

this proposition. We greatly strengthen the hands of that element in the United States that are agitating for railway reform. We go as far as we can go, without inflicting ruinous consequences upon our own roads, and we take a step which, in my opinion, will speedily secure for us the realization of what we desire by the adoption, on the part of the United States Government of that proffer which we make, to act in co-operation with them for the purpose of putting an end to freight traffic on the Lord's Day as far as it is possible to do so. The Bill, so far as it stands now, deals with local traffic. It prohibits local freight traffic, it prohibits local passenger trains, it leaves other trains with their necessary connection as it was thought necessary to do so. I may say with reference to the provision of this section, that this Bill was submitted to a special committee three years ago. Upon that special committee were representatives of all the railway interests in this country, and these points were thoroughly discussed. The difficulties that stood in the way of this arrangement were all raised and met, and the provisions of the Bill were necessarily made to meet the objections of those men, or the report of the measure could not have been secured. I repeat that the Bill, so far as it refers to railway traffic, makes the best provision that under the circumstances it was possible to secure.

The last provision of the Bill is with regard to excursion trains, and it prohibits excursions by train, partly by train and partly by steamboat, on the Lord's Day. This provision was introduced into the House several years ago, but the Bill failed to pass. A member of this House at that time, the Hon. Mr. Bowell, sent the Bill to a friend of his, Mr. Wood, in the Ontario Legislature, and Mr. Wood introduced in that Legislature that same Bill, and it was passed and is now the law of Ontario. This section provides:

Excursions upon the Lord's Day by steamboats plying for hire, or by railway, or in part by steamboat and in part by railway, and having for their only or principal object the carriage of passengers for amusement or pleasure and to go and return the same day by the same steamboat or railway or any others owned by the same person or company, shall not be deemed a lawful conveying of passengers within the meaning of this Act; and the owner, superintendent or person by virtue of whose authority and direction such excursion is permitted or ordered on the Lord's Day shall be deemed to be guilty of an indictable offence; provided that nothing in this section shall be deemed to prohibit the ordinary carriage of passengers authorized by provincial statute.

That is the provision with regard to Sunday excursion trains, and that is, as I have said, now the law of Ontario. There is, I believe, some pressure on the part of the public to induce railway managers to relax the policy they have hitherto pursued in regard to Sunday excursion trains. The great

railway managers of this continent are opposed to Sunday excursions, and they are desirous, I believe, so far as it is practicable in that respect, to give their employees Sunday rest, and the primary objection to the Sunday excursion train is found in the fact that one class of employees are robbed of their Sunday's rest in order that another class of employees may have a day of frolic. This is very happily set forth by Archbishop Ireland in his address at the International Sunday Rest Congress at Chicago, where he says:

The opponents of the Sunday strive to have us believe that the violation of Sunday rest is more or less in the interests of labour. When the question was agitated whether or not the Exposition should be kept open on Sunday, the chief reason put forward was the interest of labour. It turned out afterwards that sixteen thousand men were to be employed seven days in the week, so that other labourers could visit it on Sunday. Labour is most concerned in the sacred observance of Sunday.

And labour is concerned in the prohibition of Sunday excursion trains. Labour is concerned in the prohibition of anything that may act as an entering wedge to deprive the labourer of his Sabbath rest. No labourer actuated by proper motives would desire to rob his fellow-labourer, the engineer, the fireman, the brakeman, the conductor of the excursion train, of his Sabbath rest, in order that he might have a frolic upon that day. And if Sunday rest is to be preserved, the principle must be respected by all labourers, and will be respected by all labourers. No labourer with a true sense of what is at stake, will require any other labourer to lose his Sunday rest, feeling that he himself may be the next to suffer. The opening of the British Museum on the Sabbath has been systematically opposed from the commencement by the labourers of London. They realize that the opening of that museum and the consequent requiring of those in charge to lose their Sunday's rest would be apt to react upon themselves, and with instinctive realization of what is at issue they have uniformly opposed the opening of that museum on Sunday. In the interest of labour, I repeat, Sunday excursions should be prohibited. Anything that involves Sunday labour should be prohibited, and the argument: that it is in the interest of labour that these violations of Sunday observance are made, is a fallacious argument in all cases.

With regard to Sunday excursions, Mr. Speaker, let us see if they are desirable in themselves apart entirely from the consideration of labour being required and men being robbed of their Sunday rest in order that an excursion may be obtained. I hold they are not. In the first place, Christian people necessarily avoid the Sunday excursion; in the second place, the worst class patronize them, so far as my observation goes, and they are too often a saturnalia