

anything to do which has brought me into contact with him. The Provincial Legislature or Government of Ontario have not met this case. They have made no provisions with regard to the publication of Sunday newspaper. I hold in my hand a Sunday newspaper published in the city of Toronto by the Conservative candidate for East York, the *Sunday World* of Toronto, the harbinger of an evil swarm of foul birds which may follow in its wake. I remember when the first Sunday newspaper was published in the United States, which Horace Greeley, the editor of the *Tribune*, characterized as a social demon. When one newspaper office publishes a Sunday newspaper, others are forced to follow suit; and if the *Sunday World* is continued in Toronto, the day is not distant when every newspaper in that city will have its Sunday edition. If we are to deal with this matter, we must deal with it now, and as a Dominion matter, just as we would with the copyright question, the introduction of immoral literature, or its transmission through the mails. The hon. gentleman in his remarks with respect to provincial jurisdiction, did not touch upon the case at all, because we are dealing with matters now exclusively pertaining to the jurisdiction of the Dominion. When the hon. gentleman ignominiously proposes to kick this Bill out of court, does he know whom he is insulting by this summary treatment of the measure? Perhaps he thought he was affecting only the interests of one poor Grit on this side; but there are others interested in preventing Sunday desecration. Every church court, synod, general assembly, conference or presbytery, and the Catholic prelates, Archbishop Fabre and Cardinal Taschereau, have expressed themselves in favour of Sunday observance and Pope Leo XIII is also on record in its favour. I could enumerate ministers, bishops, cardinals, archbishops, jurists, statesmen, labour movement leaders, all over the world, who favour a law such as the one we have under discussion, yet the hon. gentleman moves that the committee do now rise and treat this Bill with the utmost ignominy and contempt. He asks that the committee refuse to consider a single provision embodied in this Bill, and that we should say to every church court, synod, general assembly, conference and other church bodies, that in advocating a Sunday observance law, in sending their petitions and passing their resolutions in its favour, they were not acting in a way worthy of the notice of Parliament. He asks that we should treat all their fulminations, petitions, expressions of sentiment, with the utmost unconcern, and refuse to consider for one moment any provision in this Bill which has received their sanction. That is the position that the hon. member for South Norfolk takes. It is one I hardly supposed a gentleman of his acuteness would have voluntarily taken. I am sorry he has done so, and I hardly believe the House will concur with him and treat this Bill as he asks that it should be treated. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman's course will meet with approval in his constituency. I am sure some of his constituents have deeply at heart the passage of a measure such as that now proposed. A few words with reference to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Militia. That hon. gentleman has criticised this Bill as hermaphrodite measure, as being neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring in his estimation. It

Mr. CHARLTON.

sacrifices, he says, the principles of Sabbath observance; it is not stringent enough; if he went in for a Sabbath Observance Bill, he would give us something stronger. I am quite willing to second the hon. gentleman's views in any respect in this regard. The Bill itself is not such a one in all respects as I would desire, but in arranging a measure of this kind, you have to conciliate divergent views, you have to compromise your own views, or you cannot get the Bill reported by the special committee or secure the support of the majority of the House of Commons. Some provisions have to be made which people in favour of strict observance would not be likely to approve. Such is the provision with regard to labour on newspapers on Sunday evenings after 9 o'clock, and also with regard to milk delivery trains. As the hon. member for Muskoka says, we have to take various circumstances into consideration. We cannot adopt the strict old Jewish method of keeping the Sabbath. We have to decide what constitutes a work of necessity and mercy, because under the christian dispensation, works of necessity and mercy are always excepted, and it may be that a little work, two or three hours of a Sunday evening, is a work of necessity. It may be that the sending of milk trains to the city, where the supply of fresh milk is necessary to the welfare and health of the people, is a work of necessity. I think it is. There are various other things which some strict Sabbathterians might not deem properly a work of necessity, and the Bill to-night is broad and liberal in its provisions, not going so far as strict sabbatherians would like, a Bill not insuring strict religious observance at all, but designed to secure to the labourer his civil right of enjoying one day's rest in the seven and to protect him from the exactions of the employer and the capitalist. The hon. Minister of Militia drew attention to the feature of the Bill with regard to the moiety of fines, and referring to some remarks made by myself on a former occasion about the custom-house system of making seizures and allowing officials to share in the fines imposed. That is a matter not pertinent to the consideration of the Bill; and although I might easily show that the two cases are not parallel, I will not stop to do so. But he goes on to make various criticisms as to the details of the Bill in other respects. All I have to say about that matter is this: The proper time to discuss the different clauses is when we are in committee. The Bill is not presented as a perfect measure, and every clause may be amended at the discretion of the House. But it does not follow because an hon. member may consider this or that section incomplete or requiring amendment, that the Bill should not be considered at all, but if there is anything in this Bill worthy of the consideration of this House, if the amendment the Minister of Justice proposes is worthy our consideration, or if anything whatever in it is worthy of consideration, let the Bill be considered in committee, let the Bill stand upon its merits in the committee, let each section of the Bill be adopted or rejected, as the case may be, in the committee, but do not refuse the Bill that degree of courtesy which entitles it to the consideration of the committee. Do not ignominiously throw the Bill out and in that way flout every man in the Dominion who believes, either for civil or religious reasons, in a Sabbath day's rest being secured for the toiler. I present these reasons and