

We have as fruits of Sunday observance, better sanitary conditions in society, better public health, a greater degree of cleanliness, a greater degree of self-respect among the people. This is admitted on all hands to be one of the fruits of Sunday observance. We have, as another fruit of respect for the Sabbath, an increase of Christian homes which are graduating schools of Christian citizens, and without which we cannot hope to have a free and independent electorate in this country or a population that will maintain their civil and religious rights. The Christian home is a matter of great importance to the continuance of the liberty of the people and the security of the state. If we do not secure to the people rest from labour on that day, Christian sentiment in the country will gradually and continuously diminish and with it the number of Christian homes.

Another effect of the observance of the Sabbath is the promotion of temperance and of regard for law and obedience to law. These reasons that I have enumerated are of themselves sufficient, from a material standpoint, totally without regard to religious considerations at all, to justify the enactment of this law. The law is calculated to secure good morals, to promote social purity, both matters of the utmost consequence to the statesman who desires to see his country prosperous and its institutions stable. The law is one which is calculated to secure the rights of conscience. The labourer who is deprived of his right to go to church on the Sabbath because a corporation demands that he should go to work, the labourer who cannot join his family in going to church or Sabbath school—that labourer has his conscientious rights trampled upon. He is deprived of the rights of a free citizen, he is deprived of the rights that appertain to civil and religious liberty in a free land. No greater outrage can be imagined than that perpetrated on the labourer who is required to work on the Lord's Day and is too poor to throw up his situation, and who can appeal to no law to protect him in the enjoyment of the right which he ought to enjoy, as a free citizen, of going to church with his family. This law of Sabbath observance is admitted on all hands to be one which aids materially and directly our national development. And this assertion is borne out by the fact that the nations that do regard the Sabbath and observe the requirements of the rest day are the nations that are making the most rapid progress, nations that enjoy the greater stability and greater freedom and have a more desirable condition of affairs as regards material matters than nations that disregard the requirements of this law. I deduce from these statements two conclusions: first, that from the religious standpoint, a law designed to secure to the labourer the right of Sunday rest is a law which tends to secure men's moral and re-

ligious advantage; and, in the second place, viewing this question from the civil standpoint that the law is one which is calculated to make for men's social, temporal, and worldly interests. If these deductions are correct, certainly nothing more is necessary to prove that the enactment of such a law is desirable.

Now, it might be well to inquire what authorities favour the enactment of a law of this kind. I have pointed out already that this kind of legislation is not a novelty, but that it has existed in England for more than 900 years, and that Sunday legislation finds a place upon the statute-books of nearly all civilized nations.

I desire now to name a few of the authorities—jurists, statesmen, and ecclesiastics—who favour this regulation. And first, with regard to ecclesiastics, I hardly need to say that scarcely a Protestant clergyman is found who is not in favour of a Sunday rest law. Some two or three years ago, I gave a list of Catholic authorities favourable to an enactment of this character, among them Pope Leo XIII, Cardinal Taschereau, Cardinal McCloskey, Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Ireland, and other eminent ecclesiastics of the Catholic Church. Among the jurists who have declared in favour of such enactments as this, I would name, Blackstone, Sir Matthew Hale, Field and Webster. I might multiply the list indefinitely, but I choose only a few of the most prominent names in order to show that this principle is upheld by good authorities, by the highest legal as well as the highest ecclesiastical authority. Among these statesmen who have expressly declared themselves to be favourable to Sunday rest enactments, are Disraeli, Gladstone, Shaftesbury, Bright, Lincoln, Garfield, Blaine and Cleveland. Not only is the principle favoured by ecclesiastics, jurists, and statesmen, but it is favoured also by almost all the labour organizations on this continent at least. Among the labour organizations that have explicitly declared in favour of Sunday rest enactments, not from any religious principle at all, not because they are influenced by religious considerations, but because they realize the importance of securing to the labourer his weekly day of rest, are the Locomotive Engineers Association, the Knights of Labour, the Brotherhood of Railway Brakemen, the American Federation of Labour, and the Telegraphic Association of America. So much for the authorities that may be quoted. I might indefinitely extend this branch of my remarks.

Now, Sir, as to the Bill itself. The Bill does not profess to cover the entire field of Sunday observance requirements. It confines itself to matters of national jurisdiction, leaving to the various provinces of the Dominion the care of such branches of this question as pertain more properly to provincial jurisdiction. The Bill confines itself