums should be open on the Sabbath Day, but whether a certain kind of excursions should be prohibited. This matter had been discussed very fully and ably by the gentleman who introduced the Bill, and had referred to the fact of an attempt having been made to obtain Dominion legislation. He had in his hand the official communication from the Governor-General, pointing out that the attempt to create a criminal distinction between travellers for pleasure and travellers for business was surrounded by insurmountable difficulties, and that any other legislation on this subject should emanate from the Provincial Legislatures. He stated the present law with respect to Sabbath observance, and showed that the principle of the Bill was now on the statute book and had long been there, and the working people had sanctioned and approved of the principle. It was a well known fact that all the clergy, both Protestant and Catholic, were against Sabbath excursions. He denied that the Bill would be against the interests of the working classes, and showed that the best part of that, the Christian part, were against Sabbath excursions. Besides respecting the scruples of the religious, their opinions should be regarded. The opinions of the larger part of the thinking men of the community was that it was of great importance that the sanctity of the Sabbath should be regarded, and that Sunday should be a day of rest.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN supported the Bill, and would go so far even as to shut up printing offices on the Sabbath Day. From the humanitarian view he was in favour of Sabbath observance. He would allow men to walk out.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Would you let him drive?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN—Yes.

Hon. C. F. FRASER—Then you will not stop the one-horse trains.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN, proceeding, stated that the British Museum was not open on the Sabbath, that he was not sure that even one art gallery in London was open, but he did know that after the art galleries of Birmingham had been opened by the popular vote on Sunday they had been closed again, and were now closed.

Mr. METCALFE was fully in favour of the Bill, and in sympathy with the views expressed by the Attorney-General.

Mr. YOUNG expressed himself in favour of the Bill. So far as Canada is concerned he believed the country had the honour of paying due regard to the Sabbath Day. It would be an unfortunate thing if the Continental Sabbath as it is in Europe were introduced into Canada. He

thought there was a gradual progression toward Sabbath work, and he contended that it might continue until the working classes were deprived of Sabbath rest and compelled to work every day in the week.

The question of the second reading was then put, and five members not calling for the yeas and nays it was carried on division.

COSTS OF ELECTION TRIALS.

Mr. FERRIS, in moving the second reading of the Bill relating to the costs of election trials, said as the law now stood only a man pretty well off or a very poor man could afford to run for Parliament. He contended that as the law now stood instead of the money being divided among the electorate as formerly, it was divided amongst the lawyers. While there was no provision in the Bill to prevent any one going any length to punish wrong and wrong-doing he would not have the innocent suffer. His idea was that the poor man should not be prevented from becoming a candidate. It was a measure which afforded those entering political life some guarantee that their means should be swept away. The question of who could sit for an alderman was easily settled, and at the longest in a few weeks, while a member of Parliament might sit for two or three sessions before he was declared not to be elected. What he proposed was to take away this temptation to the legal profession to protract the litigation in such cases.

Hon. O. MOWAT thought the object of the Bill was most desirable. The cost of election trials was enormous. This Bill, however, would not answer the purpose intended, and therefore he proposed that it should be referred to a committee consisting of some lawyers, who would frame it so as to meet the object the hon. gentleman had in view.

Mr. MEREDITH pointed out that the tendency of cutting down the costs would be to lead to more suits being entered, and to more corruption being practised in elections.

Hon. A. S. HARDY said the House would not do its duty if it allowed the scandal to be continued of such enormous bills being taxed under the guise of being agreements between solicitors and clients. He mentioned having seen a bill to-day of \$700 in a case where only one witness was called, and the trial only lasted a day. It was a shocking state of things, and enough to frighten men from entering political life.

Mr. FERRIS stated that he thought that he could bring in this measure with a better grace, inasmuch as he had no costs to pay in the case against himself. The Bill was in the interests of such men as one whose bill he produced, and which amounted to nearly \$4,000. He moved that the Bill be referred to a Special Committee consisting of Messrs. Hardy, Harcourt, French, Merrick, and Ferris. Carried.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Mr. GIBSON (Hamilton) moved the second reading of the Bill to amend the Ontario Joint Stock Companies Patent Act, which was referred to the same Committee as Mr. Ferris' Bill.

SAW MILLS.

Hon. O. MOWAT moved the first reading of a Bill respecting saw mills on the Ottawa River.

THE CENTRAL PRISON.

Mr. MEREDITH read seven cases of alleged hardship and excessive punishment in the Central Prison. He submitted that it was the duty of the Government to substantiate or disprove the charges.

Hon. A. S. HARDY asked for a list of the cases. The Government could have no interest in shielding any one who had done wrong. He would bring the matter before his colleagues, and let Mr. Meredith know the result before the House rose.

The House adjourned at 11:20.