

a nation which was once known for its regard for the sabbath to a nation which permitted its great Columbian Exposition to be opened on the Lord's Day, and is rapidly declining from the proud position it once occupied as a Christian, sabbath-keeping nation. I repeat that we will act wisely if we follow the example of the mother land and prohibit the publication of the Sunday newspaper, and by prohibition of its publication save the country from the attendant horde of evils that have attended its introduction in the United States.

It is said by some that we have not the power to deal with this question, that we have not the power to deal with this question of overwhelming importance which threatens the religious and moral life of the nation. I do not believe it. I believe, as the Parliament of this Dominion, we have power to make a criminal offence of any act calculated to injure this country. We have the right to make a criminal offence of theft, arson, murder and assault, and we have the right to make criminal a thing which is infinitely worse than all those acts in individual instances. I affirm that it is worse than any single case of murder—the consequences of publishing Sunday newspapers are worse than those following a single case of murder, arson or theft. I tell this House that the consequences of the introduction of the system, looking at the experience of the United States and judging, not by theorizing, but by the actual results following this great outrage on God's law, are of a character so grave and serious that the Government are warranted in dealing with this question. We have power over the introduction of obscene literature, we have power in the matter of copyright, we control the transmission of printed matter through the mails; and is it to be said that the central power of this country, possessing power over copyright, over the mails, over the importation of impure literature, is incapable of stretching forth its hand and dealing with the greatest danger which threatens the people of this country? Why should we go for national rather than local control? Because we want to make Canada the moral leader of this continent. We want to set an example to the neighbouring nation and we desire to place ourselves right where that country is wrong. Let Canada take this course, let Canada grapple with this evil and take heed of the results which have followed it in the neighbouring nation, and, forewarned, let Canada place herself in a position where she will be forearmed.

The second provision of the Bill is with respect to the closing of canals from six o'clock in the morning until nine o'clock on Sunday. A great many people think this is a surrender of principle, and that the canals should close during the twenty-four hours. However, the provision will be one that will prevent the quiet and sanctity of

the sabbath being interfered with so far as worship is concerned, and is one that should be adopted, as this country does not want to place itself in the position of committing breaches of a divine law.

Section 3 of the Bill is with respect to railway traffic. This Bill has been submitted to all the railway men of this country. In 1890 letters were received from Mr. Van Horne and Sir Joseph, then Mr. Hickson, with respect to this Bill, and the manager of the Grand Trunk made certain suggestions which are embodied in it. I assume, and I have a perfect right to assume, that the Bill is satisfactory to the railway managers, because no protest has been received from any of them since 1890, and the Bill has been submitted every year since that time. The provisions with respect to railway traffic, I am sorry to say, are perhaps not of a very important nature. The question was surrounded by difficulties. It was found practically impossible to deal with the question of through trains without inflicting serious consequences upon the railways. Their business connections with the American roads render it necessary for them to conform in this matter to American usage to some extent; at least, it is held that that is the case, and I presume it is correct.

An hon. MEMBER. You are making a compromise.

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend says: it is a compromise of the principle. This is an attempt to secure all that is practicable in the line of the principle. We might easily fail in asking more than we can get. All great reforms are secured step by step and item by item, and if the choice is placed before us either of securing something that is tangible and something that will lead to the securing of something more, I hold that it is prudent and proper that we should take a practical course and not stand on a theory that will wreck our attempts to do anything in the matter. Now, Mr. Speaker, this provision with regard to railway traffic goes as far as it is possible to go at the moment, by positive legislation, and it places before the United States and upon the United States, the responsibility of continuing the evil of through freight traffic, by offering to them reciprocity in legislation upon this matter and declaring our readiness to abate this part of the evil if the United States will render it practical to do so by concurrent action. This is the provision:

At such time as the laws of the United States shall make corresponding provision, no through freight in transit from one point on the frontier of the United States to some other point on the said frontier, shall be allowed to pass over Canadian roads on the Lord's Day, except live stock and perishable goods.

As soon as the United States will make corresponding regulations we place before them